OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SIXTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

6-7 GEORGE V, 1916

VOL. CXXV

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF APRIL TO THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF MAY, 1916, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY J. DE L. TACHÉ,
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1916

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—REVISED EDITION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Speaker: HON. ALBERT SÉVIGNY.

Tuesday, April 18, 1916.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the names of Messrs. Devlin and Ross be substituted for those of Messrs. Molloy and Tobin on the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS OF SENATE BILLS.

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Robert Charles Vondrau.—Mr. Scott.

Bill No. 93, for the relief of Percy Lynn Woods.—Mr. Boys.

THE BILINGUAL QUESTION.

CORRECTION OF STATEMENT IN WINNIPEG TELEGRAM.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, may I interpose just for one moment on a question of privilege. I would like to correct a report which I find in the Winnipeg Telegram of the 13th inst. referring to me, and which, under the circumstances, is a gross and mischievous misrepresentation. The Ottawa correspondent of the Winnipeg Telegram, whom I do not know at all, writes to his paper on the 13th of April as follows:

Ottawa, Ont., April 13.—Long after midnight Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Hon. Jacques Bureau, and Ernest Lapointe, M.P., who have been chosen by the Liberals to introduce a bilingual resolution in Parliament, were in conference in the Liberal leader's office. Previous to this conference Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Senator David, and Senator Choquette had met and discussed the question. Senator Choquette, following his speech in the Senate on Ontario volunteers, went with Senator David to the Liberal leader, and, it is believed, Sir Wilfrid Laurier conveyed their views to his supporters in the Commons.

This correspondent refers to the close relationship of Senator Choquette with Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I refer to this, under the circumstances, because the atmosphere being rather charged with electricity, there is an insinuation—not an insinuation, but a positive statement for which there is no foundation of fact whatever. The relations between Senator Choquette and myself are not close; they are the reverse of close; they are very strained politically, as was admitted by Senator Choquette himself on that very day. I have never seen Senator Choquette during this session except once, and not to discuss the bilingual question. The only thing that was discussed between us was a railway question of which we may hear further during the present session. As to my relations with Senator Choquette, I call the attention of the House to the explanation which he himself gave in the Senate the day after he made his anti-recruiting speech. Everybody knows that my views and the views of Senator Choquette upon this question are the very antipodes. I need not say what has been my attitude on the subject of the war, and of Canada's participation in the war, during this session and during all previous sessions. Senator Choquette made a statement on the subject because he had seen in the newspapers that my name had been connected with his. On the 13th of April Senator Choquette, on the floor of the Senate spoke as follows:

I take on myself the whole responsibility of my words in this House and outside, and I protest most strongly against the report connecting my words with the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the great leader of the Liberal party, in order by insinuation to represent him as being responsible for what I said. I advocated Liberal principles for thirty years under Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the other House, but we all know —I grieve to say it but must do so in order that the responsibility for my actions and words may be properly fixed—that over ten years ago I had some difference with Sir Wilfrid Laurier about what he should do. I have the greatest

respect for Sir Wilfrid, and I hope he has friendship for me, but we differed ten years ago when I had to take part against the Premier of Quebec at the time. Again, not more than five years ago I opposed Sir Wilfrid on his Naval Bill; I took the responsibility of my stand on that occasion, and I know the Tories were very glad to use my speech and my views against Sir Wilfrid Laurier at that time, to serve their purpose.

This is the total refutation of the imputation that is conveyed by the correspondent of the Winnipeg Telegram, and I hope he will take the opportunity of correcting that impression.

WAR CONTRACTS.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF MILITIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, I desire to make a personal explanation. On the 9th of March I left Ottawa for England. A week or so prior to my leaving, I spoke to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and some of my colleagues, explaining to them the necessity of my going. I asked the Prime Minister if he would see the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and ascertain if there were any questions likely to arise in connection with my department which would require my attendance here. It was agreed that I should see the leader of the Opposition, and I did so. I saw also the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and others on that side, and asked them if there were any questions affecting my department that would require my attendance here. The leader of the Opposition frankly stated that he did not know of any; but also, with the statesmanship which characterizes him, he declined to assume responsibility for all his followers. But I think I am justified in saying that he said he did not know of anything—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Personally.

Sir SAM HUGHES:—personally, he did not know of anything that would justify him in saying that I should require to remain here longer. None of the other prominent members of the Opposition could conceive of anything that might arise. It was known that I was going away. Needless to say, I did not "go duck-hunting with a brass band;" I did not placard the fact that I was crossing the ocean; a statement was given out that I was going South, which was perfectly true.

A day or so before I went away, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) spoke. I think I intimated to that gentleman also that I was going away. Those hon. members who will recall the night of his speech will recollect how his eye wandered to the clock, praying "for night or Blucher." They will recollect that he repeated himself; and, if Hansard correctly reports him, he repeated himself over and over and over again. I thought—I was unkind enough to think—that he was killing time, for it was known that I was leaving the next day at noon, and that was the only chance I should have to get at him. I asked him that night to continue and finish his speech, and indicated that I would be only too delighted to take up the few minutes that were necessary in reply—it would not take very long—before I left. But he pleaded weariness, and the sympathy of Mr. Speaker and the House was accorded him, and he got an opportunity to finish his speech next day. I do not know that much harm was done, however.

I shall not refer to my visit to England, and the splendid work the boys are doing, both in England and at the front, although so many of them are going down, I am sorry to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

Sir SAM HUGHES: But when I received the message that startling statements had been made in the House involving the honour of the Shell Committee, and, indirectly and to that extent, my own honour, I returned on the first and fastest steamer. I rather enjoyed the trip. I was glad and I am glad at the chance to clear the atmosphere.

In this connection, I wish to thank the hon. member for East Toronto (Hon. A. E. Kemp) for his kindness in acting so splendidly as Minister of Militia during my absence. I found everything in a very satisfactory condition in the department when I arrived. I have also to state that during my attendance at the sessions of this Royal Commission—and I intend looking after it fairly well—I shall do myself the honour, as has always been my custom when temporarily absent, to ask the Prime Minister to look after anything that may be necessary in connection with the Militia Department.

However, on my return, I have no hesitation in saying, I was surprised at the

character of the statements made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte). I had expected something really important. It is no part of a member's duty, nor is it right, to impugn the motives of another man, and I do not do so. But I had a perfect right to inquire for my own satisfaction what was the moving spirit behind the hon. gentleman's speech. Was it to ascertain the truth concerning this matter? If so, all he had to do was to communicate with Colonel David Carnegie or General Bertram of the Shell Committee, and he would have his questions answered in five minutes—answered truthfully, and answered to anybody's satisfaction. Was it to obtain notoriety? If so, he has had it, but it will be short-lived. Was it to injure the Tories? —those horrible Tories! If so, I have every reason to believe that he will fail in his object. Was it to assist the cause of human liberty? I want to point out to that hon. member that only truth and right directing a powerful attack can win for that cause. Or is it merely petty party parochial politics? I leave the public to come to their own conclusion on that subject. I cannot conceive of his object in trying to take advantage of the high-strung nervousness of the Canadian public, whose gallant sons are fighting and dying for the great cause. However, he is responsible to his own conscience and to his constituents.

Now, what are the conditions surrounding the shell contracts? At first no one could be induced to touch them. The horde of self-seekers, who afterwards came to the front, would not for love or money come out and help on the cause at the beginning. Bankers interfered who subsequently kept pestering General Bertram and the Shell Committee in order to bolster up little side-shows here and there all through the country who wanted contracts for shells. Prominent business men who had capital invested in factories and the machinery all ready could not be induced for love or money to go into the manufacture of shells and similar commodities at the beginning of the war. They were all poverty-stricken, nervous, and afraid to step in and help the Empire, though they would not take any risk in doing so. There was want of confidence on the part of capital; there was uncertainty as to the duration of the war; there was lack of proper equipment; there was a necessity for procuring the raw material; there was an absence of skilled labour; there were hard times; there were nervous people who suffered from lack of confidence; and there was a great need to remove all these depressing influences that were abroad throughout the country. But there were men who were not afraid. A few stepped into the breach; the manufacture of shells was begun; the money commenced to circulate; and it was found that Canadians could rise to the situation and play their part as well as the inhabitants of any other country in the upbuilding of the Empire and the development and protection of human liberty.

The next step was when confidence was regained. Every one wanted to get into the game. People talked in millions instead of thousands, and there were agents and promoters everywhere. That matter, however, has been touched upon by me in this House already during the present session, and I will not repeat what I said before.

As I understand the statements of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) and those of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell)—I trust that if I refer more to the hon. member for Richmond than to the hon. member for Carleton, the latter will not feel slighted—they are that a contract was made for time fuses with people who had no intention of producing fuses and who will never produce them; that $1,500,000 was paid to promoters who divided that sum amongst themselves; and that Great Britain will lose that money. The fact is—the details will follow later on— that the two companies with whom the contracts were made are now employing between them nearly 8,000 men, and that they have invested in plant, machinery, and materials fully $6,000,000. While they have undoubtedly met with great difficulties in the production of fuses, they have, with the exception of one other company, done better in that work than any other company on the continent of North America. So much so is that the case that the British Government, through Morgan and Company of New York, have recently given one of those firms a new contract for 4,000,000 additional time fuses and the other an order for 1,000,000 time fuses. Every dollar of the money advanced was protected by the guarantee of the strongest trust company on the continent of North America, namely, the Guaranty Trust Company of North America, and incidentally, I may say, by the fortunes of the men behind those companies. When I state that the American Tobacco Company, the members of which are worth upwards of $500,000,000 on their own personal accounts, were behind one concern,

and that other gentlemen with personal fortunes aggregating very large sums away up in the millions and tens of millions were behind the other, you will understand, Sir, that it is no wonder that the Guaranty Trust Company of North America was only too ready to go as security for those companies. The money so advanced went for the purpose for which it was intended, namely, for the purchase of plant and material. That is the general situation. The details will be elaborated later. From the experience which has been gained, I think perhaps it would have been better to undertake the manufacture of fuses in Canada, as I understand that similar undertakings have since been started in England and also in France. As a further instance of the bona fides of those two firms, it may be noted that the above advance of money was only 15 per cent of the contract price, whereas the usual cash advance through Morgan and Company is 25 per cent.

I turn now to the Hansard report of the speech of the hon. member for Richmond, which will be found on page 2360 of the Unrevised Hansard, under date of March 28. The hon. member states:

> The reason why Mr. Thomas did not have the opportunity of consulting with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was—

And so forth. I think it is rather a pity that my hon. friend did not consult with the leader of the Opposition, because, if he had done so, if my information is correct, he would have found that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition did have a conference with Mr. Thomas.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I had no conference with Mr. Thomas. He called on me socially; that was all.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am not retailing any confidential information imparted to me by Mr. Thomas. I have no hesitation in telling the House and this country and the British Empire that Mr. Thomas did not state that it was a private conference. He called on the right hon. the leader of the Opposition by request—so he informed him—of the Minister of Munitions of England, and had a conference. Whether it was long or short, public or private, good, bad or indifferent, I care not.

On page 2362 of the Unrevised Hansard the hon. member for Richmond says:

> With the exception of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, there was no factory or plant in Canada manufacturing t.n.t.

I regret exceedingly to have to correct the hon. member again. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company has never yet manufactured any t.n.t. This is another sin of the Shell Committee. When I was in England in 1914 I was asked by the War Office if t.n.t. could be manufactured in Canada. On my return to this country I sent for General Bertram, the then chairman of the Shell Committee. We talked the matter over, and the result was that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company received through the agency of the Shell Committee an advance of $90,000 to enable them to start the manufacture, not of t.n.t., but of toluol, a component part of t.n.t. Thus, through the instrumentality of the Shell Committee, the manufacture of toluol, which is subsequently manufactured into tri-nitro-toluene, was begun in the Dominion of Canada, and the credit for that is due to the Shell Committee and those who are associated with it. I merely make this remark as a passing correction. I have not yet found in the speech of the hon. member any statement that is correct, and I will just correct a few of his misstatements en passant.

The toluol manufactured by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company is taken to a place near Montreal and manufactured into t.n.t. The Toronto Chemical Company at the Sault, through the instrumentality of the Shell Committee and those associated with it, manufacture toluol, which is manufactured into t.n.t. The Curtis and Harvey Company and the Canadian Explosives Company are also manufacturing t.n.t.

With regard to a gentleman of whom some of you may have heard, Colonel J. Wesley Allison, I may say that this officer was formerly associated with Vanderbilt and Dr. Webb in the New York Central railway. I understand that he was purchasing agent or something of that kind. He was respected and is respected by the manufacturing concerns of the United States and of the Dominion of Canada. At the outbreak of the war manufacturers and contractors in the United States were uncertain whether under the law they could deliver their commodities to a foreign country in war time. It was uncertain whether the then Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, would not endeavour to prevent the exportation of these commodities. I challenge an instance where a contractor in the United States at that period undertook to deliver, outside of the

borders of the United States, any commodity in the war line, contracted for. Not one of them would do it. Then we were up against this proposition: That Britain, and Canada, and every other country contracting in the United States had to assume the responsibility of getting the goods out of the country. I was requested by the British Government to look after this end of the transaction, I enlisted the sympathy and assistance of Colonel J. Wesley Allison, and so well was it done—I may point out that in the early stages these articles were brought over by ferry, but that procedure became almost unbearable and could not be kept up; then whole trains were shipped right through in bond, and—I want this clearly understood, because I am told there has been some uncertainty about it—by arrangement with the Minister of Customs these war munitions were permitted to come in free of duty and were passed on to the Old Land. Later, through the instrumentality of this same officer, it was discovered that there was no need whatever of bringing these goods in a roundabout way from the manufacturing centres in the United States through Canada, so they were shipped direct from the port of New York and from other ports near the places of manufacture. So carefully was this managed that the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Harcourt, after these things had been going from New York for a year, still thought they were going by the old route through Canada. Let me point out further that when the Shell Committee had made inquiries in Canada from one end to the other, when I myself, assisting them, had asked at least fifty different concerns to undertake the manufacture of fuses in Canada—because a shell without a fuse is useless—it was found that not one firm in Canada, with all due regard to Mr. Russell, could be induced by the Shell Committee to manufacture fuses in this country. I know that articles have been padded up and written in the newspapers in this connection. I repeat that not one factory in Canada—not Mr. Russell, not Mr. Lloyd Harris—could be induced to manufacture fuses in the Dominion of Canada. I did not give much time to this sort of thing; I had other fish to fry. But I did devote an odd moment to it now and then in Ottawa at the Chateau Laurier, which does my right hon. friend the honour of commemorating him by its name. When I urged and begged some of these Canadian manufacturers to make fuses I had been met with the statement that they could not possibly make them. I turned to Allison, who was there, and I asked him if he could get capital to come in from the United States. He did not know anything about it; that afternoon he came to me and asked me about the details. I said: "I do not know a confounded thing about it; go and see Bertram." He saw Bertram and came back to me that night and mentioned the men who are in these two companies that are making these fuses to-day, and making them successfully. He spoke of a gentleman named Rufus Paterson, whom I had never met, seen, or heard of, but who was spoken of as one of the most capable mechanical engineers in the world. He spoke of Dr. Harris, well known to gentlemen on both sides of the House as a very capable man. He is a very wealthy man, living in the city of New York. He spoke of others—I forget the names; at all events they were men in these two companies. He said that they were very wealthy men, and that he would see what could be done to have the fuses made in Canada. But there were no buildings in which to manufacture them; new buildings would have to be built absolutely from the foundation up. I do not know the details; I never inquired into it from that hour on. Finally, however, when it came to letting the contracts for fuses, they could not get the buildings in Canada, and as the British Government were in a great hurry for the fuses it was decided, I understand, on the part of Gen. Bertram and the Shell Committee, to have them made in the United States in the meantime. I know nothing about Colonel Allison's connection with these companies. I may say frankly here that I think Colonel Allison, if he did get anything, or does get anything, out of these concerns, is as much entitled to it, because he has delivered the goods, as gentlemen who sell sausages, boots, leather, breeches, and other commodities of that kind up and down the Dominion of Canada.

Later, when it came to purchasing revolvers, pistols, rifle ammunition and other war material, and when I found that the price asked for rifle ammunition for the British Government at that time was $42.50 I again enlisted the services, or the sympathy and assistance, of Colonel Allison. In the intervening days I got the ammunition reduced to $37.50; I have the offer yet. We met these gentlemen through the instrumentality of Colonel Allison. I am not permitted to go into further details con-

cerning them for various reasons. I will give them to the leader of the House or the leader of the Opposition if they want them. It is absolutely straight; they can easily perceive why I could not give them. These experts gave us the benefit of their assistance and the price of ammunition was reduced from $37.50 to $33 per thousand, the cheapest ammunition by several dollars per thousand that has been contracted for during the history of the war.

On another matter, that of motor trucks, this gentleman also stepped in at my request. It was he who brought me first in touch with Mr. Beecroft and Colonel Thomas. Through association with these two gentlemen and himself our motor trucks are delivered to-day at $2,800 each, and I know of no trucks in the British Empire than can be obtained at less than list price less 10 per cent. Ours are list price less 25 per cent. At any rate, the price which we paid to the British Government for 51 trucks of the same quality as our own was $5,240 each. So that, whatever his faults may be—and I do not know that he has many more than some of the rest of us—he has at all events been instrumental in saving some money to the taxpayers of the British Empire.

On the question of Colts revolvers and pistols, let me point out how he assisted. In 1899 and 1900, the Auditor General's Report shows—and I am not finding fault with what was done then, but, oh, my! how the welkin would ring if, instead of getting our Colts revolvers to-day at $14, we had paid $15.50 for them, $1.50 going to Colonel J. Wesley Allison; and what a wail would have been set up if, instead of paying $18.50 for Colts revolvers, $1.50 had been added to that price and the total had been $20, $1.50 going to J. Wesley Allison or any other agent! There would have been a wail from one end of this country to the other. But the lowest price was the price at which orders for pistols were placed by Colonel J. Wesley Allison. His statement to the head of the Colts firm, in my presence, was that not one cent must be added to the cost of these pistols over the lowest possible net price, for any commissions or any rake-off or anything of the kind, and not one cent has been added to the cost of these pistols. They stand to-day at $14, the same pistols as my hon. friend opposite paid $15.50 for in 1900. They stand to-day at $18.50, and I challenge the universe to show one of these revolvers that has been sold for one cent less than $18.50 to any Government excepting the Government of the United States, which has an agreement to that effect. We are told that the trade can get them for $14.50. It is well known that the public, the trade, cannot get them in the Dominion of Canada or in any other country outside of the United States for $14.50 or $15; they must pay duty. And, coming into Canada, with the duty added, that revolver stand at $19.50 instead of at the figure quoted by my hon. friend. Sir, $10.50 is the cost price for that pistol in Canada, and $18.50 is the price at which it was sold to the Canadian Government, to the French Government, to the Russian Government. 200,000 of them were sold to the Russian Government at $18.50.

And now, if my hon. friend the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) will permit me, I shall refer to his summary at the conclusion of his address, as containing all that is worthy of comment or recognition in his remarks. He speaks of the Shell Committee having given contracts to themselves. He instances the Bertram Company. I need only point to page 1818 of Hansard, where my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) completely refutes his argument in that regard, and shows that General Bertram had nothing to do with it. It is also shown on page 1818 that the Chapman Engine and Manufacturing Company, which is charged by the hon. member for Carleton with being subsidiary to the Bertram Company, has nothing to do with it. It is also charged that the Valley City Seating Company is subsidiary to the Bertram Company, and on page 1818 that statement is also exposed and refuted. Then it was also charged that the Universal Tool Steel Company, of which Mr. Watts is a member, was in the same position, and at page 1820 it is explained that there is not one particle of fact in that assertion. Then it was asserted that the Electric Steel and Metals Company had Mr. Carnegie as a director. I believe that is a mistake, and that they have put in the wrong Carnegie. But at page 1602 and 1805 that is also satisfactorily explained and any suggestion of impropriety refuted.

Then it is said that the Nova Scotia Steel Company was given contracts through Colonel Cantley. Let me say one word for Colonel Cantley—not of apology; he does not need it, nor does his concern need it. When this matter came up, when the manufacturers who had undertaken to make the few shells we had then on order looked into

the matter, they were told that they had to buy crucible steel, acid steel, for the shells—that the other classes of steel would not do. They came to me and said: "We are up against it; we can get only 400 tons of crucible steel in North America." I said: "What about all our big steel industries in Canada?" "Oh," they said, "their steel will not do." Then we were given some scientific reason. I said: "This is all moonshine; get out and make the shells which we have undertaken to make." I went to the Prime Minister and I asked where I could get a man who could give me data on steel, and I was referred to Thomas Cantley, of New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, who happened to be in town at that time. Let me point out that Colonel Cantley undertook to experiment with basic steel for the Shell Committee, and at one time the Shell Committee had gone into the New Glasgow Company to the extent of upwards of $500,000 through experimenting and work of one kind and another that Colonel Cantley had undertaken for the Shell Committee, without a dollar of security or a dollar of reimbursement up to that time. The result was that Thomas Cantley and the Nova Scotia Steel Corporation finally proved to the British Government that basic steel, Canadian steel, was just as good for shells as the acid steel from the United States or other lands, and to-day Canada has had eight hundred million pounds of steel produced by her own people within her own borders, and turned into shells to assist in smashing the Germans. All I have to say in connection with this is that there is nothing too good, in my opinion, for Colonel Thomas Cantley and the Nova Scotia Steel Corporation.

The next heading in my hon. friend's speech is the question of prices. I shall not go into the details of that to-day. On a former occasion I gave prices from manufacturers in Canada, in England, and in the United States, and, in every instance but one, the Canadian prices were better than those in either of the other two countries under similar conditions. I might point out that the early prices of these commodities would naturally be fairly high. In any new undertaking, by a Government or by a corporation, the cost of the new and necessary machinery is invariably added to the cost of the first few orders, which would naturally make the first few orders for shells expensive. Then the question of unskilled labour had to be considered in this case. At the beginning we had Colonel Lafferty, Colonel Weatherby, and a few lads from the Dominion Arsenal at Quebec, who worked day and night going through the country trying to establish industries, and they did yeoman work in that respect. But they could not stay in these places all the time. They had to attend to their own duties, and it was absolutely impossible that two or three men could look after the scores of institutions in Canada then making shells. But little by little we trained up expert men to do this work, and, after the first order or two, the losses through the testing of the shells were reduced to a minimum.

And to-day Canada has within her borders thousands and tens of thousands of skilled men, whereas at the beginning she had only half a dozen or a dozen. That is a great advantage. The shells were tested, and if one shell out of 120 failed, the whole batch of 120 had to be thrown away. Only the other evening the officer in charge at Petawawa pointed out to me that 40,000 fuses had been thrown out because of the failure of a few to pass the test. In the United States 100,000 fuses were thrown out because they did not function properly.

With regard to the question of prices. On February 13, 1914, a requisition was made on the War Department, England, for 2,500 quick firing 18-pounder shrapnel shell fused complete in case.

The complete quick firing 18-pounder charge comprises shell, copper driving band brass socket, fixing screw, centre tube, tin cup, steel diaphragm, ¾ bullets, resin, powder bursting charge, perforated powder pellets, plug, fuse and fuse cover.

On the 18th June, 1914, the War Office placed an order with Armstrong & Whitworth for the empty shells only at £65 per 100, or $3.16⅔ each, to which would have to be added 5½ per cent for War Office departmental expenses and inspection, bringing the price of the empty shells alone up to $3.33⅓ each.

On the 15th April, 1914, the price paid Vickers for quick firing 18-pounder cartridges complete with shells, etc., was £1. 17s. 6d. or $9.12½; adding 5½ per cent for War Office departmental expenses and inspection brought the price up to $9.63 at Woolwich.

On the 24th September, 1914, Vickers offered to supply quick firing 18-pounder shrapnel shells complete (case, shell, primers, fuse, etc.) at £248. 10s. per 100 rounds, or $12.09⅓ each, to which would have to be

added 5½ per cent for War Office expenses, or altogether $12.75½ each. The above prices are for delivery at Woolwich, England.

When the war broke out the price of No. 80 fuses (aluminum) as quoted by the War Department, England, was 10s. 9d. each, or $2.61 to which 5½ per cent had to be added, bringing the cost up to $2.76 each.

The cost of the quick firing 4.5-inch ammunition ordered on the 19th July, 1911, through the War Office from Vickers, was: cartridge, 10s. 3d. net, or $2.63¾; shell, £1. 6s. 7½d. net, or $6.84; and fuse, 11s. net, or $2.82¼. My hon. friend will therefore see that he has made an error in quoting the price of the 4.5 shell.

In regard to the cost of shells in Canada, I have here a statement showing the estimated total cost of the materials ordered, the balance of shells to be filled at present prices, and the War Office prices authorized to the Canadian Shell Committee for the manufacture of those shells, and which they filled; there is a surplus of $42,690,630 from the prices authorized by the War Office. So that the Canadian Shell Committee would have been entitled to pay for the manufacture of those shells on the basis of the British War Office prices a sum of $42,690,630 more than they did pay. And yet we are told that the Canadian Shell Committee paid exorbitant prices. The War Office authorized a total cost of $345,220,000, but we fell short of that to the extent that our cost was $303,125,000. Let me point out that the British Government does not regard the price as the most important matter. Fortunately, or unfortunately, I regarded the price as a very serious matter, and my object from start to finish was to get the price down to the lowest figure profitable to the manufacturers. But the British War Office does not so regard it. What they want, first of all, is the proper quality; they are not particular in war time as to the price so long as they get the proper quality. In all those cases, it will be found that every reasonable effort was made by General Bertram and Colonel Carnegie to ascertain the price not only in the United States, but in Canada. They visited every part of the Dominion, and every part of the United States where anybody offered shells, and, in the circumstances, these officers did their duty, I am satisfied, absolutely squarely, as will be shown later on.

4 p.m.

We are told that in the contract for the fuses there was a commission of $1,000,000. Well, that is only 10 per cent on the whole transaction, and these gentlemen had to assume the risk of German outrages, of a change in prices, as well as other risks. I tell this House to-day, what will be proven before the Royal Commission in a day or so, that not one firm on the continent of North America could be induced to touch the No. 80 fuse at the price which was offered, and there is not one firm that is making a dollar out of the No. 80 fuse. In any event, the British Government have expressed their entire satisfaction with the firms which obtained these contracts by giving them directly through Morgan, additional contracts amounting to 4,000,000 fuses in one case, and 1,000,000 fuses in another; that is No. 80 British fuse. And these are the two mushroom companies that have been talked of before this House.

My hon. friend from Richmond endeavoured to make a point out of the advance of $1,500,000. Let me point out to this House, what will be proven before the Royal Commission, that the usual advance made by the British Government is not 15 per cent, but 25 per cent; and I learn from the Shell Committee that the gentlemen from the United States, who accepted those contracts, fought, and almost threw up the contracts, because they were cut down to 15 per cent in the matter of an advance, instead of getting the usual advance of 25 per cent. As has been pointed out, that advance was secured by the strongest guaranty trust company on the continent of North America.

There was another point made about the division of profits. I know nothing about that, and I do not know that anybody else does except what can be learned from the contract which was purported to be read by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte). He speaks of 40 cents a fuse on inspection, but like many of those rainbow affairs, by the time these gentlemen get through with their contracts there will not be many 40 cent pieces to divide amongst them. However, that will all come out; I know nothing about it whatever. I may point out further that the Canadian Car Company, of Amherst, had a contract for several million shells which was secured through the instrumentality of Colonel Allison and Colonel Mackie for the Russian Government, the contract being for 2,000,000 rounds of completed shrapnel shell at $15.75 each. The price in the Morgan contract with Great Britain for

the Russian Government for, not 2,000,000 shells, but 7,500,000 shells, was $15.65, but that was minus the powder tube, which I am assured, costs $2. Then there is a difference in price between the United States fuse and the Russian fuse of from 75 cents to $1. In other words, the Russian shell, made through the Morgan Company, cost $18.65, whereas the Russian shell made through the Canada Car Company is costing only $15.65.

The Canadian Car and Foundry Company advanced over $3,000,000 before a fuse was delivered, the American Locomotive Company over $1,500,000 and the American Car Company over $1,500,000. The Scoval Company, of Waterbury, Connecticut, were the only makers of fuses in North America prior to the war, and they positively refused the Shell Committee. To this day they will not make the Mark 80, and hesitate to undertake the making of any fuse that contains aluminum. Scovals were offered $4.50 by the Shell Committee for British fuses, but they would not touch it. The Canadian Car Company contract for 2,500,000 fuses should have been completed by March 31, 1916. On this date less than 100,000 fuses had been delivered. American manufacturers say that the International Fuse and Arms plant is one of the most extensive and best equipped plants in the world. When the American Ammunition and International plants succeed in getting their graduation and powder ring established, they can increase two or three thousand daily up to their maximum of from 15,000 to 20,000 per day. The graze fuse is a detonator. The General Electric Company had 40,000 rejected last week. The inspector assures me that sixteen car loads also were rejected. The International Steel and Ordnance Company were to make first deliveries of detonators in December, 1915, but it will be May or June before they make their first deliveries, and the Canadian Car Company, sub-contractor, is helping them out in the meantime. Now, I propose to give a brief summary to show how these deliveries are being made by the United States companies of time fuses, not detonator fuses. It is as follows:

Company.	Kind of Fuse.	Date of Contract.	Contract date first delivery.	Total Contract.	Deliveries to date.
Can. Car & Foundry Co.	Russian	March 15..	July	2,500,000	95,000
American Car Co.	American.	August 15..	Dec. 15.	1,000,000	None.
Bartlett—Haywood	"	" 15..	" 15.	1,000,000	"
Eddystone Amm. Co	"	" 15..	" 15.	1,000,000	"
Scoval Co. on Bethlehem Co.	"	" 15..	" 15.	2,000,000	"
Bethlehem Co.	"	" 15..	" 15.	1,000,000	"

American Locomotive Company were five months behind in making their first delivery.

Now, if I may be permitted, I shall pass on and take up the remarks of my hon. friend from Richmond once more. At page 2376 of Hansard, of March 28, he says:

> There is also an agreement in September, 1915, between J. Wesley Allison, of Canada, Eugene Lignanti and Benjamin F. Yoakum, of New York city.

I am assured that, when the hon. member stood up in his place in this House and professed to read from an agreement, he knew there was no such agreement in existence. He goes on to speak of the various companies concerning which I know nothing.

Then he speaks of the Southern rifle deal, relating to a contract for 500,000 rifles between the Vickers Company and Colonel J. Wesley Allison, which would amount to $8,500,000. I confess to some knowledge of that particular rifle deal. It concerns 600,000 rifles. The 500,000 of these rifles which are in question, had been shipped in 1913. I am not raising the question whether they were or were not shipped before that, but they were shipped by the German Government to Brazil. It had been hinted that the situation existing between the United States and Brazil at that time was not conducive to good feeling. It was known that there were 700,000 ex-German soldiers settled in Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay and the Argentine Republic. These rifles were shipped out in 1913 and they are there to-day. Every effort was made on behalf of the British Government, I understand, to secure these rifles, but in vain. I was appealed to and asked semi-officially to report on the feasibility of getting these rifles. I have no hesitation in saying that I very soon pronounced it to be one of those

rainbow-chasing affairs which are to be found in every street, in every city in the Dominion, or on the North American continent, or in the world. First, they would be asked five cents a rifle, then they would be asked ten cents, then there would be another advance, and the agents of the German interests who were holding those rifles were simply taking all the money they could get out of the various people who were anxious to get them; but they had no intention, so far as I could ascertain, of delivering up those rifles. Without going into the whole story, the rifles were never obtained and they are there yet. So that, when my hon. friend says that this was agreed to he does not say that they got them.

Then he speaks of another deal concerning 140,000 rifles, known as the Allison Southern rifle deal. It will be found that this was even more visionary than the first one. I objected to these rifle deals; I reported directly against them; and, if it is true that Allison was in them—and I do not know whether he was or not—I reported directly against his best interests and accordingly took away the amount that it is stated Allison was to get. If Allison, as it is stated, was to get $1.25 out of each rifle, I robbed him of $1.25 each on 600,000 rifles in one case and on 140,000 rifles in another.

Then, the hon. gentleman says that there were negotiations pending with the Providence Chemical Company, of St. Louis, for the sale of 5,000,000 pounds of picric acid. It might as well be understood first as last that whenever any man, I care not whether he was black or white, French or British, or of any other race—or German Canadian—appealed to the Department of Militia and Defence, representing a firm that was straightforward and competent to do the work, I had no hesitation, nor had the Prime Minister—I think I am justified in using his name in that regard—in backing that concern to bring trade to Canada from any part of the Empire or the world. Therefore, not only did we do that, but when I found that exorbitant prices were being charged the British Government or the Canadian Government, I used my best endeavours to have these prices reduced to what was fair and reasonable. At the time I am speaking of, the prices being paid for picric acid, as I was informed, were exorbitant, and an effort was made in England by members of the British Government to have those prices reduced by bringing in other competitors. The result was, not that this gentleman sold anything, but that he forced the parties who had been negotiating with the British Government to reduce their prices down to lower and proper figures. That is what I had in my mind when I stated that through the instrumentality of this gentleman millions upon millions had been saved to the British Government; because it is well known in this House that I have been asserting from the beginning of this war, that if the war is going to be won, it is going to be won by dollars and cents and munitions. Flesh and blood cannot run up against steel and shrapnel shell and high explosives with any hope of winning the war. Therefore I have maintained from the start, I maintained it long years ago—and I in consequence incurred odium and the enmity of certain gentlemen in Canada—that this war was coming on, and that it was our duty to get ready when commodities were cheap. I realized that Germany had every warehouse within her borders filled from cellar to garret with rifles and munitions of war, and that is borne out by the facts, for they have not yet caught up to those supplies which they had made before the beginning of the war. I pointed out that they had these munitions made cheaply, and that the nations that fought them would have to produce their supplies in a hurry, with unskilled labour, and under very adverse conditions, and that the prices which would be paid by the British, the French, and the colonies, would of necessity be abnormal, being those of war-time. I declared then that every dollar that could be husbanded should be husbanded in order that the final result of victory for liberty might be assured. I had therefore no hesitation in endorsing our saddlery men, our shirt manufacturers, our boot manufacturers, our clothing manufacturers, our producers of every kind in Canada, who had commodities to sell and who could provide these commodities for the British Government at fair prices.

The hon. member for Richmond in the course of his speech was asked some questions:

Sir Robert Borden: Is the hon. gentleman reading from an agreement or from a brief?

Mr. Kyte: I am reading from a statement I have prepared.

Sir Robert Borden: Would he be good enough to send over any of the agreements he may have read as he finishes with them?

Mr. Kyte: I will send over everything that the right hon. gentleman is entitled to have from

me. The Munitions Board is not very ready to give us information; I do not think we should hesitate to stand upon our rights in regard to this matter.

Sir Robert Borden: I was not asking the hon. gentleman to depart from any rights. I was merely asking, as a matter of courtesy, if he would have any objection to sending over the agreement he has read.

Now, they say that an equivocation is worse than a falsehood.

Mr. Kyte: We have sent over one document already.

If the inference from that is not that he was reading from an agreement, I do not understand the use of the English language. Further on he speaks of a contract with the Electrolytic Metals Company, of which I never have heard that I am aware of; and then he goes on to say:

I have here a summary of the amount that was actually divided between Yoakum, Lignanti, and Allison.

Then he went on to read a list of commissions that, I understand, turned the head of the House of Commons, the figures were so magnificently large. All rainbow! I am assured by my counsel, who has been in New York awaiting my arrival, that he has examined these, and that not one dollar of this stuff has ever been divided or ever will be divided.

After referring to a contract with one of the ammunition companies, in regard to which I know nothing, the hon. gentleman speaks of the Edwards Valve Manufacturing Company, a matter that will come before the commission, and then he goes on:

Out of a contract negotiated between the Canadian Vickers and Allison for 500,000 rifles, known as the Allison Southern rifle deal for $8,500,000, Yoakum and Allison receive $625,000.

I am informed that it is unlikely that one dollar was ever received by them, or that one dollar will ever be received by them. He says:

Then, out of a contract negotiated between the Canadian Vickers and J. W. Allison to sell 140,000 rifles, and known as the Allison Southern Rifle deal, Allison and Yoakum receive $1.25 per rifle, or $175,000, less one-eighth paid to Lignanti.

Not one dollar has ever been received or ever will be received. And yet a gentleman, representing a free constituency in the Dominion of Canada, knowing that he had no data whereon to make these statements, stands up here and makes to this House and this country these abominable misstatements.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is exceeding the rules of debate.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I accept the ruling. I retract the word "abominable." The hon. gentleman goes on to refer to a contract for 2,500 tons of picric acid, which, he figures, paid a commission of $262,500. Not one dollar was ever contracted for, not one dollar was ever received for this contract. This House and this country are told that these men pocketed these huge sums, and there is not a particle of truth in the statement.

Then, the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) speaks. They even wakened him up with the sound of these big figures—and he does not deal in small sums. They roused him from his slumbers, and he asked a question:

Sir Thomas White: Would my hon. friend state the contracts from which these commissions are to be derived?

And the answer of the hon. member for Richmond followed, and will be found at page 2378 of Hansard:

Mr. Kyte: I have read them.

Sir Thomas White: Are they contracts of the Shell Committee?

Mr. Kyte: Not all of them.

Sir Thomas White: My hon. friend will realize the difficulty of following such a complicated statement as this.

I should think so.

Sir Thomas White: Does my hon. friend suggest that the commissions to which he has been referring are to be derived under contracts with the Shell Committee?

Mr. Kyte: Not all of them; I think there are three with the Shell Committee.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte), as reported at page 2380, says:

The hon. member for Carleton found fault not only as to non-deliveries, but as to the prices being exorbitant and altogether unjustifiable.

Let me point out that there is only one firm on the continent of North America that has been able to compete with these two firms that began under such adverse conditions. I have read the great list of other firms that have not yet delivered one solitary fuse. And as to the prices, so far as the No. 80 British fuse is concerned, the hon. gentleman cannot find a firm in the United States or Canada to take a contract and guarantee deliveries, in lots of a million, at the price accepted by these concerns. The American fuse is 75 cents to $1 cheaper than the No. 80 British fuse—these are time fuses I am speaking of. In regard

to the graze fuse, the No. 100 detonating fuse, I have nothing to say; I never heard of it definitely until after the contract was made. When the original order came from the British Government, an agreement had been made, as already referred to in this House, for these fuses. They had no detailed, specific plans for the No. 100 fuse. They knew that the price in Great Britain was nearly $4—something like $3.60 or $3.72. I do not know anything of the details, but am merely giving an explanation to the House as I have it; and it was found that this detonator or No. 100 fuse could be made somewhat more cheaply, and it is being made somewhat more cheaply to-day.

When in England I read an extract from a German paper relating to present conditions. The Germans claim that since the outbreak of the war they have added a population of 55,000,000 to their domain. They claim that they have annexed Belgium almost entirely, the northern portion of France, nearly all of Russian Poland, nearly all of Galicia, and all of Servia; that Bulgaria is with them and also Montenegro, Roumania, the Adriatic provinces, and Albania, and that they have formed an alliance with Turkey. I had the honour years ago in this House of Commons of pointing out that that was the ambition of Germany, namely, to rule from the North sea and the Baltic to the Adriatic, the Aegean, and the Euxine. They have seized and they control to-day all the vast resources, agricultural, mineral, and manufacturing, of those countries that I have named. They control the rich industries and mines of Belgium and of France, at Lille, Armentières, and all those great industrial centres which our boys can see every day from the trenches. In Russian Poland they have possession of vast mines and manufacturing establishments. In Galicia they control very rich oil fields and the other industries there. In Servia they have abundance of copper from the mines there. Bulgaria, with her vast resources, is with them, and I see from recent statements in the press that Roumania has come to an agreement to furnish Germany with millions of tons of farm produce. Every day, they claim, the grandest railway train in the world runs from Berlin to Constantinople, and the vast resources of the Turkish Empire, in men, materials, and produce, are at their disposal. Every morning shows that the German submarines are not idle, and the commerce of the Allies is disappearing from the face of the waters. Such is the situation, according to the Germans. Yet, after an absence of four or five weeks, I find, on my return to Canada, that two hundred of the ablest men in this country, members of the House of Commons, instead of being out helping on the cause, are sitting here listening to piffle of that description.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I have just one word to say in regard to the facts and materials which have been presented to the House by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. When my hon. friend left for England the motion which I had made asking for an investigation into all the operations of the Shell Committee was still pending before the House. The Government had from the start taken the attitude that this investigation should not be granted and that they would not, for reasons with which the House is familiar, favour such an investigation; in fact, that they would oppose it. But, when my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte), in the course of the debate, after my hon. friend had left for England, brought to the attention of the House contracts made by the Shell Committee with two American concerns, which the hon. member for Richmond characterized as mushroom companies, for the manufacture of some 5,000,000 fuses at a price of $4.50 each, and stated that the approval of this contract had attached to it the signature of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, the Government thought that they would, at all events in so far as that operation was concerned, change their attitude and grant a commission of investigation. .The Prime Minister informed us two days afterwards that he had advised His Royal Highness the Governor General that a commission should be appointed, and that he had communicated with the Minister of Militia asking him to return at once. The situation in the eyes of the Government, therefore, was very grave, inasmuch as it necessitated the return of the Minister of Militia. When the hon. gentleman came here to-day, as the commission had been granted, as therefore his conduct in this matter was to be investigated in the terms laid down by the Order in Council, we expected that my hon. friend would explain his connection with it; that he would inform the House how it had happened, what were his intentions, what were his motives, and what he had in mind when he made those contracts. My hon. friend has

to-day discussed almost everything connected with the motion which was pending when he left, and which has been disposed of since, but he has said very little about his connection with those contracts for time fuses. He has not chosen to explain the circumstances under which the contracts were given. In fact, if I have understood him correctly, he has rather hinted that the contracts had been made without his participation. If that inference is correct, he has not explained to us how his signature and his approval is attached to them. The only reference which he made to the contracts was to explain why he had given them to two foreign firms, the information being that Canadian manufacturers had been urged again and again to enter upon the manufacture of fuses and shells and that they would not do so. He insisted that he was in a manner forced to go to the United States because the Canadian firms had been deaf to his repeated appeals in that regard. That is a matter for investigation. But, Sir, my hon. friend has chosen to go into other contracts—steel, boots, shoes, Colts revolvers, and so on.

I have to express my regret that he did not think it advisable to refer also to a contract which has been brought forward prominently in the press with regard to the disposal of small ammunition It has been alleged in the press that his department has sold fuses and cartridges, manufactured by the Government for the benefit of the country, to a private firm. This matter is in the air to-day, it is demanding attention, and I am surprised that my hon. friend did not refer to it, since he chose to go into other matters than this one.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I shall be more than delighted, at any time, at any place, in this House or out of the House, if my hon. friend wants any data on that subject, to give him everything he wants.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If that was the intention of my hon. friend, he has lost a fine opportunity of carrying it out. The information is desired not only by myself. The press has talked about it and has given the views of the community on the subject—not only the Liberal press, but the Conservative press as well.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I must say that I never heard of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It may be; I assume that my hon. friend has not heard it. At all events, if that is the case, he will have an opportunity of giving an explanation. At this moment I do not want to deal with the matter in any way; it is not fair for me, or for the hon. gentleman, or for the House, that the matter should be discussed to-day.

I regret that my hon. friend has gone into matters which will come before the commission. But one statement particularly struck me in the references made by my hon. friend, and with regard to it I think the House is entitled to some information. My hon. friend told us that it is not his intention to act as Minister of Militia pending this investigation, and that he is turning his department over to the Prime Minister. I should like to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to inform us what is the exact condition of things—whether or not my hon. friend the Minister of Militia is still in the Government, and, if he is in the Government, why he is not administering his own department?

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): The Minister of Militia is still a member of the Government. He has asked me to undertake the administration of his department while he is occupied with the investigation which has been granted at the instance of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Has my right hon. friend concluded his remarks?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I desire to say that, with regard to the matters to which the right hon. gentleman has alluded, and which are now under investigation, the Minister of Militia and Defence has assured me that he not only desires, but intends that the investigation shall be full and complete to the end, and that he is prepared from now henceforth to place his time at the disposal of that commission in order that the most searching investigation may be made. I sent a telegram on Friday last to Sir William Ralph Meredith, which I communicated to the Hon. Mr. Justice Duff—I had heard that the commission had not been organized—desiring them to undertake the organization of the commission and to proceed with the inquiry at the earliest possible moment. I received a telegram in reply from Sir William Ralph Meredith, on Saturday I think it was, informing me that the commission would meet to-morrow and would then organize and continue the investigation

with every possible expedition until it is completed.

I do not know that there is anything further in the observations of my right hon. friend that demand comment at the moment, except this: The Minister of Militia and Defence had had no previous opportunity of making reply in respect of certain matters with which certain hon. gentlemen on the other side sought to connect him. Many allegations were introduced with regard to enormous profits supposed to have been made by Mr. Allison, which were not connected, so far as I am aware, with the Shell Committee, or with the Minister of Militia and Defence, or with the Government in any shape, form, or manner whatsoever. The allegations of the hon. member for Richmond were entirely new to me in respect of nearly all these matters, but they were introduced in such a way as to endeavour to connect the Minister of Militia and Defence with the supposed enormous profits. Therefore, notwithstanding the criticism of my right hon. friend, I think it was a perfectly proper thing for the Minister of Militia to make the observations which he did make in reference to the supposed contracts in order to dissipate the idea that he had any connection with them, or that any such contracts were, as a matter of fact, ever made, or any such profits ever realized. It seemed to be the object of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, at a most critical time in the history of this country and of the Empire, to swell up an enormous sum of supposed profits, and by veiled insinuation to connect the Minister of Militia and Defence with them. I am free to say that there never was a Royal Commission recommeded and granted, for inquiry into the conduct of a minister of the Crown, that was based on such slender and slight foundation of charge or assertion as the Order in Council and the commission issued in pursuance of it in this case. In recommending that course to His Royal Highness the Governor General, I went beyond the pledge that I had given to the House. I went beyond that pledge because I realized the impression which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were endeavouring to create by suggestion and insinuation, and because I was determined that these insinuations should be probed to the bottom. Let me assure my right hon. friend and gentlemen on the other side of the House that they will be probed to the bottom by this commission, and that no effort on the part of this Government will be wanting to that end. In making that assertion to this House I am expressing the determination and conviction of every one of my colleagues, and especially of the Minister of Militia and Defence himself. To-morrow this matter will proceed before the tribunal which has been selected, and while that investigation is being carried out the Minister of Militia and Defence will give his whole time and his whole energies to the investigation of the facts and the determination of the truth. I am prepared, at his request, although it is a very great burden in addition to responsibilities already sufficiently onerous, to undertake to give my attention to the affairs of his department in order that the efforts of this country in doing its part in the great conflict which the Empire is carrying on may not be stayed and that our great common cause may not suffer from lack of attention or effort in that department. That is the whole situation, which we expose frankly and without any hesitation to the members of this House and to the people of this country.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: (Pictou): At the request of my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), who was forced to leave the House and who was mentioned by the Minister of Militia in connection with a conversation the minister had with him previous to his going to England, I desire to state that the Minister of Militia had spoken to the hon. member for Halifax and asked him whether he thought the Opposition would agree to allow him to get his Estimates through quickly in order to enable him to leave for England. He replied to the hon. Minister of Militia that he could not tell him, and suggested that he should see the leader of the Opposition. He affirms that he made no undertaking with regard to any matter as a result of that conversation. I desire to say with regard to myself, for the hon. Minister of Militia mentioned my name, that the minister spoke to me with regard to his going to England.

He discussed with me certain matters which I need not mention here, and he asked me whether I would see the right. hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to the question whether any matters would come up affecting him. I told him I would not see the right hon. leader of the Opposition; that, if he desired to hold any com-

munication with those upon this side of the House in regard to any matter of that kind, he would have to see the leader of the Opposition himself, and I was aware that he did so.

I understood the Minister of Militia to say, in response to my leader, with reference to the question of small arms ammunition, that he was prepared to deal with that question. I would ask him to take occasion to deal with that question at an early day, as there has been some slight difficulty in getting information in regard to the matter in his absence.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I will remove every difficulty, and the hon. gentleman's most ardent wishes shall be gratified. So far as concerns the tittle-tattle of discussion between the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and myself, that is nothing. I had already seen the leader of the Opposition when I saw the junior member for Halifax; but that does not matter. The gentlemen were very courteous; I am not finding the slightest fault. The leader of the Opposition said that, so far as he was concerned, he knew of nothing coming up, and he was very nice. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was also very nice; I was delighted with him for once in my lifetime.

DEATH OF PRIVATE D. CURRY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. KYTE: I desire to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Militia to some complaint with respect to the illness and death of Private Dugall Curry, at St. Joseph's hospital, Glace Bay, during the past week. It is alleged that Private Currie did not receive the medical treatment he was entitled to from the medical officer in charge of his regiment, and it is alleged that, owing to that neglect and the consequent delay in receiving medical treatment, his illness was increased and possibly his death resulted. I should be glad if the acting minister would make inquiry.

Mr. KEMP: I will draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the matter and he will likely give an answer to the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

RECRUITS FOR THE ROYAL NAVY.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Supply:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of the Naval Service to an article in to-day's issue of the Montreal Daily Mail. This House will recall that, at an early period of the session, I ventured to press upon the attention of the House the fact that it is very desirable that in this great war Canada should play some part upon the sea as well as upon the land. I felt that, coming from a portion of the Dominion where our men were accustomed to following vocations on the sea, it would be more easy to obtain men who would volunteer for naval service than to obtain volunteers for service on the land. I see in the Daily Mail a despatch from Ottawa to the effect that the English Government have asked the Canadian Government to take steps to recruit men for service in the navy, and that a deputation, headed by Lord Alfred Guinness, is on its way out from England to interview the Government with regard to this question. It was urged by hon. gentlemen opposite, when I mentioned the matter, that such a thing as recruiting men in Canada to serve in the navy would be entirely unnecessary, that they were not required, that England did not need in her navy any one from this country. Will the Minister of the Naval Service tell us if this despatch is correct, and if it is the intention of this Government to proceed to call for recruits to serve in the British Navy?

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of the Naval Service): Mr. Speaker, some time ago, when I spoke to the motion for papers referred to by my hon friend, I referred to the fact that the British Government had asked us if we could obtain the enlistment of about 200 men capable of taking charge of motor boats. They asked us to have it made known that they would enlist a certain number for that purpose, and to receive applications; and they said they would send out a commission from the Admiralty to make selections from the number offering. We have done that. We have advised the Admiralty of the fact and we are informed that the Hon. Rupert Guinness and another gentleman are now on their way here to consult us in regard to that matter. I may say further that they have intimated that they are willing, if we can get volunteers for the purpose, to take into the British navy a certain number of men who would enlist at the British rate of pay and subject to British conditions. That infor-

mation was furnished to us only within the past few days, and we are now taking steps to make that fact known so that any of our seamen who are anxious to enlist in the British navy will be able to make application to us, and when the Hon. Rupert Guinness arrives here the matter will be submitted to him. I suppose that the newspaper item to which my hon. friend refers is something along that line, but I have not yet seen it.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: As my hon. friend from Pictou will not have another opportunity to speak, I shall read the despatch which appears in the Montreal Daily Mail. It is a despatch from Ottawa as follows:

Canada to recruit for British Navy.

Ottawa, April 17.—The British Admiralty wants recruits in Canada for the navy and a recruiting party headed by Hon. Rupert Guinness is on its way across the Atlantic. The party will be in Ottawa in the course of a few days. Only seafaring men are required as recruits and the rates of pay, pensions and separation allowances will be those in force in the Royal Navy.

It is expected that the Canadian Patriotic Fund will take care that the emolument to the dependents of the Canadian sailors will be made up to the standard of the militia.

The limit of age is 40 and the period of engagement will be the duration of the war. Persons resident in the maritime provinces who wish to join should as a preliminary step send their names and addresses to the Superintendent H.M.C. dockyard, Halifax; those resident in British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan to the Superintendent H.M.C. dockyard. Esquimalt, and those in the remaiing provinces to the Secretary Department of Naval Service, Ottawa.

Beyond the regular naval service the recruiting party wants recruits for the auxiliary patrol service of the Admiralty. This is a motor boat service which has turned out to be one of the most valuable of the navy.

That information would seem to be somewhat more definite and authentic than the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would lead one to suppose. It would rather seem as though some one in Ottawa, probably connected with the department, had more information as to the mission upon which these gentlemen are coming from England than my hon. friend the Minister of the Naval Service himself.

Mr. HAZEN: It is exactly the information which I have given the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No. While the Minister of the Naval Service puts the idea of recruiting sailors for the Admiralty as secondary to the question of getting men to man motor boats, this article puts the question of recruiting for the navy ahead as being the supreme matter in regard to which this commission is coming from England and the question of manning motor boats is one of an entirely secondary character.

While upon my feet, I wish to express my regret at the half-hearted way in which the Minister of Naval Service speaks of the idea of recruiting Canadians for service in the British navy. He says that any persons desirous of entering the Admiralty service will be requested to send in their names, and will be given an opportunity of serving. I think that from the beginning of the war this Government has been remiss in its duty in not encouraging our young men to offer their services to the British Admiralty. Of course, we on this side of the House have always been in favour of starting a Canadian navy, which would be of assistance both to Canada and to the Empire. Failing that, I think, as many other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House think, that this Government ought to have taken hold of the question in a whole-hearted and enthusiastic manner. We have thousands, scores of thousands, of young men in Canada, living on the shores of the Great Lakes, who are accustomed to navigation; thousands of young men upon the coasts of both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; thousands of young men engaged in the fisheries, who would be delighted to have an opportunity of entering the service of the Admiralty. But, from the very beginning of the war until now, they have received no encouragement, and to-day the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are made in a half-hearted way. He says that if the British Government want our young men, and they want to go, they will be allowed to go; that permission will be given to them to serve the Empire in this splendid service. I do not think that that is the right spirit in which this question should be approached. This Government should have entered into an arrangement with the British Government to enable our young men to receive in the naval service pay commensurate with that which our young men serving in the army are receiving, and should have encouraged them to enter the Admiralty service. It should always be borne in mind that our young men engaged in the naval service of the Empire would be engaged in the service of Canada, for Canada is almost in the centre of the Empire, and what benefits the Empire

benefits Canada. Every effort has been put forth, with enthusiasm and with zeal, to encourage our young men to serve in the army; but no similar effort has been made to encourage them to serve in the navy, and that is a branch of the service in which, as I have said, many thousands of our young men would feel it an honour to serve.

I am glad that hon. gentlemen opposite are coming to reason. Perhaps the minister will allow me to say, without offence, that I trust they will wake up to the necessities of the situation. We know how hampered this Government has been. I know what has hampered it, and every member of this House, and the people of this country, know what has hampered it in regard to doing anything to assist in the naval service of the Empire. They know that this Government pledged itself before the elections of 1911 to abstain, as far as possible, from having anything to do with the naval service of the Empire. I trust that the gentlemen who are coming from England will be able to do something to wake the Government from its lethargy, so far as this important branch of the service is concerned, and that something really beneficial will result from the efforts of the committee who are proposing to visit Canada.

CANADA'S TRADE AND COMMERCE.

On the motion for Committee of Supply:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I am going to ask the House this afternoon, before taking up my Estimates, to listen to a short statement which I think may be of some interest in connection with the trade and commerce of the country. I am not making any apology for asking the House to listen to me for a few moments on this matter, as I think it is one of very great importance, and one to which, probably, neither side of the House has devoted that amount of time, energy, and attention which 224 representatives of Canada, comprising business men, men of capacity, men of influence, men of ripe and extended views, men of great experience in commercial and business matters, might have found it profitable to devote.

I do not believe that any of us in this House, or that any one in the country quite appreciates the tremendous transition which is to take place in this country some time soon when war ceases and peace commences, a transition rendered necessary because of the diversion that has taken place along certain lines since the war began. At the risk of repeating something of the sentiments, if not the words which I have already expressed in this House, I am going to call the attention of the House to a few prominent features of the situation.

What has happened in this country since August, 1914? The happenings have been gradual and, therefore, they have not impressed themselves upon our minds with the same force as if, instead of being gradual, they had come suddenly. But they are none the less important and none the less grave because they have been gradual.

5 p.m. Up to the present time, 300,000 adults have been drawn from the fields of industry, from the factory, the business house, the farm, the mine, and the fisheries. These have been abstracted from productive work in these lines, and if this war continues for a year, or a year and a half more, 500,000 adults will have been been abstracted from productive work in this country. Now, if the Minister of the Interior had come to this House two years ago and stated that he could promise that within a year there would be an immigration into this country of men like ourselves, representing an addition of 250,000 adults to the working forces of Canada, he would have made a statement such as had never been made in Canada, or in any other country in the world. And if he had followed that up with the statement that in the succeeding year there would be an immigration of men like ourselves, knowing our institutions, understanding our laws, familiar with our social, intellectual, and moral habits, adding in the course of two years 500,000 working adults to the productive power of this country, that would have been a statement surpassing in interest and gravity the one to which I have just alluded. But does it make any difference whether the statement shall be made in that form or shall be in the inverse form, that in two years during which this war shall have been carried on 500,000 adults shall have been abstracted from the productive forces of this country? That is the first point to consider and it is one which I would like the country to consider very carefully.

More than that, during those same two years something else has been taking place. There has been a diversion from productive, beneficent labour into lines of labour and work which are not beneficent and productive, but which are malefficient and hurtful. Tens upon tens of thousands of

men have been diverted from normal and beneficent, productive work in this country and have been set to the work of making munitions of war for the purposes of the destruction of life and property. In this destruction of life and property, the only redeeming thing which can be said about it is that they are defending the life and liberties of the Empire and fighting for the cause of human freedom and liberty. But from the economic point of view, my argument stands that this diversion has taken place. Something more has taken place in that time. Not only has there been this diversion and abstraction of productive labour, but there has been no compensating inflowing current of immigration. To a young country like our own, a country situated as Canada is, that is one great source of growth and advancing strength and prosperity. Outside of the natural increase, and coming from suitable sources, the strength and prosperity of the country are enhanced by an inflowing population, adults and others, which mingles itself with, and becomes co-operative in the production and development of the country. For these two years of war a very small amount of that current has flowed in and Canada is bereft of the invigorating and progressive force and enterprise which are derived from such sources. But, in addition, capital and equipment and capital for the purposes of equipment have been diverted to and employed in the work of making munitions of war and therefore is not employed in normal productive industries. This is a factor which has also to be reckoned with. In addition, financial conditions will have been so changed that when peace comes we shall be met with a different situation as regards enterprise and industry from that which existed before the war. Money will be harder to get, interest will be higher, the cost of Government and of administration will be enhanced and all these are factors in the obtaining of capital and in the working out of enterprises for which capital is necessary.

Now, you say that this labour, or a great deal with it, will return. Let us consider some factors in regard to this. Of these 500,000 adults who will have gone from our country some, unfortunately, will never return. That will be human energy entirely lost to this country. Another considerable portion of those who return will be totally, or partially, disabled and will therefore be, in one way, a burden which we will all love to bear, but yet an economic burden upon the country; or they will be reduced in point of worth and efficiency in the productive work of the country. The men who come back after two years of the life in the trenches, with all the strain, the nervous and physical shock, the endurances and privation of war, will be different from the men they were before they went to the war. Will these men quickly settle down to normal operations? Will they be as effective as they were before? Any way there will be a period, more or less lengthened, during which there will be a process of adaptation and of change from the old—though it is only two years old—to the new and something like the normal conditions that preceded it.

Now, this is just a rough statement of the facts upon one side of the case. Are we thinking about this situation which faces us when the war stops? The moment the war stops the doors of every munition factory will be closed and the help that was gathered, and which worked therein, will have to find some other employment. When the munition factories stop, the thousand and one subsidiary operations which spread themselves through the length and breadth of the country, connected by more or less subtle threads with the dominant work of forming munitions of war, will also come to a standstill, and these two working together will bring about a period during which reversion to normal, adaptation to circumstances as they then exist, will eat up time, will confuse and disturb energy and will have its effect upon the economic condition and development of the country. These are the things that face us. Whilst we are glad to see the munition works doing their part in supplying the Empire with that which is necessary, whilst we are glad to have the money which comes as a sequence to the employment, yet all this is not beneficent and productive work and when it stops—yes, before it stops—well before it stops—the people of this country should be putting on their thinking caps, sizing up the situation and getting ready for the inevitable and important change that is to come. The first duty of this House and of the people of the country is simply to face that situation, to get right down before it, face it, think it out and be prepared with plans and organization as to what shall be done when the time arrives. That is the first duty of us all. In the next place,

will you allow me, Mr. Speaker, to call your attention to another phase of the question, and that is: what are the practical things that can be done and to what extent are we doing these practical things?

And now I make an acknowledgment to the House: that is, that I feel the duty and necessity of saying a few words about my own department, the Department of Trade and Commerce. I have not projected that department nor myself before this House nor before the country; I have been very modest with reference to the work that was going on. I have come to the conclusion that I have been a little too modest and that maybe my department has not taken that place in the minds of hon. gentlemen to which it is rightly entitled. I do not speak in this way from any personal vanity, or any personal regret; but I would like the people of this country and the members of this House to know something of what we really have been doing; and I speak in order that my department may not only have their sympathy but also their active help and co-operation. So, I know, Mr. Speaker, you will pardon the allusion that I am about to make to my own department.

One of the things that I think we ought to do, and may well do, is to take stock of the situation in Canada as it will probably be when peace comes. What is it in the Dominion of Canada that we shall consume, that we shall find necessary for our daily wants? To what extent can that be produced in Canada, and to what extent must we depend upon outside countries for these supplies? First—and I am not going to labour the point, for I wish to finish my remarks by six o'clock—I think that the thing we ought to do is to sit down and take stock of the resources and of the wants of the country. And with this idea—that, knowing what we require, and knowing how much is produced by ourselves at the present time, and for how much of it we have to depend upon foreign countries, we may, in a business way, set ourselves as Canadians to the solution of the problem of our wants. And I think the most accurate statistics that it is possible to have on that subject should be within the departments in Ottawa, and more especially within my own department, and should be there for the use of the House and of the business men of the country—information, comprehensive, accurate and fresh, as the foundation for the active work of dealing with this problem.

The next thing I think it is necessary for us to do, and which my department is trying to do, and I think is pretty effectively doing, is to find out in what fields outside of Canada goods that are made in Canada, and the products raised in Canada, may find sale and consumption. There are business enterprises and aggregations of capital which may better busy themselves with the home market of Canada, and with that only. There are other aggregations of enterprise and capital which may better busy themselves entirely in providing for the foreign markets. And there are other aggregations of capital and enterprise that may most economically combine both, and, making a base of the home market, extend their trade to the supply of foreign countries and thus diminish the incidence of overhead and general expenses upon their total trade. So, my department, while I have had charge of it—and as it commenced before, and I hope will continue—is particularly occupied with that problem.

Through what media? In the first place, we have the medium of the Trade Commissioners whom we now have in every important district of the United Kingdom, in the overseas dominions, and in such foreign countries as it has seemed best, up to the present time, to enter. These trade commissioners are, I believe I can say without exaggeration, doing their business on the whole excellently well, and some of them deserve all the praise that can possibly be given them for the energy, the capacity, and the success with which they are carrying on their work. These trade commissioners are diligently engaged, from the first of January to the thirty-first of December in every year, gathering information in the districts to which they are accredited and the areas to which their work applies. They are gathering that information judiciously, and not simply sending in anything which would make a paragraph or a report. They send in weekly and monthly reports, and these reports are carefully edited and published in our bulletin, and in that form sent out weekly to now some 6,000 or 8,000 of selected business men in the different parts of Canada. It has been a source of great gratification to me to receive the kind words and hearty endorsation of business men in every part of Canada, testifying to the interest with which these bulletins are regarded as welcome, helpful and profitable visitors to their offices and their homes. But the trade commissioners are assisted, and the scope of the whole system is widened by the privilege which we have,

the right we have at the present time as Canadians, to call upon the commercial intelligence branches of the British consular service in every part of the world. These officials are not only instructed from the Foreign Office, but from the communications I have had, they are willingly and cheerfully throwing themselves into the work, and providing us with such information as they think will be of use, such information as is asked of them by Canadian merchants and by my own department. So, special reports asked for by my department are obtained from all these countries upon special subjects, from the intelligence department of the British consular service. That gives us a much wider scope than if we had simply our own trade commissioners. Then, there are special and travelling commissioners. As the House will probably remember, I appointed a special commissioner to the West India Islands, who spent nearly a year and a half in those islands, went through them thoroughly, possessed himself of the information which was there to be obtained and which was particularly adapted for the purposes and the needs of Canada, and has lately published a report. I do not know whether all members of this House of Commons have seen it or not, but if any member would like to see it I would be glad to put it in his possession. It is a book upon the West Indies, and it embodies the result of his travels, his observations, and his advice with reference to trade.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the name of the commissioner?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Watson Griffin. Within the last few months I have also had prepared a resume of the distinctive energies of Canada in production, both natural and industrial, a sort of vade mecum for our outside commissioners, people in foreign countries, British consuls and others into whose hands we put it, destined to answer this question: Is there anything that you want to know about Canada? If there is, here is a book in which you will find something in reference to it. If you want more information, you will know where to apply for it, and get it in detail.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can we get that book?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That book has just been put through the press, and members of Parliament will have a copy of it placed in their hands. It is not for general distribution in Canada; it is for the purpose of helping and aiding our correspondents and business men in foreign countries who want to know for instance, where asbestos is found, and obtaining similar information in reference to any of the natural or the industrial products of Canada.

During the last year one of our best trade commissioners has spent five or six months in Russia, going through the country from west to east, from Petrograd to Vladivostock, and he has made his observations and gleaned his information from every part of that country. He has embodied that information in reports which have been published in the Bulletin, and those reports have been collected in a small volume. To-day Mr. Just is in Petrograd as our chief trade commissioner in Russia, and within a few weeks another trade commissioner from Canada will take up his headquarters at Omsk, in the farther east; and those two gentlemen, with efficient sub-workers at several points, will cover the Russian area in the endeavour to get information with reference to Russian trade and send it to us for distribution.

I have adopted a system of training subcommissioners. Young men who have gone through the universities, or through the colleges or the schools, who are well educated, and have shown excellence in certain lines of economic and business pursuits, have been taken into the department and have been trained in the departmental work so as to get the home view, as it were, of these matters—trained with reference to tariffs and customs regulations. They have then been given travelling commissions through different parts of Canada, under instructions to make for themselves a thorough examination into different lines of industries and businesses and report to the minister thereon. They have visited the exhibitions, the factories and the producing centres in order to get that information. After having passed through a drill of a year and a half or two years in that way, they are going to foreign or outside fields. One of them, a graduate of McGill, will be the commissioner at Omsk; another will take up a position in another district; and a third, a university graduate from Toronto and a clever young man, is now studying the Italian language in connection with his drill in Canada, and I design him to undertake in Italy the work of getting that same information and of acting as our trade commissioner there.

This year, in response to an appeal from British Columbia, whose lumber interests were somewhat disorganized and confused, I asked the British Columbia people to pick out for me the man who they thought would be best suited for the work of travelling over the world in the interest primarily of Canadian lumber, with reference particularly to the western coast. They gave me their man, a university graduate, a very clever young man who had had training in forestry work in British Columbia. He is now making a tour of the world, commencing with the United Kingdom, and visiting France, Belgium—such part of it as is left—Russia, South Africa, India, China, Australia, New Zealand, and the South American continent. He is on the latter part of his travels, and his reports, full of information and of suggestions, have been published in the Weekly Bulletin; and, when they have been finished, they will be collated in a pamphlet or volume by themselves. Not only has he been looking into the matter of lumber conditions and possibilities, but he has also had an eye to general trade conditions, and his reports have embraced that side of the question as well as the lumber side. In Great Britain I appointed a general trade commissioner, with a special knowledge of fruit questions, who works in collaboration with the agricultural department, and who is engaged in gathering information and sending us reports in reference thereto.

At the present time I am contemplating the sending of a special trade commission to the United Kingdom, to France and to Italy. These will be different from our trade commissioners. I am trying to select four or five business men of Canada—men of capacity, of practical experience, to a certain extent of expert knowledge in the different lines of industry to which they are or have been attached—who will form an honorary commission. Their expenses will be paid, a secretary will be provided for them, experts in different large lines of industry will accompany them; and their duty will be to go to those three countries and look specially for new openings which are possible owing to the changed conditions brought about by the war, openings which would have been impossible two years ago, but which now, temporarily in certain cases, and permanently, I believe, in many cases, will be open to the industries and products of the Dominion of Canada. These men will make a thorough inquiry, they will have the best opportunity for doing so, and they will prepare an exhaustive report on those fresh points of view which have come into existence within the last few months, owing to the problems and the conditions imposed by the war. That, I think, will be very important for this country, and the result will be very beneficial to the future expansion of our trade.

Then I have been for the last two years looking thoroughly into another branch of work in connection with the Department of Trade and Commerce, which, I think, is no less important, and which in the future will be of very great interest and benefit to us. I think the time has come in Canada when we should establish a bureau of commercial information, which shall stand in Canada as the clearing house for commercial and business information with reference to foreign countries and to our own country as well. I have looked into these commercial museums and bureaus of information in different countries. Perhaps the one I have in mind will be formed on a plan different somewhat from those that exist in Japan and in other countries, particularly in the United States, where the conditions are much on a parity with ours. I think I can better express my aim by reading the ideal placed before us in the establishment of a bureau of industrial information, and which when complete will:

1. Answer all enquiries for information respecting commerce and industry, home and foreign—a clearing house for commercial intelligence.

2. Exhibit samples of home manufactures in actual and photographic form, and statistics thereof.

3. Exhibit samples of goods in vogue for consumption in foreign countries of such kinds as might be made in Canada, and statistics related thereto.

4. Exhibit samples of imported goods of such kinds as might be made in Canada, with statistical information relating thereto.

5. Exhibit samples of natural resources, serving as material for manufactures, in Canada and in the Empire, with statistics relating thereto.

6. Exhibit the processes of manufactures and industries in Canada.

7. Exhibit, in diagram, the resources, production, and trade of Canada; our lines of transport, internal and external.

8. Co-ordinate the scientific and engineering forces and factors of Canada along the line of research and technical re-

quirements intimately connected with production and distribution.

One of the revelations of the war has been that there lie within the British Empire raw materials the command of which, when the war broke out, would have had a profound effect upon the progress and prosecution of the war. The Empire woke up to find that in many most important particulars its own raw materials were within the hand and clutch of the enemy, and were being and had been exploited by them, forming an important base of supply and a means for offensive action in the way of the manufacture of munitions, and thus tending to aid the enemy and injure the Empire. One thing that will come out of this war, I think, is that the various parts of the Empire will be drawn so closely together in economic interest and their minds will be so devoted to the development of the great estate within the bounds of the Empire itself that the best energy and enterprise and capital of the Empire will be mobilized for the exploitation of its own boundless resources of raw material, and these will be kept primarily for the use of the Empire, whatever may be left over for other countries afterwards. So a part of the work of this bureau of industrial information will be the collection and description and representation of the raw resources of Canada and of every other part of the Empire.

Such a bureau as I mention would exhibit also the processes of manufacture and industry in Canada itself. To-day the stranger who visits our shores must travel from British Columbia to Sydney before he can get a visualized idea of what we make and how we make those things which we do produce. It is possible, with no very great expense, to have in this central museum, distinctly visualized to the visitor, whether he be from a foreign country, or from our own country, the processes of manufacture and industry in this country. Pictorial representation is in these times taking on the efficacy of a fine art. It is a wonderful co-operator and helper in getting together in small space what otherwise could not be seen without extended travel, much time, and great expense. This bureau will not be simply for people outside the country. Our own people in Canada have, in some cases, almost as little idea of what we do produce in this country as people from outside, and it would be a wonderful eye-opener and stimulant to our people if they could pass in review occasionally something of the kind that I have tried to describe.

Then, there will be exhibited also in that establishment, in diagram, the resources and productions and trade development of Canada, and our lines of transport, both internal and external. An attempt will be made to co-ordinate the scientific and engineering factors of Canada along the lines of research and technical requirements intimately connected with production and with distribution. I think this is of prime importance to us in Canada. There is to-day in our universities, in our colleges, in scientific societies, and in individual laboratories, excellent resources and ability for chemical research, for all that kind of research which transfers from the laboratory to the factory what is absolutely necessary for the factory at this time, and what will be more necessary for the factory when the period of unexampled competition comes within three or four or five years from now. Science, knowledge, and information are as essential to a well-ordered and successful business as they are to the profession of the doctor or the engineer or any scientific man. Germany's great point of vantage was that her technical and scientific instruction had advanced to such a pitch and had disseminated itself so widely that it worked itself into the very grain of Germany's production and made them the powerful competitors that they were. Britain, Canada, Australia and other countries must not merely take a leaf out of Germany's book; they must sit down before that question and solve it by bringing the aid of scientific research, of engineering capacity, of technical power and expertness into the region of the farm and the factory and the business establishment, and incorporating and bringing together those essentials which ought never afterwards to be disjoined. Such a commercial bureau of information as I have attempted roughly and briefly to describe can, without any very great expense, be brought into existence in Canada, and prove of great help and of great instructive and stimulating power to the business and industrial life of Canada in the future.

Then, I think something else should be done, and should be done soon. It may be that I have been criticised for not thinking that it should have been done sooner, for I have had many statements and suggestions made to me on that score. Men have written to me and men have said to me: What is your department doing all

this time? Should you not get people together, and should you not have them thinking, making plans, mobilizing for the work of the future? Now, I looked upon that in a somewhat different light from some other people. My view was that there was a time at which such an attempt would have been premature. But things have developed by the very force of necessity. The work of Canada had first to be devoted to the furnishing of munitions and war supplies. That took all the energy, and, for the time being, all the thought, all the enterprise, and all the capital, that could be got. The demand was less in normal lines, and consequently less enterprise could successfully be devoted to ordinary production. The time has now pretty well arrived when we can see far enough through the mists to enable us to make up our minds fairly well as to what future conditions will be, and hope has so far come into the dominant position as to lead us to think that we are getting somewhere near the end of this war. So I believe that now, outside of all these aids and all this work which we have been carrying on, outside of what the manufacturers' associations have been doing, outside of what boards of trade have been doing, and what individual business men in this country have been doing, the time has come when we ought to sit down together in council, and when the business men of this country ought to exchange ideas, formulate plans, and take measures to mobilize and systematize the industry, the business capital, and the business enterprise, which are to attack the problems of the future. So what I propose to do is this, within a reasonable time to call together a convention of the business men of Canada, from the Pacific to the Atlantic—men in every kind of business, the captains of industry, the experts in industry, the scientific men in industry, the engineering men in industry, the transport men, the banking and financial men representatives of all kinds of enterprises and industries; to have them sit down together in conference here in the city of Ottawa for three or four days in a heart-to-heart talk about these matters, and to come not unprepared to give definite views with reference to different phases of the great industrial and economic questions which are looming up before us, and which must be solved by us. At that convention I propose to have the report of this commission of which I spoke a while ago; and I propose to have here also the permanent Canadian trade commissioners in other countries, who are gathering information for this very purpose, and who will be on hand to give that information to the people who are assembled.

That, in brief, outlines a line of action which, I think, may well be undertaken, and which my department is undertaking. For all of that I must ask this House for money. For all of that it is requisite that we shall have added ability. But added ability and money for purposes of that kind constitute a demand with which no reasonable man in this country will find fault. There is nothing outside of the problem of its defence, with which it is more necessary that this country should busy itself than the problem of production and distribution of products. That is the problem of trade and commerce, which must be founded on production, with which it is twin sister, and most intimately connected. I have been taunted sometimes with being too economical in my department. I believe in economy; I hate extravagance.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I hate the idea of taking money from the people's pockets, putting it into the people's treasury, and then spending it for that which is nought and worse than nought.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But I do believe that there is nothing which this House or this country, if reasonably asked, would deny to the departments and to the ministers who wish to engage in the kind of work where money goes to its proper objective, and is actually needed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And where that proper objective is likely to result in benefit to the public interests.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: How my hon. friend rolls his sturdy form in front of me as I make that declaration, as if to say: "That is hard for you chaps on that side of the House." How was it for my hon. friend? The tu quoque argument is not worth a snap of your finger; but large men like my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) sometimes use it and sometimes laugh it, and sometimes give it representation as my hon. friend has just done, as much as to say: "We on this side have never let money go aside the proper objective."

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They know very well that they have. They know very—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Just make a comparison.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All the same, just as I state it I believe it. I have stated it before and I will state it again; and I do not think I come with an empty plea, or a plea that will be refused—

Mr. GRAHAM: An empty treasury, though.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: —by the House or by the country, when I ask that the coffers of the Trade and Commerce Department be a little more generously filled up than they have been. I leave you my administration in the past from 1911 up to the present time. The books are there, my reports are there, my work is there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And all of you are quite welcome to go and examine every bit of it. I have not done all I have tried to do; I have not done all I wanted to do; but I have tried to manage my department in a fair, reasonable, and economical way.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But there comes a time when economy must be given a little different translation. That time has come now in my department, and I am going to ask my colleagues, and afterwards this House, to be a little more generous to my department for the next few years which are to come.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will they be in the supplementaries?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, they will be in the supplementaries; that is where these things come. I have wearied the House probably longer than I should have done—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no; go on.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:—But I felt it my duty to lay these things before the House and to enlist the sympathy of men on both sides of the House in this matter; and if I can have the extreme pleasure of having hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, after this brief sketch of what I propose to do, give me the benefit of their criticisms, I shall feel greatly indebted to them. If something that I have in view now can be better done, let me have it. On this side the House, or on the other side, let us at least take up this question, a mighty and tremendous one, and one which I have very inadequately brought to the attention of the House. Let us take it up, put aside our party prejudices and our party shibboleths for a moment, and come right down to a good hearty committee-of-the-whole conference upon what is best to be done, and how it can be done, under present conditions, in reference to the development and the distribution of our country's products.

[Sir George Foster.]

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I agree with almost every word my hon. friend has uttered this afternoon, but I would like him to supplement his remarks by declaring that the business commission which he is going to appoint and send abroad will be of a non-partisan character.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is dissented from.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I know that if I gave my hon. friend warning ahead it would be a shock to him, but he will see what the commission is to be when I announce the names.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has certainly given us a very valuable and informative address. When he stated that he intended to enlist the sympathy of his colleagues as well as the sympathy of the other members of this House I thought I would like to have a well-secured dictaphone under the council table when my hon. friend was pressing his colleagues to support him, and especially when he was impressing upon them the necessity of economy in the other departments of the Government, in order that he might have a little more money to carry out the important projects which he has in view. There is the difficulty with the hon. Minister of Trade and Commecre; he never brings to bear upon his colleagues his great ability and what ought to be his surpassing influence. If he does we fail to see any results. My hon. friend has come to this House on more than one occasion and talked eloquently and forcibly of the necessity of economy. You, Sir, have heard him say in stentorian tones that he abhorred extravagance and believed in econ-

omy. How often has he told his colleagues that he abhorred extravagance and believed in economy? The Estimates brought down to this Parliament in these war times amount to the enormous sum of $189,000,000. Think of it, Sir, an estimated expenditure of $189,000,000 in a country with a population of about 8,000,000. Can we believe for a single moment that the Minister of Trade and Commerce can sit dumb while his colleagues are putting forward demands upon the treasury of this country for millions and millions of dollars? If my hon. friend had sought to use his influence—and he could use it if he tried—he ought to have been able to produce a different result, and it would not have been necessary for him to take a slap back at his colleagues twice during this session when he talked about economy and insisted upon the necessity of a more rigid supervision over the expenditure of public moneys. In that veiled manner my hon. friend has made two strong attacks upon his colleagues in the Government.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I regret to notice that the questions which have been so ably presented by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce do not seem to attract that attention on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that one would expect. Therefore I would hardly hope, in view of the slim attendance of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the things which he has presented will command their very deep or earnest consideration. I had hoped that some one or more hon. gentlemen opposite would have taken advantage of the occasion to rise in their places and express their views in regard to the proposed economies which have been so ably presented to the House by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I regret to have to observe that in my opinion he would find very little support from that side of the House. These young gentlemen —these young spendthrifts—who are sitting on the treasury benches beside my respected friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce do not seem to have the same regard for the sacredness of the treasury, or the necessity of saving public moneys, as has the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The matters which have been presented are very important; but in this connection I cannot help observing that we have had two extraordinary and rather contradictory speeches from the treasury benches this afternoon. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes), in which I think I am quite right in describing as the extraordinary statement he made to the House, deplored the fact that Germany had been so successful in this war that she had added 55,000,000 of population to her dominions, that she had acquired a number of countries, such as Serbia, Poland and Galicia, and that now she had a splendidly equipped railway running from Berlin to Constantinople. The hon. gentleman appealed to the members of this House, in tones which seemed to show how deeply he was affected, and he deplored the fact that in this dreadful state of affairs two hundred members of this House were wasting time on such piffle as the question of the waste of some $80,000,000 in connection with the purchase of shells and the taking of large commissions in connection with the letting of the most improvident contracts which were given in the United States for fuses. He seemed to feel that the end of the war was by no means in sight, but that the question was so serious that the representatives of the people should not be discussing questions which ordinarily would engage their attention, but that they ought to be overlooking the faults of the Shell Committee, the Minister of Militia, and the members of the Government, sacrificing their own views as to whether it is right and proper, and giving their whole assistance to the Government in carrying on the war.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, on the other hand, takes a roseate view of the situation. He has a vision that enables him to see the end of the war. The hon. gentleman is so pleased with the prospect that he even contemplates calling together the business men, manufacturers, and other classes of people of Canada in the very near future. He is going to have a great banquet in the city of Ottawa, I presume, in connection with the convention he proposes to hold. Well, it is a roseate view that my hon. friend seems to have, and I can picture the delightful time that they will have at that convention and banquet. It would be worth going 3,000 miles even to hear the eloquent speech which my hon. friend will deliver on that occasion.

Mr. REID: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It certainly would.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: While it is pleasant, in one aspect of the case, to find that the minister has such a roseate view of the future, there is one thing that is a little deplorable, and that is that the minister seems to have been touched with the microbe which has been afflicting the other ministers, and he feels now that we on this side of the House should join with hon. members on the other side of the House and encourage him to bring down Supplementary Estimates giving him all the money that he desires to carry out his roseate ideas. I am beginning to despair somewhat of even the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Has it not seemed pitiable that the minister should be seeking in all quarters of the world to advance the trade of Canada, that he should be educating young men from the universities, that he should be educating one especially, to advance the interests of Canadian trade and commerce in Italy, sending others to the West Indies, sending these gentlemen to all parts of the world to seek to secure trade for Canada, while right down here to the south of us, Sir, is a great country with a hundred million people affording to the people of Canada every opportunity for trade, every opportunity for the advancement and promotion of commercial intercourse that any people would desire, a country whose trade, so far as Canada is concerned, even durng the period that this Government have been in power, and when they have sought by every means at their command to hamper and prevent trade with that people, has yet advanced by leaps and bounds. In the year ended March 31, 1915, the trade of Canada with the people of the great republic to the south of us surpassed by about $170,000,000 the trade of Canada with all the rest of the world put together. What a marvellous showing that affords of how trade can be developed if you seek trade with people with whom you will naturally have commercial intercourse. Let me give the House the figures for the year ended March 31, 1915:

Total imports of Canada..	$ 629,444,894
Total exports..	490,808,877
Total foreign trade..	$1,120,253,771

The total trade of Canada with the United States during that year was $644,026,253, and the total trade of Canada with the rest of the world was only $476,277,518; so that we had about 170,000,000 more trade with the United States than with all the other countries of the world combined, Great Britain included. Yet, notwithstanding these facts, the minister has not told us to-night that he has done anything to encourage trade between Canada and the republic to the south of us. He has not told us what action this Government has taken with respect to that trade. If he had told us, it would have been a story of trying to hamper trade instead of encouraging it. You know as I do, Mr. Speaker, that the great hope of this country depends upon the development of our fertile, wonderful Northwest. There in the three Prairie Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta you have a country which would make not one European empire but which is large enough and wealthy enough in resources to make three European empires. And yet, knowing, as these gentlemen do, knowing as in his heart the Minister of Trade and Commerce must know, that the best means of developing that country, the best means of getting immigrants into that country, the best means of enabling to grow up there a large and contented population, is to give to the producers of the West free access to the markets of the great American republic, this Government has persistently refused to place upon the statute-books a law which would open the markets of the great country to the south of us to the farmers and cattle-growers of our western lands, a step which would be the means of advancing to a far greater extent the commercial development of this country than all the commissions and all the emissaries that my hon. friend could send to all the countries of the world. And yet they claim that they are in favour of increasing our trade.

Mr. BLAIN: Does the hon. member think that the Canadian people made a mistake in 1911 when they voted against reciprocity with the United States?

Mr. PUGSLEY: In my judgment they did make a mistake. But the results have not been so disastrous to the people of Canada as they would have been had it not been for the fact that the Democratic party in the United States were victorious in the last election and to a large extent opened their markets to our people. As a result of this we are able to send our lumber into the United States free of duty, the duty on oats has been reduced from fifteen cents to six cents a bushel, the duty on cattle has been vastly reduced.

Mr. TURRIFF: It has been taken off; and the same with hogs.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The duty has been taken off, and so has the duty upon hogs, as my hon. friend reminds me. The result has been that our exports to that country have been enormously increased and we have not felt the disastrous effects which would otherwise have come to the people of Canada as the result of their refusal to accept the agreement which had been made with the United States. Not only does this Government refuse to place upon the Statute Book a law which would admit United States' wheat and wheat products free of duty, and would thereby open to the people of Canada a free market for our wheat, but in the new tariff which last year they placed upon all products indiscriminately they imposed a heavy tax upon American products, and during the present session they went further, and, in respect of a most important part of the food supply, of which only some 200,000 bushels was imported into Canada—I refer to apples—they imposed a tariff against imports from the United States which is nine hundred per cent greater than the duty the United States imposes on the same article going from Canada into the American republic. In every respect these gentlemen have sought to hamper the trade which is natural to the Canadian people, the trade which could be most easily developed. They have been seeking in all quarters of the world, sending their emissaries across the Atlantic and across the Pacific to cultivate a trade difficult to obtain, while hampering and hindering that which is at our very doors. They forget that the inexorable law of supply and demand must make an enormous demand in the United States for Canadian products, a trade which has grown in the face of difficulties which have existed in the past. They forget that we have close to the Canadian border great cities such as Portland, Boston, Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Cleveland, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Minneapolis, and St. Paul—and so I might go all the way to the Pacific ocean—where there are millions of people consumers of products who would be glad to obtain the products of Canada both of the East and of the West.

Well, my hon. friend has told about what he proposes to do, and has given us a very interesting story. It shows great effort, on paper. It shows that many stenographers have been employed in the arduous work he has had to do with; it shows great thought, and, so far as can be said of a scheme on paper, I do not know but that it reflects great credit on the Minister of Trade and Commerce. And he has told us that he is in favour of encouraging industrial and technical education in this country. He has not said that in so many words, but he has told us how much good the chemist may do to advance production in Canada. Has he never heard of the report of the Commission on Technical and Industrial Education, a report made by most experienced men and strongly in favour of the very thing the hon. gentleman advocated this afternoon?—a report which was submitted to the Government shortly after this Administration came into power, but which they have not acted upon up to this moment, but have pigeonholed it, declining to bring it into operation. How long have they been in power? Judging by results, one would say they had been in power only a few days; but judging by the Auditor General's Report one can see that they have been in office for years, for they have left a record in the public expenditure which only a number of years would enable any Government, however, extravagant to make. They have been in office for some four years, and not one single step they have taken to encourage in Canada industrial and technical education. The Minister of Trade and Commerce comes before Parliament this afternoon and suggests that it would be well to encourage the study of chemistry in Canada—as if he had never heard of the report of the Commission on Industrial and Technical Education. Would not you think that, instead of talking, instead of writing reports, it would be desirable to do something of a practical nature and to bring into operation some of these things which my hon. friend professed to be so anxious to see inaugurated in Canada?

But there is something else that he has forgotten. He did not give us one word about the important Economic and Industrial Commission of which his colleague, Senator Lougheed, is chairman, and which has been working for a number of months in an endeavour to solve the very problems which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his very eloquent speech of this afternoon, presented. That commission is housed in a mansion on Vittoria street, formerly the home of Mr. Manuel, one of Ottawa's millionaires. In this magnificent house they have been housed for a considerable period, and there, I am told, they have numberless clerks, and have already spent many thousands of dollars working on the very problem which the Minister of Trade and Commerce presented to us this

afternoon as entirely new. I think he had better consult with his colleague the President of the Council, the Hon. Mr. Lougheed, and not entirely ignore the work that this commission is doing. Heaven knows it is costing the country enough, but it is only one of the eighty odd commissions which this Government has appointed since it came into power. Surely my hon. friend, with his long experience and his great ability, ought to be able to work out such problems himself; or, if he cannot do that, he ought to be able to work them out with the assistance of his colleagues. But he is going to have a commission also to work at the same thing, and then, when he gets it organized, he is going to have this conference and a right good time right here in the city of Ottawa, and he is not going to wait until the war is over, because he now sees the end of the war in sight. My hon. friend has asked us to meet with him here in friendly intercourse almost as a joint committee of this House to talk these things over and endeavour to arrive at a decision as to what will be best for Canada, but when the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) asked him if he would treat the matter from a non-party standpoint there arose a buzz of protest from behind the hon. gentleman which prevented him from giving an assent to the proposition of my hon. friend from Rouville. Whether the war is on or whether the war is not on, this Government is partisan first, last, and all the time, and we need not expect very much from it.

My hon. friend says that conditions are going to be very different after the war is over, and that we must get to work now and have these commissioners and have this conference, and, I suppose, have this banquet and talk this thing over. My own idea is that we should win the war first. I would far sooner see the time of this House taken up in trying to expose wrongdoing and trying to prevent graft and the waste of millions upon millions of the money of the people of Canada and of the British Empire than in discussing theoretical questions which will not become practical until the war is over. My hon. friend has great fear, however, that the industries of Canada will be affected to a large extent by reason of 250,000 of our young men being taken from Canada to fight the battles of the Empire. My hon. friend also deplores the fact that while industries have been created, yet they are not being used for a good purpose, and says that ordinary industries are to promote the peace and happiness of mankind, while the industries which have been started in connection with the manufacture of munitions of war are really for the injury and the detriment of mankind. Was my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce here when the Minister of Finance made his Budget speech, in which he spoke in glowing terms of the great increase which had taken place in the trade of Canada since the war began, of the wonderful development which had taken place, of the thousands of men who were being employed? The Minister of Finance fairly gloated over the present situation and said that to-day Canada was prosperous. One would almost think he would like the war to go on forever, because then Canada would have a flowing revenue and men would be employed and the taxes could be paid, because people would have the money coming in from munitions to enable them to pay the taxes. I rather agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think it is deplorable that this condition of affairs should exist, and we ought not to boast of what has been the result of it from a financial standpoint so far as this country is concerned, and we ought not to take pleasure or pride in it as the Minister of Finance and many other gentlemen on the opposite side did. Of course, it ought always to be remembered and pleaded in excuse and palliation for the Minister of Finance, that before the war broke out our industries from the Atlantic to the Pacific were paralysed, that men were out of employment; that the wheels of industry had stopped, that the factories had closed and the chimneys were smokeless, and that the war did start up new industries and did give employment to many people. I am not, however, one of those who despair of things righting themselves very quickly when the war is over, whether it should be over in the near future or at a somewhat later date. While it is true that many thousands of our young men will come back maimed and disfigured and incapable of taking their places in the industrial life of Canada; while it is true that many thousands more have already laid down their lives upon the battlefields of Europe and that many thousands more will, I fear, lay down their lives before this war is over; yet it should never be forgotten that the training which those thousands of young men have obtained and will obtain makes them better, physically

and morally, and when they come back they are likely to be better citizens than they were before they went away. There is no training which is better physically and morally for a young man than the training of a soldier, and I believe that when they do come back they will soon take their appropriate places in the industrial life of Canada, and that it will not take long to settle the problem which will face us in the future. I do not despair of our country rapidly going ahead again and soon reaching the wonderful stride which it attained in the years when the party led by my right hon. friend who is now leader of the Opposition was in power. When he came into office there was great depression; but, by the adoption of energetic and progressive policy, the wonderful resources of our western country were made known to the people of the United States and of Europe, and it was not long before immigrants from the Old Land and from the new began to flock to Canada, not by thousands, not by tens of thousands, but by hundreds of thousands. We have in our western country the same rich lands that we have ever had. We not only have the millions of acres which have been settled upon, but in that country there are from seventy-five to a hundred million acres of land still unsettled, still belonging to the Crown, among the most fertile and most splendid land that can be found in any part of the world. And all that has to be done is for a Government progressive enough to take steps for the settlement of these lands, to make their wonderful advantages known to the people of the outside world; and when peace comes, immigrants will again come into ou country by the hundreds of thousands, as they came in the years gone by. That will bring prosperity, that will bring peace, that will bring hope and inspiration, to the people of Canada. I, Sir, have no fears for what the future may bring forth, and I desire to repeat that, instead of indulging in those theoretical ideas which the Minister of Trade and Commerce seems to have in his bonnet, and for which he is asking the opportunity to spend money while the war is on, we should wait until the war is won, and then the people of Canada will soon adapt themselves to the situation, and you will see an era of prosperity again spreading over this country.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is going to have a great commercial bureau, situated in Ottawa. While I am not quite sure that that would not be desirable at some distant time, I think that the matter of our voting unanimously, as the minister has suggested, a considerable sum of money at this late day in the session in order to carry out these ideas might very well be postponed until different conditions prevail throughout the country.

I had thought, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend would have had something more practical to present to us to-day than that which he has suggested. He knows that since this war began the necessity for a Canadian mercantile marine has increased week by week and month by month. He knows well—because he comes from a province where even the most ignorant are aware of this—that in the not distant past Canada was one of the great ship-building and ship-owning countries of the world. He knows that in the city of St. John, from which I come, it is not so many years since we could see at least 1,200 men working in the shipyards of Courtenay bay. He knows that shipbuilding was carried on up the St. John river, on the Kennebecasis river, on the north shore of the province, on the magnificent Miramichi river, where ships of the world, almost, could lie at anchor. He knows that the people there have the instinct for shipbuilding. He knows that if there is anything which the Empire requires to-day for its success in this war it is more vessels to carry the products of the overseas dominions to the markets of England and the Allies. He knows that, as a result of the destructive submarine warfare, the merchant marine of Great Britair has been declining to an alarming extent, and that upwards of 2,000,000 tons of mercantile shipping belonging to the Empire have been sunk. He knows that many people in this country outside of Parliament have been urging upon the Government the necessity of doing something for the promotion of shipbuilding. Yet, Sir, with this knowledge, my hon. friend comes to Parliament and talks about his emissaries, about his commissioners whom he is sending to all parts of the world to encourage trade and commerce, about the bureau which he is going to establish on behalf of Canadian industries, about the convention which he is going to have before long in Ottawa. He talks about all these things, but upon the great question in which the people of Canada and the people of the Empire are so vitally interested, my hon friend remains silent. When I ventured to bring this question to his attention a few days ago he told me that when he should come again with his Estimates he would ask our advice with

regard to ship-building. When my hon. friend intends to ask our advice, I do not know, but let me tell my hon. friend that unless this Government take hold of this important question at once and do something in a practical way for the encouragement of ship-building in Canada, they will be committing a crime against the people of this country and against the people of the Empire which no administration of the department, no matter how good that administration in other respects may be, can condone or expiate before the people. In the presence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who would properly have this important subject in hand, I say that to-day Canadian ship-building is hampered as it should not be by the duties which this Government imposes upon engines, boilers and other machinery which enters into the building of ships. If he would remove the duties upon these articles and give reasonable assistance and encouragement to ship-building, it would not be many months before shipyards would be established in Canada, before many keels would be laid and many vessels turned out which would be an ornament to Canada and of material assistance to the Empire. I am not alone, Sir, in this demand for the encouragement of ship-building. Hon. gentlemen opposite act as if they were under the impression that no man in Canada thought that ship-building should be encouraged or undertaken in this Dominion except my unworthy self. They act as if the words which I speak are not worth listening to, and they pay no heed to what I say. Let me tell them that they will hear before long the voice of the people of Canada demanding that they should take action. There is no reason why they should not take action. I have it upon the most reliable authority that if they would give proper encouragement, steel shipbuilding would be undertaken in the province of Nova Scotia. I know that there are people interested in shipbuilding, who, if reasonable encouragement were given, and the duties on machinery taken off, would engage immediately in the building of wooden vessels furnished with auxiliary power, which would be of enormous assistance in transporting food products from Canada to the markets of the old world. Sir, this Government have done nothing, in spite of the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has seen the freight rates upon our wheat, upon our cattle, upon our lumber and upon everything which Canada has to send to the markets of the old world going up month after month since the war began, until to-day the carriage of these products costs the producers and consumers together a thousand per cent more than it did before the war broke out. Is there not something in that state of affairs that will appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite and make them take hold of this practical question instead of devoting their attention to theoretical questions which are of no practical importance?

I apologize to you, Sir, and to the House for taking up so much time with reference to these matters, particularly at this late date in the session. As a member of this House I felt that the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce were deserving of some attention. I was not able to agree with him that the course which he outlined was one that ought to be pursued for the advancement of trade in Canada, and for the industrial development of our country. I regret to have to differ from him at this time, he made such a kindly appeal to us to work with him. I would love to work with my hon. friend. If he would only come down to us with some broad progressive policy based upon true lines of Canadian development I should be glad to work with him, but so long as he continues not to be influenced by those grand and beneficent considerations which are had in regard by men who would like to see our foreign trade developed; so long as he simply looks to the keeping of a home market; so long as he does not look abroad, particularly to that country with which we would naturally trade and with which, if proper encouragement were given, our trade, amounting to hundreds of millions, as it does to-day, would still further advance by leaps and bounds; so long as he follows these lines I regret that I am not able to agree with my hon. friend or to act with him.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): I would not delay the House at this late date in the session by continuing this discussion had it not been, first, for the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has delivered in the House this afternoon one of the most masterly presentations of the trade problems facing Canada and the Empire that has been delivered in Canada since the outbreak of the war.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce, as on other occasions since the outbreak of the war, presented his proposals not only

in a non-partisan way, but in a manner which showed that he has given the problem the deepest consideration from a national and economic standpoint. In terms entirely free from partisanship he invited the co-operation of the House, and particularly of the leading members of the Opposition, whose experience has made their advice valuable, to co-operate with him and with the Government and the House generally, in an attempt to solve these enormous problems. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) a few moments ago took to task hon. gentlemen on this side of the House because we did not rise in support of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. But, Sir, the hon. member himself was actually wiggling in his seat for three or four minutes before my hon. friend concluded his remarks, and was on his feet before the hon. minister had actually taken his seat. I hasten to take this opportunity of expressing not only my approval, but my gratitude to the minister for introducing the subject in the manner he has. In my estimation there is no greater problem facing the Dominion of Canada to-day than the problem of what we are going to do to reorganize the nation's industrial and commercial life after the conclusion of this war. My hon. friend from St. John says that when these young men come back from the front, with the training and discipline which results naturally from a military life, they will again fall back into their places in the industrial life of Canada. This is the first time I have heard, in recent times, from the lips of an hon. gentleman claiming the experience, and at the same time having to a large extent the respect, shall I say, of the people of Canada, for his ability at least, such a sentiment as that. The hon. gentleman knows, if he knows anything at all, that when there is a disruption of trade caused by a great war lasting for a period of years, men do not fall back into their places again. If he wants a few examples I shall give him some that occurred during the few months prior to the opening of the session. Between September and January, there returned to my city a large number of men wounded and incapacitated for further military service. Three particular cases which came to my notice impressed on my mind the gravity of this problem, which the hon. member laughs at and brushes to one side as a simple proposition. The first was a young bank clerk who returned from the front to Vancouver. He came to my office and asked what would be done for him. I asked him what he did before the war. He said he was a clerk in such and such a bank. I said: There should be very little difficulty in your going back to your old position. He said that he did not want to go back to the bank, that he was out of the bank now and never wanted to go banking or clerking again; he wanted an outside job. Would my hon. friend thrust that man back into his former position? My hon. friend knows that the mere fact of this man having served the Empire would arouse sympathy for him if any such attempt were made. Then a young man came to my office and I asked him the same question. He said he was a farmer. I said: That is splendid, because I know where there is a demand for young men on farms. He said: Not much, I have had all the farming I want, I want a city job.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He must have been after a Government job.

Mr. STEVENS: He was after a Government job; and I may tell my hon. friend that I recommended him and about 30 others for Government jobs. And further to gratify my hon. friend in his little gibe, I have adopted the policy in Vancouver that no one but a returned soldier gets a Government job, and, if my hon. friend does not agree with that policy, he may as well say so. So far as patronage is concerned, if that is what the hon. gentleman wants to introduce at this time, I would not give a snap of my fingers if all the patronage in my riding were undertaken tomorrow by a commission. Patronage has no attraction for me; it is the curse of public life. But that is the situation and the facts, that these men come back to Canada with their former ideas disrupted and changed; they have been taken out of the ruts they were in before and they are going to demand a different outlook in life. The return of 250,000 or 300,000 of these men will have a very serious effect upon the affairs of the country, and so I say that, in my estimation, the greatest problem facing Canada to-day is the problem of re-adjustment at the conclusion of the war. The hon. member for St. John says: Oh, let us wait, there is lots of time to deal with this, let us first win the war. Oh, he says: I would sooner sit in this House and expose graft than indulge in the consideration of such profound economic

problems as those proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Certainly he would rather do that, scandal mongering, the digging out of alleged and supposed graft, has more attraction to my hon. friend than the consideration of these great problems. It makes my blood boil—I may be young, while my hon. friend may be ancient in his seat—but it makes my blood boil to sit here and waste the time of this House week after week, and month after month, what at? A lot of pettifogging, alleged scandal. Ninety per cent of the charges made by hon. gentlemen opposite are absolutely foundationless. I have not the slightest objection to any hon. gentleman in this House, be he a member of the Opposition or a supporter of the Government, rising in his seat during these strenuous times and calling the attention of the House to well-established irregularities. But the wasting of the time of the House seems to me to be a serious evil, and many hon. gentlemen opposite deplore it as much as I do, because they have told me so with their own lips. You do not hear them talking on these petty graft scandals. I say they deplore the attitude assumed by some hon. gentlemen opposite in this matter, at a time when the House should be paying attention to these great problems. My hon. friend called the supporters of the Government a group of young spendthrifts. I had under my hand the other night, a list of the figures of the hon. gentleman's department prior to the accession to office of the present Government, and I think that any comparison of the records of the two Governments in this respect must result favourably to the present Government. Take, for instance, the Public Works Department, of whose spendthrift policy we have heard so much from my hon. friend. He has moved that certain Estimates be cut in two, willy nilly, whether they are needed or not. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Public Works saved on his appropriation last year upwards of $12,000,000. Instead of making false criticisms, it would come very much better from the lips of the hon. member for St. John and others if they would hand out a little commendation once in a while when the Government does perform a good act. Take, for instance, the fitting up of this building. Within three days of the fire we were in here, comfortable; and we have been comfortable ever since. What has it cost? The whole fitting up of this building was done out of the savings of last year's appropriation on the maintenance of Government buildings. The sum of $39,000 was all that was spent in the fitting up of this building, and the work was done in a remarkably short time.

Then the Minister of Trade and Commerce gave a detailed statement showing the activities of his department which, through the whole regime of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition, was a dead letter, an absolutely useless department, a sinecure. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given us a splendid resume of what his department has accomplished, and is accomplishing. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) said a moment ago: Here we have right south of the line the greatest market in the world, and, instead of bothering ourselves with the foreign markets in Europe, why do we not develop that market. Does my hon. friend consider that the market of Russia to which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is giving particular attention now, is a market to be ignored? There is a country with 170,000,000 people, comparatively undeveloped; a country that will demand in the next few years more railroad steel, more construction steel than any other country in the world; a country which requires certain natural products that we have in abundance, such as silver, copper and lead, and from which we can import many valuable articles which we can not and do not produce at home. It is a country which may be reached by both our seaboards with equal facility, through Archangel and the Baltic ports on the Atlantic side, and through Vladivostock on the Pacific side; a country which is open to our trade, waiting for development, and having a population of 170,000,000. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce sends one of the ablest trade commissioners the department ever had to investigate the trade of that country; he makes excellent reports, and all he receives by way of support from hon. gentlemen opposite, if the hon. member for St. John speaks for them, is sneers and ridicule. I am surprised at the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. I did expect that the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce would have some support from them.

My hon. friend from St. John actually blames the Government for the high freight rates on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. This Government—he did not say so in so many words, but the insinuation was there, and that is about all we get nowadays, in-

sinuations, innuendoes, and allegations of one kind or another—this Government sat idly by while the freight rates on the various ocean routes were going up by leaps and bounds. Everybody knows perfectly well that it is because of the withdrawal of tonnage from the usual trade routes for the transport services of the war, and because of the fiendish submarine policy of Germany, that freight rates have gone up. There were one or two sane remarks made by the hon. member from St. John, and these were in connection with shipbuilding. I do not agree with him that a great deal could be done to stimulate shipbuilding in Canada. But in connection with steel shipbuilding, we must bear in mind that so far as steel plates and ship-angles are concerned at the present time, it is a very difficult thing to get them at anything like reasonable prices owing to the large demand in other parts, and owing also to the amount of steel that is being used for munitions, and for other purposes connected with the war. But a great deal could be done immediately to stimulate the building of wooden vessels with cheap auxiliary power. On the Pacific coast, we have peculiar facilities for this class of industry. We have the timber; we have the trade waiting for ships to carry it, and if we had the tonnage we could to-day be shipping millions of feet of lumber to the markets of the world.

9 p.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: I certainly agree with my hon. friend that this is an opportune moment for dealing with the question of shipbuilding.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman could not help agreeing with me.

Mr. STEVENS: I have been in favour of it for a great many months; in fact, for a number of years. I give my hon. friend credit for the few remarks which he made on that subject at the end of his long and rather rambling speech, as giving something of value.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It was only rambling in comparison with my hon. friend's excellence.

Mr. STEVENS: Then my hon. friend charged the Government with having placed on the statute-book duties which made it difficult to carry on the shipbuilding industry. Nearly all the material used in shipbuilding comes in free with the exception of boilers and engines. As my hon. friend knows perfectly well, boilers and engines can be made with the greatest success in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my hon. friend agree with me, as all shipbuilders agree, that the very best engine that is used for auxiliary power is what is called the Deisel engine, and does he not know that that is not made in Canada?

Mr. STEVENS: Some of them are made in Canada; they are making internal combustion engines in Vancouver.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not the Deisel engine?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, the Deisel engine, or the ordinary internal combustion engine. I have not the slightest doubt that they can be made in Canada. However, that is a point which we could discuss in an intelligent and friendly way, and not in the hypercritical way adopted by my hon. friend. It is a question of encouraging shipbuilding and possibly of removing the duty on that class of engine, and I would like to see the Government look into that question and see whether it would be reasonable or possible to do something along that line.

Just a word or two upon the proposals of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He proposes to hold a convention. My hon. friend from St. John says that the minister is going to hold a huge banquet, and that certain people are going to enjoy a feast, and so on, which was an entirely unfair and improper way of referring to the suggestion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The minister proposes to hold a convention of the leading industrial men of Canada, experts in the various industries, and nothing could be more desirable than to get together those men who are experts in their various lines. Then, some of the problems with which we are faced to-day could be intelligently discussed, and a policy looking to the best interests of the country as a whole could be mapped out. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has already sent throughout the various countries of the world commissioners to gather information and data so that our merchants, our captains of industry, our manufacturers, could have an intelligent idea of the needs of other countries. I know from my own slight experience that one of the difficulties that has faced the manufacturer in Canada has been a lack of clear, definite and accurate

information as to the requirements, wants, wishes and whims of the people of foreign countries. We cannot go on doing as some of the old English manufacturers did, and thrust our type of manufactures upon other countries. We have to study the markets, and give the people of other countries the line of goods, or the type of article, that they want, not the type that we want to give them. Therein lies the success of many of the manufacturers south of the line. They try to manufacture an article which is attractive to the people to whom they hope to sell, and that is where we have been lacking in Canada up to the present time. The Minister of Trade and Commerce proposes to rectify that chronic error in our industrial life, and to give the manufacturers of Canada an intelligent idea of what is required by the various foreign countries. In this regard I think he has done and is doing excellent work, and, instead of receiving the criticism and sneers which have fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from St. John in such unctuous terms, he should have received commendation and assistance. I noticed that when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was speaking, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) seemed to respond, and I am under the impression that before this discussion ends, he will rise up to a little higher plane than his colleague from St. John, and will offer, on behalf of the Opposition, some real assistance and advice. It is not often that a minister of the Crown, Tory or Grit, comes to this house and says: I do not know it all, and I would be very glad to have your suggestions and constructive assistance. That is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce says, and, in view of his long experience, such a statement coming from him should have some effect upon hon. gentlemen opposite. I hope, Sir, that the results of the proposals will be that for once this session we can drop these picayune peccadillo politics and partisan views and indulge for a little while in a real discussion on commercial lines.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): Mr. Speaker, I hope to not detain the House more than I should with the few remarks that I intend to offer. I am glad that in the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) he should have found at least one good feature in the observations of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) a moment ago. As long as my hon. friend from St. John criticised the Government mildly he was doing something very wrong, in the judgment of the hon. member for Vancouver; but when my hon. friend from St. John tackled the question of shipbuilding, then my hon. friend from Vancouver found that for his own province, for his own port, perhaps there was something more than rambling remarks in the speech of the hon. member for St. John—that there was in it something constructive which had been carefully evaded by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster).

Be that as it may, I wish to say at once that I have listened with great pleasure to the speech delivered this afternoon by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not know if anything practical will result from the remarks he has made; I hope something practical will emerge from the discussion. The hon. gentleman will allow me to say what Lord Lytton said once of a great parliamentarian who, like the Minister of Trade and Commerce, was able to sway a public audience. After having listened to this great orator, Lord Lytton, in his poem, "Saint Stephens," described his eloquence as follows:

Then did I know what spells of infinite choice
To rouse or lull has the sweet human voice.

My hon. friend has the sweet human voice, and he has the peculiar faculty of winning the plaudits of those who are his fortunate listeners. But, Sir, this is not poetry, this is a trade. I expect, in spite of all, that something constructive will emerge from the statement he has made to-day. As he well said, this war will not last. I hope it will soon be ended and that it will end victoriously for the Allies. When this war is ended, new conditions will arise in this country and the world. The most important thing for us who are not in the fray, not in the trenches, is to do our duty, not only to our country, but to the Allies, by organizing the conditions which economically should help the Allies and ourselves.

Nothing can better help our country or our Allies at this juncture than the practical development of our trade. It is true that all our industrial plants are actually employed, it is true that there are war orders distributed from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but as was stated the other day in the House, this has brought about a fictitious prosperity in the country and my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was right this afternoon when he warned us that this prosperity, being fictitious,

could not last. If we do not at the present moment, or in a few months, collect our thoughts, the aftermath may be disastrous. Our industries will be dislocated and in the period of reconstruction which is going to follow the declaration of peace, the country will not be prepared to face the realities which will confront it. The duty, therefore, of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and of the department over which he presides, is at the present juncture to organize for the future, economically speaking, and to assist in capturing for Canada her legitimate share of the world's markets. My hon. friend threw out the suggestion that we should have a round table conference and give to the questions arising out of that conference our best thoughts. For my part, I can assure the hon. gentleman that he will get my best support in studying the organization of this country in view of the reconstruction period that is to follow the war.

I was, however, rather surprised that in the course of his eloquent and able speech my hon. friend evaded an issue which, it seems to me, should have been foremost in his thoughts. I refer to the preferential trade policy betwen the Motherland and the dominions. I do not propose to say that I am committing myself to that policy, because I understand that there will be in a short time a conference between the Allies and the dominions, but I would have expected from the hon. gentleman, who has always been a convinced—shall I say a consistent—adherent of the idea and the principle of closer co-operation between the Mother Country and the dominions, that he would have given us the benefit of his views upon that subject. I remember that some years ago my hon. friend delivered in England, perhaps in Scotland, a series of addresses in favour of that policy. I remember that during the last campaign, and since the last campaign on many occasions, the hon. gentleman has been the protagonist of the policy of preferential trade between the Mother Country and the dominions. Let me here express my sincere regret as a Canadian that in the Paris Conference Canada is not to be officially represented by a Canadian. I am in good faith in making this statement. I am not ready to say that I would favour a preferential trade policy as between the dominions and the Mother Country, but I am ready to listen to any reasonable argument upon the question, and to accept any solution which is favourable to the interests of my country and the Motherland. But, Mr. Speaker, I should have expected that the Canadian Government would have been represented in that conference, and that my hon. friend himself, would have been our delegate. No abler, no more eloquent Canadian could have represented the interests of Canada than the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. Look at what has been done by Australia. The Prime Minister of Australia left his country, crossed the Pacific ocean, went to the United States—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He did not touch the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He went to Honolulu.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And from there to Vancouver.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He went to Honolulu, thus touching United States territory, and there he gave an interview which I read. I followed him very closely from the day he left Australia. He came to Ottawa, and had several conferences with the members of the Cabinet. From here he went to England. Many of the English papers, and perhaps many in the British Government, did not relish the idea of Mr. Hughes asserting his rights as an Australian to represent directly his country at the Paris Conference. But I admire the pluck of the man. He stood to his guns, and to-day he is the accredited representative of his country at the Paris Conference. True he goes to Paris as an Imperial Privy Councillor, but will not he represent the interests of his country at the Paris Conference more than the interests of Great Britain? Yes. And our country, so proud—our country, the largest and the oldest of the overseas dominions—our country which took such a prominent share in the establishment of the Colonial Conferences, will not be represented. My hon. friend (Sir George Foster), or the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), or at least our representative in London, Sir George Perley, should have directly represented Canada at that conference. But be that as it may, I was surprised that in his remarks bearing on the development of the trade of this country my hon. friend should have avoided speaking of the question which is engaging the attention of his electors in Toronto, of a large number of the people of the province of Ontario, and a large section of the Canadian community generally, namely, the

question of a preferential policy between the Mother Country and the overseas dominions. I am in receipt of a resolution adopted by a meeting of representative farmers, manufacturers and business men, held in Galt, Ontario, on the 11th of April, 1916. I shall not ask the House to afford me time to read the entire resolution but let me read the conclusion, the prayer which is contained in the resolution. My hon. friend will see that it raises an issue which cannot be ignored:

Therefore be it resolved that this meeting of farmers, manufacturers and business men, representing the counties of Waterloo, Brant and Perth, place itself on record as of the opinion that, next to such an organization of her resources in men, money and material, as will best conduce to a speedy and successful termination of the war, Canada's paramount duty is so to organize public opinion at home, and to assist in organizing public opinion abroad, that there may be consummated with as little delay as possible:

1. A series of preferential tariffs between all parts of the British Empire that will give the greatest practical encouragement to inter-imperial trading.

2. A series of reciprocal tariffs, between all nations that are allied against the Central Powers in the present struggle, by means of which the trade of the countries concerned will be conserved as far as practicable for their mutual enjoyment.

3. An agreement among all the Allies to give favourable tariff treatment to neutral countries.

etc., etc. Sir, I am surprised that my hon. friend should have ignored that question. This was the occasion for him to refer to it. I hope that before this session passes we shall hear from him on this subject. I have always thought that this proposal of a reciprocal tariff between the Mother Country and the dominions was not feasible, and that, perhaps, it would in some way injure the Mother Country and injure the dominions with other nations of the world. But I am open to conviction. This war has changed radically views and opinions that were entertained before it began—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And conditions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: —and conditions, certainly. I say that I am open to conviction on the subject. But I should have expected that a master, like my hon. friend, would have given to the House the benefit of his views on that question. But probably we shall hear from him later on.

The question of transportation has reached, as the hon. gentleman will admit, an acute stage in our country, due, of course, to the loss of so many ships since the beginning of the war, and also to the requisitioning of so many of our ships by the Admiralty. I commend to my hon. friend an article which was published a few days ago in the By-Water Magazine, written by the well-known authority, Mr. Wolvin, on the enormous amount of money which has been paid by Canada to the United States for lake and ocean transportation. He refers especially to the shipment of our grain, and says:

To move this grain from United States ports to foreign purchasers undoubtedly required 500 steamers, each of which in stevedoring charges, supplies purchased, and repairs made, would average a cash outlay in port of $1,200, or a total of about $600,000.

So we find that we have calmly turned over in cash to our neighbours to the south:

Lake vessels	$4,125,828 00
Railroads	6,143,061 81
Port charges	519,147 06
Ocean vessel port disbursements	600,000 00
	$11,388,036 87

Present indications are that the wheat, oats and barley now in our western provinces, the remainder of our wonderful 1915 crop, will contribute just about the same number of dollars to the United States, making a grand total from the 1915 crop of about $23,000,000.

And here is the crux of the whole question:

This "real money" can be retained in Canada only by the greatest protection to her lake vessels, increased railroad and ocean port facilities, and an assured supply of ocean vessels trading from Canada. Our statesmen at Ottawa are keenly alive to this loss which we are suffering every day, and I feel sure will develop our Eastern Canadian facilities so as to properly care for this great tonnage of grain from the West and will make every effort to the end that Canada may have a proper supply of her own ocean tonnage.

In that connection I was reading the other day from a New York paper the synopsis of a book, "The National Issues of 1916," which has just been published by Mr. Charles N. Fowler, who has been chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives at Washington. Mr. Fowler believes that of all economic and commercial issues in the United States the question of ocean transportation is about the biggest. He clearly and convincingly gives all the facts of the maritime history of the United States to show that whenever they had a discriminating duty against imports brought there in foreign bottoms, they always had a superb merchant marine, and whenever they lowered or removed those duties, their ships disappeared from the seven seas. He advocates the imposition of an additional duty on all goods which

are not brought or carried to the United States in American bottoms. He shows beyond question that an extra ten per cent of import duties imposed upon all imports coming to the United States in foreign bottoms would give the United States in their oversea trade what their shipping laws and regulations have given them in their coastwise trade—the finest shipping on the waters of the globe. Mr. Fowler says that in the next presidential campaign in the United States this will be one of the great issues.

My hon. friend from Vancouver expressed regret at the reference made by my hon. friend from St. John to our trade with the United States. We may have our respective views on the question of trade between Canada and the United States; we may differ as to the limited reciprocity as was advocated during the last campaign; but can we ignore this fact that Canada after Great Britain is the best customer of the United States and that after Great Britain the United States is the best customer of Canada?

I was reading a moment ago about the United States shipping. In that same paper there is an article on the trade to be developed between the United States and Latin America. As you are aware Sir, since the Pan-American Congress there has been in the United States quite a party favouring closer trade relations with the southern republics. This paper dismisses any hope of a very large trade between the northern republic and the southern republics. The reason is very obvious. The editor says:

> Grant that we want to sell everything we can sell in the Latin Americas; grant that we ought to make earnest efforts to broaden our markets there; yet how can any man in possession of the cold, hard facts, bearing on this question, blind his eyes to the impossibility of ever making a Latin-American consumer a buyer of our commodities or a user of any service we can offer, as we can make a man who is more like ourselves, whether in Canada, Great Britain, Germany, South Africa or Australia? Think of Canada, with a population only approximately what the population of New York city is! Canada buys more from us—buys it in years of peace and buys it in years of war—than all the Latin-American countries, with all their vast populations put together. Given the opportunity on anything like even terms, she always will. Again, the reason is fundamental. The people there are like us. They live as we live. They want what we want. They use what we use. Why, Canada, with one-tenth the population of the German Empire, has been even a greater customer of the United States than all the German peoples in Europe! What, then, is the use or the sense of misunderstanding where our best and richest markets are and must be?

This is common sense, and surely no one will be offended when, perchance, somebody on this side of the House urges upon the Government the necessity of bettering our trade relations with the great republic to the south of us.

The move taken to-day by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is quite logical. Men have done of late what he recommended the other evening that some of us should do; they have put on their thinking caps. For instance, the report published by the Ontario Commission on Unemployment shows conclusively that the intellectual men of Canada are on the qui vive. I find in that valuable report the reason why there should be at the present time an organization to develop our trade with foreign countries. I find there the evidence given by the general manager of the Bank of Montreal, one of the ablest financiers of Canada and indeed of the Empire, Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, who estimates the total outstanding indebtedness of Canada to Great Britain alone to be £545,546,849.

Mr. EDWARDS: At what date?

Mr. LEMIEUX: 1914. To this must be added our indebtedness to the United States at that time and the total foreign borrowings of 1915 and 1916.

Sir George Paish, another authority on finance, stated that the Canadian people owed Great Britain and the United States not less, in round figures, than £600,000,000. It is evident, therefore, according to these two authorities, that the total foreign indebtedness of Canada, public and private, is not less at the present time than $3,000,000,000. I now quote the view expressed by the commissioners:

> It is necessary, therefore, after taking into consideration the new capital coming to Canada in the form of imports, to find annually a market for $140,000,000 of exports in excess of imports to provide for interest charges alone. There are some considerations which modify but do not substantially alter this statement. If our exports do not provide for this, it simply means that to the amount of the deficiency we are living on borrowed capital or accumulating arrears of interest.

The commissioners point to some remedies for this condition. For instance, they recommend better banking facilities, consideration of the questions relating to foreign tariffs and transportation, technical training, greater knowledge of modern

languages and of what may be properly termed the economics of foreign trade.

Just a word about modern languages. My hon. friend the member for Vancouver spoke of the possibilities of better trade conditions with Russia, that great country which is now an ally of Great Britain and France. May I tell my hon. friend—and this is a plea for bi-lingualism—that if an Anglo-Canadian not conversant with the Russian languages or dialects—because there are many Russias in the Greater Russia—is to represent us in order to establish better trade relations over there, he will meet with difficulties, because the only foreign language spoken freely in all the large centres of Russia is the French language. I say this en passant, so that my friends in the House may understand how important it is for us, Canadians to be conversant with more than one language.

In connection with the very able report of the Ontario commission, which came to the conclusion that in order to provide employment for the unemployed and to meet the conditions arising after this war we should develop our trade with foreign countries, I may say that in Great Britain also, this question has of late been very prominent. Not later than in the month of January last a motion was made in the British House of Commons by Mr. Hewins, and the very question which was presented to the House this afternoon by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, was also discussed in the British House. Mr. Hewins moved:

> That with a view to increasing the power of the Allies in the prosecution of the war, His Majesty's Government should enter into immediate consultation with the Governments of the Dominions in order with their aid to bring the whole economic strength of the Empire into co-operation with our Allies in a policy directed against the enemy.

I would commend this debate to those of my fellow-members who take a special interest in the trade question, because in these speeches, especially in those delivered by Mr. Hewins, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Fell and Runciman, you will find most interesting data and facts.

For the moment I wish, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words about the trade possibilities between Canada and France, one of the great Allies. My reasons for confining my remarks to Franco-Canadian trade are obvious. First of all, as I have stated, France is the great ally of Britain. A hurricane of glory has swept over France. She has fought the enemy since the beginning of the war in a way which, by her heroism and by her undaunted courage, has elicited universal admiration. Besides, we should bear in mind that one-third of the population of this Dominion is of French descent. We have had two treaties with France, one which was negotiated some years ago by the late lamented Sir Charles Tupper, and another which was negotiated only a few years ago by Mr. Fielding when he was Minister of Finance. We have an oceanic service with that country which, I believe, could be improved. I hope that when the war is over and when new steamers are built my hon. friend will exact from the Allan Company a better and more modern service between Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John and Havre. Sir, France is anxious to trade with us; she is willing to buy from us. If you look at the latest figures published by the Department of Trade and Commerce, you will realize how wonderfully our trade with that country has increased.

In 1896, the total trade, imports and exports, between France and Canada, amounted to $3,364,313; and for 1915, the total imports and exports were $22,847,315. This is a wonderful advance, and shows how France is anxious to trade with us. I know that people will say that these conditions arise from the war, that France is buying from Canada war munitions. But, Sir, I am informed on the highest authority that we can maintain our trade at at least that figure between Canada and France after the war is over, because France is grateful to Canada, grateful not only for the noble part Canada has taken in the war, for the blood which has been freely given by her sons on the plains of Flanders yesterday and to-day, but grateful also for the gifts that have been made from every city, from every town, from every hamlet of Canada, to the suffering peasantry of France. Yes, France is and will be grateful. It so happens that the Republic is represented to-day in Canada by one of the ablest consuls-general this country has ever had in the diplomatic service. I refer to Mr. Bonin of Montreal who was conseiller d'ambassade, and who is a far-seeing statesman. He is an arduous worker who knows exactly the economic conditions of both France and Canada, and he has been doing his best to foster those conditions since the war began. Consider the importance of that Franco-Canadian trade. 20 years ago it was about $3,500,000 a year, total imports and exports, and last year it was nearly $25,000,000. It is the imperative duty of Canada to maintain that trade,

and to do whatever is possible to promote it in the future.

What was our trade with Germany? In 1896 that trade, total imports and exports, was $7,212,000; and in 1914, the year before the war, it was $19,119,000. I do not know that many people in Canada, that many people in the Empire, will be willing to develop trade relations with Germany after the war, and if we can transfer our orders from Germany to France, we will only be doing a patriotic duty. I was rather painfully surprised last year, when the first war loan of France was launched, that this loan was not better appreciated by our banking institutions in Canada. There is an old saying in Europe that was applied to France before the war, and I suppose will be applied to her after the war: France is the creditor of all nations, and is the debtor of none. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is versed in finance and who knows the credit of all European countries, is aware that this is true. Every country in Europe was more or less a vassal to France, from a financial point of view, and if there is anything to be regretted it is that France was far too free and to generous in her foreign investments. Yes, I was surprised that when France offered some of her coupons on her national loan to the banking institutions in Canada, the response was not very generous. Perhaps there were reasons for that. The Government and the banking institutions had probably in mind that we would have our own domestic loans, and that we had to provide in some way for the needs of the British exchequer. At all events, I express this regret, and I wish to state most explicitly that there is no nation in the world, with the exception perhaps of Great Britain, which stands higher than France in regard to national credit. You may ask me, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce may ask me, what Canada could buy from France. I would simply mention a few articles that Canada could buy from France instead of buying them from Germany as we have been doing in the past, such as wines, drugs, chemicals, scientific instruments, and above all, l'article de luxe, what is commonly called l'article de Paris, which has been insidiously replaced in many markets of the world by the shoddy goods of Germany with the false labelling "article de Paris." Our importers and their agents should see to it that the commercial world is not humbugged, as it has been in the past, with the shoddy goods of Germany falsely labelled "article de Paris." But what is now important for Canada is to know what she can sell to France. The list which I am about to read I take from a French review dealing especially with this question of our better trade relations with France. Although it has been often said that there is no sentiment in business there is already in France a very pronounced movement in favour of the expansion of commercial relations with the Allies, and particularly with Canada.

The desire, as much as the necessity, after the war, to substitute for the Austro-German trade direct commercial relations with the Allies, either by the creation of preferential tariffs, by the signature of commercial treaties, or by the direct action of commercial leagues having for their special object the severance of all trade relations with Germany, will contribute in a great measure to the aforesaid expansion, which, as regards Canada, will be here the more pronounced that we can furnish and manufacture an immense quantity of the items which were formerly bought in Germany.

In the review which I hold in my hand, it is shown that during the year before the war broke out France got from Germany manufactured goods and raw products, to the value of $250,000,000. Now, Sir, France will require from Canada, and is ready to receive from Canada these raw products and manufactured articles: Wood pulp, horses, live stock, frozen meat and fish, cheese, flour, hay, leather, saddlery, shoes, asbestos, steel, building material and rolling stock for railways and all sorts of tools and implements which, during the war, have been exported from Canada to France will certainly continue to be exported, and to the aforesaid articles must be added the goods which France used to buy from Germany and which she now knows she can have in Canada. As I have stated, the exports from Germany into France amounted to $250,000,000 per year before the war, and there is no reason why a large proportion of that trade should not henceforth be given to Canada. In addition to the above products and articles, the following items may now readily find a market in France: Agricultural implements, steam excavators, dredges, road ploughs and horses, concrete laying machines, steam rollers, etc; railway material and rolling stock, spare parts for locomotives, straight and bent axletrees, steel in bars, locomotive tires, cars and vans; locomotive fire grates,

bolts with or without nuts, manganese bronze tubes, coupling chains and hooks, nails, brads and staples, copper tubes, copper wire, bars, and plates, cast iron locomotive cylinders, cast iron and cast steel pieces, steel and copper grate plates, cross-head leaders, brass plates and wire, moulded brass pieces, springs, flat spiral and screw, buffers, smoke tubing with covered welding, weldless tubing, stretched tubing, copper tubing, railway ties in any quantity, I am informed; wood and steel flat cars and freight cars for standard and narrow gauge tracks; construction handcars, steel in bars and blocks, profiled steel, beams, corner plates, air compressing machines, electric and compressed air drills, electric apparatus, hardware and plumbing sundries; wood and iron working machines, chucks, planers, drilling and countersinking machines, tackles, cranes, pulleys, etc.; wood and pulp, iron, steel, copper, nickel, asbestos, coal and phosphates; horses and live stock; wool and woollen garments, underclothing and hosiery; leather, shoes, saddlery, harness, belts; butter, eggs, cheese, canned fish and meat, frozen fish and meat, ham, pork, lobsters, crab fish, salmon, codfish, sugar, maple syrup, molasses, condensed milk, flour, hay; furs, green and dressed skins; paper, naphtha, soap, tobacco, artificial manures, twine and cord, trunks, carriages; raw and manufactured rubber, grain, alcohol, photographic implements, furniture, fishing nets, hemp and flax thread, brushes, pins, cotton goods, etc., etc.

The above list was handed to me by the Secretary of the French Chamber of Commerce in Montreal, and the Consul General of France in Canada wishes to call the attention of every manufacturer and of every industrial firm in Canada to these articles, because he is anxious that Canada should get the preference in French trade.

A few months ago the French Government delegated to Canada and the United States a mission composed of several members of the House of Representatives. The mission was headed by M. Maurice Damour, who has occupied a very high position in the financial world of France. For some years M. Damour was, if I mistake not, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives in Paris. I was present when he addressed the Board of Trade in Montreal and later on a meeting of merchants and manufacturers on the 23rd December last. On that occasion, he said that as France had been taken unawares by war, she did not intend to be taken unawares by peace, and for that reason she was sending trade commissioners abroad in order to seek other markets in place of those she had sought before, and in order to trade with people other than those with whom she had traded before. He called our attention to the fact that the northern part of France having been invaded, all her industries in that part, and the best at that, had been practically annihilated. He said that, for instance, the textile and metal industries were crippled, and that France required the raw material from Canada in order to enter upon her period of reconstruction. He said they would require agricultural implements for moto-culture to replace farm hands. So many yeomen have given their lives on the battlefield that moto-culture will replace the use of farm hands in a large degree in agricultural France. He said that for years the French manufacturers had bought, for instance, their asbestos from Berlin, whilst Berlin was importing asbestos directly from Canada. He said: "We must not make that mistake in the future." After that meeting, a cablegram was addressed to the Premier of France, M. Aristide Briand, which read as follows:

> The economic associations and the representatives of the industrial and commercial forces of Canada assembled to receive the mission of Maurice Damour, deputy, acclaim his hearty statements. They address to the eminent head of the French Government their sentiments of gratitude and their faithful devotion to great and beautiful France, and to affirm their will of maintaining to-morrow on the economic field the fraternal union which binds them to-day to France in the struggle for the certain triumph of the cause of right and civilization the Canadians decide to repay soon to the Old Country, whose fervent souvenir they will cherish, the visit made by the Damour Mission which has opened with success the most brilliant future to the economic relations between Canada and our dear and glorious France.
>
> Benson,
> President of the Board of Trade.

Mr. Speaker, a delegation met my hon. friend on the 15th of January. There were representatives of the Board of Trade, the Corn Exchange, of the banking institutions and of the transportation companies. The object of that interview with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was to promote trade between Canada and France and with that object in viey they asked him to send repre-

sentatives to France to attend the Exposition de Lyon. My hon. friend properly said that, as only a section of Canada was represented in that delegation, he could not at the present time see his way clear to granting the request. I agree with him. There is something more urgent than the Exposition de Lyon. I understand that a commission composed of business men will visit France, and possibly the other allied countries, in order to systematically promote better trade relations.

But I wish to draw his attention to a matter which I regard as of greater importance. There is at present in France, a movement on foot towards the reconstruction of cities and towns that have been destroyed during the war. I hold in my hand the programme of a large and important committee which has been formed in France in order to organize a Reconstruction Exposition. This Reconstruction Exposition is under the high patronage of the president of the French Republic, and the ministries of commerce, industry, postal and telegraph service, agriculture, interior, public instruction and arts, the general council of the Seine and the Municipal Council of Paris. It is to be held in Paris during the months of May, June and July, 1916. What is the object of the Exposition? I wish I could address myself to the industrial communities of Canada and to our manufacturers, in order to impress them with the importance of that Exposition. It will advertise to the world what are at the present moment the needs of France for the reconstruction of its devastated cities, towns and villages.

The Americans have not been slow in responding to the call which has been made to them by the committee to which I have just alluded. American manufacturers have formed a national committee, and they are preparing to send out delegations to all those engaged in industrial activities in order to capture as far as possible the trade which that reconstruction will necessarily create. The exposition will open on May 16 in the Terrace of the Tuileries Gardens and in the halls of the Jeu de Paume, which the ministry has been good enough to place at the disposal of the exhibitors. The programme is to be divided into four groups. In the first group will be found the essential organs of a modern town, the plan for arrangement and extension, and plans for reconstruction, everything concerning the æsthetics and hygiene of a city, the precautions to be taken with a view to the absolute respect of local styles, the variety of which lends such charm to French towns, the preservation of historic monuments and of any particularly beautiful natural site, etc. The second group will contain buildings in general, public edifices, dwelling houses and rural and industrial construction. In the third group will appear modern methods of and materials for construction, with examples of what has been achieved. Lastly, the fourth group will be specially devoted to legislation governing the arrangement, the construction, the improvement, and the beautifying of cities. The American manufacturers know that their chance is there, and quick as they are to realize their opportunities, they have launched an appeal to the business men. I wish that that appeal had also been made by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the Canadian manufacturers. I claim that our Canadian manufacturers, Tories as they are generally—

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, not all.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not all—are keen, progressive, capable, and quite able to hold their own against the American manufacturers. I hope that my hon. friend will yet make a special appeal to them, so that they may get their share in the immense reconstruction business which France expects within the next few years. Let me quote just a few paragraphs from the appeal made by the American manufacturers:

> We regard this as the greatest opportunity American manufacturers ever had to establish themselves in the commerce of Europe. The habitations of 35 millions of people are more or less damaged or destroyed and everything must be replaced. The highways are destroyed, the streets of cities are destroyed, all the public service systems, such as water, sewerage, gas light, electric light have been destroyed, factories, dwellings, farms, everything. The labourers need every kind of tools and implements by the millions, used in building and refurnishing these institutions. Furthermore, the neutral countries have been in the habit of buying from countries now engaged in war, and their markets are entirely bare. These countries find themselves not independent, and each one is seeking to make it so.
>
> Hence they all want to get vast quantities of up to date machinery to manufacture the things they formerly have gotten from the countries now at war. It will require the full capacity of all the American factories for many years to meet these needs, provided they exhibit samples here that are satisfactory to the buyer. I may add that the American goods are more popular in Europe than any other, but it is practically impossible to get them.

Now is the opportunity for the Canadian manufacturers.

> Practically everything, except things to eat or to wear, are desired in this exposition.
>
> To illustrate the demand and the readiness with which goods offered are taken, let me say that we are already asked to make prices and submit samples for the restoration of one city, which will cost 150,000,000 francs, another 250,000,000 francs, another, 600,000,000 francs
>
> The exhibits will be admitted free from all duties, and arrangements will be made with the French consul at the point of shipment to so stamp the goods on their departure.

Again I urgently call the special attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to that circular, and ask him to have it distributed amongst the manufacturers and business men of Canada. Their opportunity is excellent, having regard to our special standing in France.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take up the time of the House further, except to say this: There is some confusion in certain minds as to the business ability of the French people. People are apt to believe that the French people are only able to make savings. Sir, the French are a wealthy people because they make savings, but they become wealthy because they are industrious. It is by hard work that they make their savings profitable. It is said that the French export trade does not bulk large in the bluebooks. Let me answer in the words of one of the ablest French statesmen, an ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs, who visited Canada a few years ago, and who has been one of the most remarkable writers before and during the present war, who was one of the fathers of the Entente Cordiale—I refer to Mr. Gabriel Hanotaux. Speaking of the trade of France with the world, he said it could be crystallized in one simple expression, "small tonnage and large profits." We do not export coal from France, says Mr. Hanotaux, but we export diamonds—small tonnage, large profits. We do not export cotton, he says, but an artist in Paris will buy a small canvas, put a frame around it, and with a few strokes of his brush he will sign his name—Cormon, or some other—selling it afterwards for 500,000 or perhaps 1,000,000 francs—small tonnage, large profits. That is the commerce of France, coupled with her genius, expressed in words.

But, Sir, to conclude it all, and regretting that I have taken so much time, let me say that I expect my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has such command of the English language, but whom I suspect to be French at heart—I would say that even to his electors in Toronto—

[Mr. Lemieux.]

An hon. MEMBER: He speaks French well.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He speaks it well; he is a university graduate. Yes; I expect that he will do his best to promote trade between Canada and France. He may well be proud of what has been achieved, not only since the war but before the war, for our trade with France has increased wonderfully within the past five years. The time has come to capture more of that trade, to keep it in the channels which it has entered, and so to maintain between Canada and the old motherland of one-third of the Canadian people, now the faithful ally of Great Britain, the happiest relations that can exist.

Mr. S. F. GLASS (Middlesex East): I have a question to ask the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), but did not put it while he was speaking, as I did not wish to interrupt him. He quoted from a circular sent to the members of this House portions of a certain resolution, but he omitted the preamble and certain clauses. I presume that the fact that he presents these resolutions to the House, and places a portion on Hansard, may be taken as indicating that to some extent they met his approval. But I would like to read a clause in the preamble and also a portion of the resolution which the hon. member omitted. Possibly there may not have been reason for omitting these, but I think they would form a valuable contribution with the rest, as showing the opinions of these representative farmers, manufacturers and business men who met in Galt:

> And whereas it would seem to be feasible for the Allies, by means of customs tariffs and otherwise, to reserve their great consuming markets for their mutual enjoyment, and to the exclusion of the enemy, thus serving the double purpose of hastening their own economic recovery, while retarding that of the Central Powers.

The hon. gentleman said he would not delay the House by reading the whole resolution, but he read the third clause and passed over the fourth as "etc, etc." The fourth clause says:

> An agreement among all the Allies to subject the products of the Central Empires to such surtaxes and other disabilities as will effectually restrict their competition in the markets of the Allies.

I wanted to ask my hon. friend why these parts of the preamble and of the resolution were omitted by him in reading this circular.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I might very well have read the fourth clause. I read from this circular just to show the necessity of Canada taking part in the economic conference at Paris. I regretted the absence of a Canadian delegate at that conference.

There was, however, no thought on my part of avoiding this issue, and I did not say that I committed myself to the preferential trade policy. I am, however, willing to listen to such an idea as my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has presented, and to any arguments in favour of it. I stated that theories that were roseate and that had captured men's hearts and heads before the war would crumble to pieces after the war. I even expect some of my Tory friends to be free traders after the war. Therefore I am open to conviction, but I sincerely regret that Canada shall not be represented at that Paris conference and shall not give expression to her views.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately for myself I was not in the House this afternoon when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce made his speech. I can, however, quite agree with the remark made by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), that it was a most eloquent and able speech. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has the faculty of making good speeches and of giving expression to good ideas. Unfortunately, however, his colleagues do not always seem to agree with him, or at least they do not back him up to any considerable extent. Not long ago we listened to one of the most eloquent speeches ever heard in this House delivered by my hon. friend, I think, on the Budget, when he spoke of the advisability of cutting out political patronage and of having a public committee appointed to deal with all requests for the expenditure of public money before the items were placed in the Estimates. That was a very fine idea, but it does not seem to have been impressed very strongly upon his colleagues, because the Estimates have been coming down in department after department, perhaps not quite as large as in the last year or two, but extremely large, and one minister after another has been asking for millions of dollars which they claim they do not expect to expend during the current year.

My only reason for saying a word on this occasion is this, that I understand that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is proposing to expend a considerable sum of money in looking over the whole face of the earth in an endeavour to find new outlets for trade between Canada and other countries with which we are not trading at the present time. I quite agree with the general proposition that it is very desirable and necessary for Canada to secure additional trade if at all possible; but the point that I particularly wish to impress upon my hon. friend is that in every case where he will send commissioners to secure additional trade with Canada, that trade is secured at a great cost. In every case, particularly if you secure a trade arrangement with any foreign country at a distance, in addition to the expense of securing that trade, you have to subsidize steamship lines to carry it, so that the taxpayer of Canada has to put his hand into his pocket and out of any profits that are made from the trade he has to pay for securing ships to carry the freight backwards and forwards between Canada and whatever country the trade arrangement has been made with. Let us take the case of the trade arrangement that my hon. friend made with the West Indies. It is very good in its way, but it has not amounted to much, and it has meant a heavy expense. If we trade with our own sister colonies, Australia or New Zealand, we have to grant large steamship subsidies. If my hon. friend secures additional trade arrangements with other countries, there will be large expenditures in subsidies in order to make that trade possible. What I want to point out in particular is that right at our own door for the asking more trade can be done in one week than can be done in a year with any other country with which my hon. friend can form a trade arrangement after paying sweetly to get it. Right at our own door is a population of between ninety and a hundred million people who are wanting to trade with us, who are already trading with us to a large extent, who are doing more trade with us than Canada is doing with the whole world. Canada, with a population of about 7,500,000, buys approximately twice as much from the United States as the ninety or a hundred million people buy from us and we have to pay the difference by trade with other countries. Those people want to buy from us. My hon. friend could enable them to do so by a turn of the hand, and it would be of great advantage to the people of Canada. In many parts of Canada the people have

almost unanimously been asking for freer trade with the United States, and we could have it without hurting any portion of this country. Yet my hon. friend and his colleagues absolutely refuse to extend the trade of Canada where it can be carried on for nothing and still give splendid results and be profitable. The people of the United States are probably the richest people in the world at the present time. During the past two years that this war has been waging they have made thousands of millions of dollars on account of the war, and they want to buy our goods, whereas practically every other country to which my hon. friend can go in order to make a trade arrangement has become more or less impoverished by the war. I do not for a moment mean to say that if my hon. friend made a trade arrangement with any of the nations that are now engaged in this war, it would not pay for the goods it bought. No doubt it would do so; otherwise it would not buy the goods. But what I want to point out is that we have right at our own door a hundred million people wanting to buy our goods.

Mr. EDWARDS: Wanting to buy what?

Mr. TURRIFF: All the natural products that can be produced on any piece of land in any part of the Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: What are they to do with them?

Mr. GRAHAM: Look at the trade returns.

Mr. TURRIFF: We need not care what they will do with them. Surely my hon. friend does not need to worry about what they will do with the implements he manufactures if they buy them and pay cash for them. It does not matter to him whether they plough the ground with them or whether they leave them out on the ground to rot. If they buy the goods and pay cash for them, what more does my hon. friend want? Here we have a hundred million people wanting to buy our goods, offering to buy them, wanting to better our trade relations, to get our goods in and pay for them, and what more can any one ask for is something that I cannot understand. So far as we in the West are concerned, we produce practically only the natural products of the soil. The prairies are not a manufacturing section of Canada. I believe that for centuries we shall not be a manufacturing country out there, for the simple reason that the cost of living is higher in that part of the country than it is in Eastern Canada, and that we have not the raw materials. The advantage of shipping in the raw material and paying freight on it as against bringing in the manufactured goods is not sufficient to overcome the extra cost of manufacturing. In most things, at all events, we shall not be manufacturers in the West; we shall be producers of natural products—wheat, oats, barley, flax, cattle, horses, sheep, hogs and everything that is produced on the farms. We shall sell these things and buy our manufactured products from the manufacturers in Eastern Canada if we can get them anything like as cheaply as we can get them elsewhere.

Mr. BLAIN: What about Winnipeg as a manufacturing city?

Mr. TURRIFF: Winnipeg does some assembling and manufacturing.

Mr. BLAIN: It ranks third among the manufacturing cities of Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: I know perfectly well what the trade returns are, but Winnipeg is not a manufacturing city in the sense that Montreal and Toronto are. There are certain things that we manufacture in the West; Winnipeg will be a large assembling point. But even if we do some manufacturing, our main business will be agriculture and its associated industries. We shall sell those products wherever we can sell them to the best advantage and we shall buy the manufactured products that we use to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars, thus making the western country the best market for the Canadian manufacturer. What does the Canadian manufacturer want? To my mind, if he took the proper view of the matter, he would want to put the western farmer in a position to get the best price for what he grows and produces. What does the western farmer do with his money? He does not bury it. He sends it into the towns and villages near where he lives; from there it goes to the wholesalers in Winnipeg and from there it goes East to pay for manufactured goods. Why not give the Canadian farmer in the West the best advantage that you can give him so that he will be a better customer for the Eastern manufacturer than he can possibly be so long as you circumscribe his market? The Canadian farmer is not asking for protection. He is not asking that duty be imposed on any one thing that he grows. No farmers' organization in the Prairie Province will ask that duties be placed on

anything that the farmer produces. What they want is to have the duties all taken off the goods they are producing. Give them the free market, and that is all you need worry about. They will sell where they can sell to the best advantage; if they can sell better across the line they will do so, and thus be able to expend more money in goods manufactured in Eastern Canada and be a bigger asset to Canada as a whole and to the Canadian manufacturer in particular. To give them this market would be a general advantage to Canada. It was said four years ago during the reciprocity campaign that we would pay too much for the American market for our farmers' produce. Well, there is an opportunity now to get that American market without paying anything for it. Supposing my hon. friends across the floor of the House were right four years ago—I do not think they were, but never mind that now. At the present time they can get the American market for wheat and all wheat products and potatoes by simply putting them on the free list. The western farmers, and to a large extent the eastern farmers, want to see that done, because it would mean an increase in the trade of Canada each year to the extent of tens of millions of dollars. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce could bring that about at once if he and his colleagues wanted to do so. They would not have to spend a dollar; they would not have to give any steamship subsidies. Why will they not do it? My hon. friend is anxious to send men all over the face of the earth to try to make little trade arrangements that would not amount in a year to what the extra trade with the United States would amount to in a week. Why this course has not been followed is something that is very difficult to understand. Four years ago our friends across the floor of the House maintained that the putting of cattle on the free list would mean the ruination of Canada. But a little over two and a half years ago the United States put cattle and hogs on the free list, with the result that practically every hoof that has been exported by Canada has gone to the United States. Why? Simply because we can get more money for our cattle there than we can get by sending them to Liverpool. Have my hon. friends across the floor of the House observed any lack of loyalty on the part of the prairie provinces since they commenced to sell their cattle and hogs in the United States? Do they think that it has had a bad effect on Canada in any way? If they do, why do they not put a stop to it? They know very well that that state of affairs has been in the interests of Canada, and they know, too, that it would be very much in the interests of Canada if that trade were increased. My hon. friend the minister is in the frame of mind to try to increase Canada's trade. My recommendation to him is that instead of spending all this money in sending men all over the world to try to secure some doubtful trade—all good enough in its way—he should begin by getting the trade that is right at his door, and which can be secured for nothing. Surely that is common sense; surely that is reasonable. It is what the people are asking for; it would not hurt any one, and it would be a very great advantage along the lines that my hon. friend is working on. It very often happens that what we can get for nothing, or with very little effort, is not appreciated. My hon. friend thinks that if he can make a trade with some nation 10,000 miles away at a cost of a quarter of a million or half a million dollars by way of subsidies to steamships to carry the goods back and forth he has achieved something of great value to the country and of great credit to the Government. It is true that this trade would be of advantage to the people of Canada. I do not want to curtail my hon. friend, or interfere with him in any way so far as getting the trade of the outside world is concerned, but what I appeal to my hon. friend to do is, first, to get the trade that is right at his door, and that he can get without paying anything for it. Why does my hon. friend refuse? I cannot think of any other reason than that it is done at the instigation and on the advice of the manufacturers of Canada. I may be wrong in that, but I can think of no other reasonable reason why my hon. friend should refuse to give us the American market where it is possible to get it. I have no doubt that in addition to wheat, wheat products and potatoes, my hon. friend could have a large number of other natural products added to the list, and in doing this he need not touch manufactured articles at all, or interfere with the Canadian manufacturer in any shape or form.

In regard to the building of ships, I wish to impress on the minister that, according to reports in the Old Country papers, both the Government and private interests are urging that special efforts be made to increase the building of ships in the Old Coun-

try. Great complaint is being made because in one particular town where ships are built, there were 157,000 hours of work performed and over 15,000 hours lost by the workingmen. The article to which I particularly refer went on to point out what a tremendous loss that was to the nation, and where they were going to land if this war kept on. It is an unfortunate thing to have to say that during the last week practically five ships a day were sent to the bottom by German torpedoes and mines, 33 for the week. That is going pretty strong. I doubt if the British shipbuilders, in addition to keeping up and increasing the strength of the navy, are going to be able to keep up the tonnage of freight boats if the Germans can continue to sink them at that rate. These, of course, were not all British ships, but the destruction of neutral or Allied ships interferes just as much with the carrying of goods from Canada to Great Britain as if they were all British ships that were sunk. I see that they are building large ships in the United States. The other day a ship whose keel has not yet been laid was sold at auction on the Pacific coast. It is to be a ship of 7,500 tons. The report did not say whether that was registered tonnage or carrying capacity. The ship was sold for $600,000, yet it will not be built until the coming summer. We in Canada ought to be able to build ships as well as they can in the United States and it would appear to me to be good policy on the part of the Government to take this matter up in earnest. I am sure that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce will do that he will do that he will find out that we on this side of the House, while we may criticise—and I am sure that a considerable amount of criticism is good for any Government—our criticism will not interfere with the Opposition assisting the Government to any extent that may be possible in securing a method or system by which we can go on and build some ships in Canada. My own feeling is that we should take off every vestige of duty on everything that goes into the construction of a ship, and then we would offer a permanent inducement to the shipbuilders of Canada to go into the business, a very great inducement over and above what they have now. If something along this line is done, we may be able to help make up the wastage. I was glad to hear that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was in hopes that the war would end at an early day, that the end was in sight. Listening to his colleague the Minister of Militia, one would come to the opposite conclusion, because the Minister of Militia explained to the House what Germany had accomplished; and whatever we may do in the near future, it is unfortunate that we have to say so, but the fact remains that we have not yet started to drive the Germans back. They are gaining ground to-day in France; we have not driven them back. The Russians are driving the Turks back, but the German army has not, so far, been driven back. I do not think that means that we will not win in the end, but we have a long, hard task ahead of the Empire and of the Allies, and if we delay too long in starting to provide ships to keep up commerce between Canada and Great Britain, if vessels are to be destroyed at the rate of five per day, it may turn out that next fall, when we have our wheat and other farm products and other products that the British Empire needs, to send across, there will not be ships enough to carry our produce across at any price. I think that something ought to be done along the lines of securing trade that is offering to us near at home. I trust the minister will consider this matter, and I know that if he sets his mind to it, with the experience he has had and the ability he has, he will accomplish something; and I am also quite sure that we on this side of the House will be willing and ready to tender any assistance that it is possible for us to give.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) calls to my mind a couplet which runs:

> The lightning bug is brilliant, but it has'nt any mind—
> It wanders through creation with its headlights on behind.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is very clever.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not want to say, or to be understood as saying that the hon. member for Assiniboia is like the lightning bug in not having any mind. He has a mind, of a kind. But I think I might be excused for saying that the last line of that couplet does apply to the hon. gentleman very aptly—that his headlights are on behind. If the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia has forgotten some of his past history, there are members of this House who have not forgotten, and there are some of us who still remember that this same gentleman who gets up now and talks about making everything free as the air we breathe, taking the duty off agricultural implements,

is the same man who, in 1907, not only voted against reducing the duty on agricultural implements, but got up in his place in the House and spoke against any reduction in the duty on agricultural implements, putting himself on record as one of those expressing the unquestioned view of the western farmer, that the western farmer in 1907 did not want the entire duty taken off agricultural implements. Now he says he is expressing the view of the western farmer. What changes have taken place in the western part of this country? Has the western farmer changed his mind in regard to the duty on agricultural implements? Or is the changed attitude of my hon. friend due to the fact that he is now sitting to your left instead of to your right? On that occasion the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) moved for a reduction in the Fielding tariff, and the hon. Minister of Finance of the Laurier Government, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, rose and argued very strongly that it would be a very wrong thing to expect men to accept the motion of the hon. member for Souris, and reduce the duty on agricultural implements; and, like a good, stalwart, loyal supporter, the hon. member rose and said that he thought this was certainly right. He said: "Do not reduce the duty; the farmers in the West do not want the duty reduced." Now, when this same gentleman gets up and preaches along the lines he has taken since the change of Government, we have a right to take his statements cum grano salis—with a good liberal supply of salt at that.

The hon. gentleman says that there are 100,000,000 people across the line who are anxious to buy our products, who are craving our Canadian products. He says that they removed the duty on cattle. If they took the duty off Canadian cattle they had a purpose in view. I would suppose that their purpose was that they wanted the cattle to come into the United States, and, if I am correct in my reasoning in that respect, I would suppose that the reason they do not take the duty off wheat is that they do not want the wheat to come in to the United States to the extent that they wanted the cattle to come in. But is the United States the natural market for Canadian farm products? I know that that assertion has been made repeatedly by hon. gentlemen opposite, but, in my judgment, the United States is not the natural market for Canadian farm products. I say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is justified in sending out his trade commissioners seeking to enlarge our markets and to encourage trade with countries across the seas. I say that the West Indies, for instance, are a natural market for many of Canada's farm products, because these farm products are not indigenous to the West Indies. The natural markets for our products are those countries where these products do not naturally grow, not countries like the United States, where they have a surplus of these products. In what condition do we find the United States, so far as farm products are concerned? It is not starving for Canadian farm products; it is our greatest competitor in the markets of the world in these products. What country, of all the countries in the world, to-day produces the greatest amount of wheat for export? Am I not absolutely right when I say that the greatest wheat-producing and wheat-exporting country in the world is the United States? Large as our export was of last year's crop, it was small, indeed, compared with the exportable surplus of wheat in the United States. In the production of wheat the United States ranks first among the countries of the world. As an exporter of wheat the United States ranks first among the countries of the world. In the production of corn the United States ranks first among the countries of the world. It produces, I venture to say, as much corn as the rest of the countries of the world put together. In the production of oats, and in the exportable surplus of oats, the United States is far and away ahead of Canada. I venture the assertion that the United States to-day exports a larger quantity of meats than any other country in the world. Yet the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) tells us that the United States is the natural market for Canadian wheat when the United States exports more wheat than any other country.

Mr. TURRIFF: And oats.

Mr. EDWARDS: He tells us that the United States is the natural market for our oats, though it is a large exporter of oats. He says that the United States is the natural market for Canadian meats, though the United States exports more meats than any other country in the world to-day. The hon. gentleman will not attempt to deny my statement in that respect.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is my hon. friend asking a question?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am making a statement. I said that the hon. gentleman would not deny my statement that the United States is the largest exporter of meats in the world. Does he wish to deny that?

Mr. TURRIFF: If the United States is the largest exporter of oats, it is a very large importer of Canadian oats, on which it pays a duty, and of cattle also, though they get the cattle free.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman does not deny my statement.

Mr. TURRIFF: No, it is true.

Mr. EDWARDS: Very good, then we agree on that?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: I did not think he would deny it. I repeat that the hon. gentlemen said that the United States was the natural market for Canadian meats.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: I say that that statement is illogical in view of the fact that the United States is the largest meat exporting country in the world.

Mr. TURRIFF: They buy our cattle.

Mr. GRAHAM: They also buy our raw material.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. member for South Renfrew will take the trouble to look at the figures for the last two years he will find that, immediately after the duty was taken off cattle, there was a rush of cattle from Canada to the United States, but he will also find that that rush did not continue and that there was a considerable falling off.

Mr. TURRIFF: Where are they going?

Mr. EDWARDS: I maintain that it is illogical to say that a country such as the United States, which is unquestionably one of the greatest, if not the greatest agricultural country in the world, a country which has an exportable surplus of farm products, is the natural market for our farm products. Instead of being the natural market for Canada, it is our chief competitor in the markets of the world.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is the unnatural market.

Mr. EDWARDS: As my hon. friend says it is not only not the natural market for Canada, it is an unnatural market. The natural markets for the products of this country are, I repeat, those countries which do not produce the same kind of articles, and the best kind of trade that we can develop is with the countries which will take articles from us which they do not produce, and which will sell to us articles which we do not naturally produce. That is the proper basis of trade.

But hon. gentlemen opposite, with their famous reciprocity agreement which they wished to place upon this country, proposed to throw Canada open to the surplus production of all the agricultural countries of the world. That is what they proposed to do, and had the people of Canada not voted them out of power, had the people of Canada endorsed that policy, what would it have meant. It would have meant that the farmer of Canada would have been certain of one thing: that he would always receive for his product the lowest price paid in any country in the world, because, if the price of any farm product in Canada became high enough to be an inducement to the farmers of the Argentine or of the United States, or of any other country to send their products here, their products would be sent here. The price of our farm products would have been reduced to the lowest possible level and kept there if the reciprocity pact had been carried into effect. In 1911, after giving the matter very careful consideration, the people of the Dominion said that they did not want anything of the kind; and while hon. gentlemen opposite, like the hon. member for Assiniboia, may try to make himself, and others, believe that the people of Canada want reciprocity, I venture to say that neither he, brave as he is in regard to trade matters, nor any other member who sits beside him, will venture to test the opinion of this House by a resolution on that matter, much less to test the opinion of the country, and make it an issue. They know that the people have decided on that, and the hon. member for Assiniboia knows, as other hon. gentlemen opposite know in their hearts, in 1911 the people of Canada decided wisely.

11 p.m.

Mr. TURRIFF: No, I do not.

Mr. EDWARDS: He knows that they decided in their best interests. There is no doubt about that; the hon. member knows it perfectly well.

The hon. member for Assiniboia referred very briefly to the question of this great war. He quoted the optimism of my hon.

friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and he characterized my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence as being somewhat pessimistic. He added to-day his own opinion to the effect that the Germans were getting the better of this war. I do not agree with him for one moment. I do not believe he could find, if he were in a position to canvass the opinion of the people of Germany, that even they would agree with him. They do not think they are getting the better of the war. In a great war there are three factors which must be taken into consideration—men, money and munitions. If the war is short you may exclude the question of money and assume that both parties to the war will have enough, but if the war continues for any length of time, money will be a factor and money is one of the most important things in this war. At the beginning Germany had it over France, Russia and England in so far as men and munitions were concerned. That is the reason why she was able to make the wonderful advance she did make on the eastern front as well as on the western front, but during the last six or eight months the situation has entirely changed. While it is true that the line is practically where it was some months ago—

Mr. TURRIFF: That is all I said.

Mr. EDWARDS: But the hon. gentleman left an impression that I want to dissipate if I can. While it is true that the line is practically where it was a few months ago, it is also true that the Germans have not been able to carry on their offensive and advance on the western front, because in the meantime, or within the last few months, England and France have been enabled, not only to bring up men, but to bring up munitions, and in men and munitions, they are on an equality with Germany and are holding her there. The same thing is true of the eastern front as regards the contest between Russia and Germany. If you look at the whole situation, notwithstanding that Germany holds most of the Belgian territory which she has taken, notwithstanding that she temporarily holds her position in France and has overrun Serbia, the position of Germany and Austria in this war has become gloomier. While that is the condition on land, that is not the only phase of the question. The greatest blow which has been struck at Germany in this war has been struck by the British Navy in tying up the German Navy behind the forts of Kiel, in scattering German commerce and in driving it from the seas.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the British vessels which had been sunk by German torpedoes, and he intimates that possibly—if this continues, we may not have enough vessels to take our wheat—where, did he say?—not to the United States, but to take our wheat across to England. No matter what the price might be, we must have enough vessels, he says, to take our wheat across to England. If that is true for us, it will be true for the United States too. They would not have any chance to take their wheat across. Will the hon. member for Assiniboia get up and say that in a case like that, if we had not access to the British market, our natural market for wheat would be in the United States, where they would have millions and millions of bushels tied up that they could not get out to the markets of the world? Will he argue that? If he will not argue that, how can he logically maintain his position? But, while my hon. friend speaks about the possibility of boats being sunk, why is it that our Canadian wheat and the wheat of the western farmers is getting across the ocean to the markets of the world? It is because Britain has freedom upon the sea; it is because the British Navy rules the sea, and I cannot sit down without reminding the hon. member for Assiniboia that he was one of the men who stood up in this House and did his part to prevent the Dominion of Canada from making that navy stronger than it is to-day, and assisting it to protect our products on the way from Canada to the markets of the world.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, this debate seems to have got away from everybody, or everybody seems to have got away from it. My hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Edwards) has discussed the Navy. I do not think he has missed any question that has been up in the House during the last year. I intend to make a few remarks on the proposal of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in reference to the development of the trade of Canada and the machinery he proposes to use. I was once asked, while discussing the departments of the Canadian Government with the then Prime Minister, what department I considered the most important. I did not mention the Finance Department, I did not mention the Department of Agriculture, although these are very important, but I said to him that I thought the

department that gave the greatest scope to a man with a heap of energy was the Trade and Commerce Department in a young country which is really just beginning its development. However, I will refrain from making any comments until the Supplementary Estimates come down, as I understand my hon. friend has almost induced his colleagues to let him have a vote in the Supplementaries for this purpose. I must say that notwithstanding all the theories that have been spun to-night, and I do not say it disrespectfully in connection with what has been said or thought by any of you as to trade within the scope and the lines of a preferential tariff, when the department or the members of any convention, get down to the real question, they will discover that the representatives of Canada, and rightly so, will insist upon the position that they will not give up any of their rights to manage their own affairs as they see fit even though that view may not harmonize with somebody else's idea. Generally speaking, the theory is good, that when you come to take up some measure which is new, you will not allow the people of any other country, even a country in the British Empire, to control the conditions under which you manage your affairs, but these conditions will be controlled by Canada as they have been in the past. However, this is a large subject, and I am afraid I might make a speech if I continued along that line. I will keep my remarks until the supplementary estimates are up.

Mr. F. N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, there is a matter that I think my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) might deal with, and perhaps he could do so much more easily than he could deal with the question of navies and shipbuilding to-night. Canada produces a small quantity of hemlock tan bark, but, she produces more than can be used here. There has been an embargo placed upon the export of that commodity under an Order in Council which was passed about a year ago but which was only put into effect about a month ago. Whilst there is not a very great quantity produced, there is more than there is sale for in Canada. In the part of the country I come from, there has been business for more than fifty years in the shipping of bark to the United States. But this embargo was put into force about a month ago and the export of the stuff is held up. And there is no sale for it in Canada. I think that the Order in Council must have been put in force without consideration, because I cannot see any good purpose that is going to be served by prohibiting the export of tan bark. It cannot be shipped to Europe in the form of bark. At one time, in the province of Quebec, there were quite a few extracting works which reduced the bark to a liquid form so that it could be shipped anywhere without great expense for freight. But these works have disappeared, as also have many of the tanneries that formerly used bark. Consequently there is only a small quantity used in Canada. Unless the embargo is removed the stuff will waste, for it is not an article that will keep for any great length of time. I think that probably this matter is under the charge of the Minister of Customs, but I should fancy that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is interested in doing everything necessary and possible for facilitating the handling of the Canadian products, would also be interested. I trust the hon. minister (Sir George Foster) will give it his attention and will try, if possible to remove this embargo. Of course, if there is any good reason why it should not be removed, we will have to put up with it. If the Government can have it removed, it will be of benefit to us, and will hurt nobody.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Have any representations been made to the Customs Department or to my department on the subject?

Mr. McCREA: Yes, to the Customs.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not heard of it. I will make a note of the matter.

Mr. McCREA: I have a letter from Mr. McDougald, who says that the embargo has been put on and could not be removed. I do not think he has considered the matter very carefully.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Trade and Commerce—Trade commissioners and commercial agents, including expenses in connection with negotiations of treaty or in extension of commercial relations; miscellaneous advertising and printing, or other expenditure connected with the extension of Canadian trade, $150,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I presume that when the supplementary estimates are under con-

sideration there will be ample opportunity to discuss this question?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The same discussion can take place.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not see any reason why this should not pass.

Mr. THOMPSON: Have we any trade or commercial agents in South America?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, we have a representative in Buenos Aires. The former and actual commissioner of trade there was Mr. Poussette who was one of our experienced trade commissioners and who was changed from South Africa to that point about four years ago. But Mr. Pousette went overseas and the work of the department in Buenos Aires is being done by Mr. Webb, who also is a very efficient man. That reminds me that today I had a letter from a very prominent Canadian who has just made a tour of the Argentine. I had given him letters to Mr. Webb, and he had called upon him. He was very cordial in his praises of the services Mr. Webb performed for him and gave a very flattering idea of the worth of his services to Canada. When the war is over, Mr. Poussette will take his place again. In addition, we have the services of the British consuls in all South America. Two years ago Mr. Poussette made a tour of the states of South America, and consulted personally the consular agents. We have found his report of great value.

Mr. THOMPSON: I followed with great interest the discussion which has taken place. I feel very strongly that Canada, in the very near future, will have a golden opportunity to reach out and get her share of the world's trade. Our interprovincial trade, of course, has been a great factor in our economic development; but we have built our transcontinental railways, subsidized our steamships, dredged our harbours, lighted our coasts, all with the ultimate idea of making our country one of the great trade routes of the world. And I think that just now, with war in progress and the sympathies of our Allies with us, we cannot do better than project our ideas regarding trade in the future with neutral countries and with our Allies. I have always thought that we have never got our full share of the South American trade. Germany has had a very large percentage of it; Great Britain has had a large percentage of it; France has had a very considerable percentage; but Canada, I feel, has never had as great a share of South American trade as we should have had. In the countries that lie adjacent to the Equator, I believe, there is great opportunity for exchange of products with Canada. Brazil, for instance, offers a large field for the exploitation of our extra-territorial commerce. They grow many things which we want, and we grow many things which they want, pulpwood, for instance. It is generally considered that we have enormous resources in our forests for the making of pulp, and I believe that Brazil imports a large quantity. The woods indigenous to the soil of Brazil, we are told, are not suitable for the making of pulp. That is one item, which, I think, the Minister of Trade and Commerce should investigate. I understand that there is an opening there in a larger way than in the past for the sale of our fish. Many of our manufactured products might find a market in Brazil. I am glad to know that we have a trade agent in the Argentine. Though that country and ourselves compete in many things, still there are articles which we can exchange with mutual profit. I hope the Minister of Trade and Commerce will be seized—as I am sure he will be—of the importance of cultivating as far as possible the exchange of products between Canada and the republics of South America. There is a great opportunity right now, and I believe that our neighbours in the United States are exploiting those markets in South America to-day, and I hope that we shall get our full share from now on as we have not had that full share in the past.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Wednesday, April 19, 1916.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

CANADIAN PAY AND RECORD OFFICE, LONDON.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many persons are employed in the Pay and Record Office, in London, England, in addition to the commissioned officers?
2. What is the average cost per month of the operation of said office?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. N.C.O.'s and men, 915; of this number about half are men who have been invalided, sick or wounded, from the front. Civilian clerks: male, 99 over military age, or unfit for military service; and 264 females.

2. For month of January, $96,200.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is there a Canadian Pay and Records Office in England? If so, how many officers are employed in it, and how many men?

2. What was the total number of officers and men of the Canadian force in England and France up to the end of March, 1916?

3. Is there a Pay and Records Office in connection with British War Office?

4. If so, how many officers and men are employed in it?

5. What is the total number of the force of the British Army?

6. Are the officers in the Canadian Pay and Records Office in England paid according to rank, or do they get special pay?

7. Do they get anything extra for allowance?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes. Officers, 50; N.C.O.'s and men, 915; of this number about half are men who have been invalided sick or wounded from the front. Civilian clerks: male, 99 over military age, or unfit for military service, and 264 females.

2. 134,838.

3. Yes, by latest available information in Army List there are 38 pay and record offices in the United Kingdom. The duties, however, performed by the British pay and record offices differ in several important respects to the Canadian pay and record office. The latter, in addition to the same duties carried out in British pay and record offices, also has charge of all officers' accounts and records, and includes a large audit staff which audits all expenditure before accounts are forwarded to Canada. Both these duties are performed by separate offices and staffs in the case of the British army. The work of the Canadian office is still further increased by having to furnish complete information to the Militia Department in connection with all casualties, in addition to supplying information to the War Office and to relatives of Canadian officers and men in England whereas in the case of the British offices, they only have to deal with the War Office and units, etc., in the United Kingdom, and have nothing to do with records or accounts of officers of the army.

4. No information, but from inquiries made in England last October, it was ascertained that the staff required to deal with the pay and records of the British Expeditionary Force was higher, in proportion to the total strength of the army, than the staff of the Canadian pay and record office was to total strength of Canadian Expeditionary Forces overseas.

5. No information.

6. Officers are paid according to appointment for which special rates of pay and allowances are prescribed by Order in Council.

7. All allowances are included in special rates, except allowance in lieu of rations at 50 cents a day, the same as other officers receive.

PUGWASH SPUR LINE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What has been the total cost of the spur line of railway built from the main line of the Intercolonial railway into the brickyard at Pugwash, N.S.?

2. What has been the total amount of freight arrived from this spur line?

Mr. REID:

1. The Pugwash spur was built to the brick and tile plant, on the west side of Pugwash harbour, at the request of the Nova Scotia Clay Works, Ltd., they guaranteeing to ship not less than 6,000,000 bricks per year for a term of 15 years, to pay an extra or shunting charge of 20c. per thousand bricks, and to bring in at least 60 cars of coal each year for a period of 15 years, upon which they agreed to pay 20c. per ton as an extra or shunting charge. The cost of this spur line was $79,432.97.

2. Total Intercolonial earnings on freight delivered from this spur, $1,026.79.

THE VALE RAILWAY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What amount has been expended on the Vale railway since it was taken over by the Government?

2. What has been the receipts from the operation of said road since the date of operation?

3. What has been the cost of operation?

Mr. REID:

1. Since the Government made a tentative agreement for leasing the Vale railway, it has expended $6,925.52 in operation and maintenance.

2. $5,245.98.

3. The cost of operation of this section is included in the answer to No. 1.

MAIN STREET SUBWAY, MONCTON.

Mr. COPP:

1. What was the total cost of the Main street subway, Moncton, N.B.?

2. How much was paid for right of way and

for damages in connection with said subway constructions?

3. To whom were such payments made?

4. Have any such claims been made to the Railway Department that have not been paid? If so, by whom and for what amounts?

5. What has been the cost of the different concrete sidewalks laid on and in connection with the Moncton station yard during the past three years?

6. What was the cost of the concrete sidewalks along Main street, Moncton, N.B., leading to and through said subway?

7. If the concrete and other bridge work in connection with said subway was let by contract, what was the contract price, and what, if any, amount has been paid contractors over and above the contract price of same?

8. Is the Government aware there are said to be other dangerous level street crossings in the city of Moncton? If so, how many, and is it the intention of the Department of Railways to eliminate same in the near future?

9. Were the grades on streets approaching the subway changed from the original plans regarding same? If so, in what particular?..

10. Have damages been paid?. If so, how much for the properties east of Archibald street, in front of which the street has been lowered from one to ten feet, caused by the construction of said subway?

11. What was the total cost of concrete work in connection with said subway?

Mr. REID:

1. $132,673.21.

2. Nil.

3. See answer to Number 2.

4. Claims for abuttal damages have been presented as follows: George V. Steeves, $1,000; Edward O. Steeves, $5,800; M. Francois Hogan and Margaret E. Hogan, $6,000; James D. LeBlanc, $12,000; Henry S. Armstrong, amount not named; W. McK. Weldon, amount not named.

5. 1,121.06.

6. $3,444.38.

7. The contracts for the concrete and other bridge work in connection with subway are at schedule prices for the different items of work.

8. When financial conditions improve it is the intention of the department to complete the elimination of level crossings in the city of Moncton, in accordance with the arrangement made between the management and the city.

9. The rates of grades not changed.

10. No.

11. $30,411.18.

ENLISTMENTS IN CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many officers, N.C.O's and men have enlisted in Canada for overseas service during January, February and March of 1916?

2. How many enlisted from each province during the first three months of 1916?

3. How many enlisting from each province were, respectively, British subjects born outside of Canada, French Canadians, German Canadians, and English Canadians (that is, Canadians of English, Scotch, Irish or Welsh descent)?

How many of these enlisting from each province during the first three months of 1916 were, respectively, Methodists, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Anglicans and other denominations?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1 and 2. Enlistments of N.C.O's and men for overseas service with the Canadian Expeditionary Force for January, February and March, 1916:

No. Military Dist.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Total.
1. Ontario..	4,071	2,561	2,622	9,254
2. Ontario..	7,669	7,785	6,981	22,435
3. Ontario..	3,035	3,409	3,595	10,039
4. Quebec..	1,537	1,414	2,284	5,235
5. Quebec..	423	495	542	1,460
6. Maritime Provinces..	1,915	1,757	3,639	7,311
10. Manitoba and Saskatchewan.	5,375	4,831	8,736	18,942
11. British Columbia and Yukon.	3,384	1,821	1,547	6,752
13. Alberta..	1,803	2,585	2,759	7,147
Totals..	29,212	26,658	32,705	88,575

3 and 4. This information is not yet available.

NEW BRUNSWICK AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. COPP:

1. How much has been paid on account of the purchase price of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway?

2. How much of said purchase price remains unpaid?

3. How much interest has been paid on the purchase price of said railway, and to what date is said interest paid?

Mr. REID:

1. Amount paid on account of the purchase price of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, $180,000.

2. Amount of purchase price unpaid, $90,000.

3. Interest paid on purchase price, $19,186.30; interest paid to August 1, 1915.

PELAGIC SEALING COMMISSION.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. What was the total cost of the commission to inquire into the question of compensation to sealers, for damages caused by reason of the compulsory cessation of Pelagic Sealing in the North Pacific Ocean?

2. How much, if any, of the said cost has been charged against the funds received from the United States, under the Sealing Treaty between the United States, Japan, Russia and Canada.

Mr. HAZEN:

1. $35,546.93.

2. None.

ASSISTANCE TO FAIR ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Did the Federal Government ever grant any subsidy for the construction and repair required for exhibitions in rural counties?

2. What are the circumstances under which the Federal Government grants subsidies to exhibitions?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No.

2. The conditions governing federal aid to fair associations may be briefly stated as follows:

Fair associations whose shows are open in all classes to the whole of Canada, and which have paid out in the utility classes of live stock and poultry at their last preceding show the sum of $5,000 or over, will be given a grant equal to 50 per cent of the actual amount paid out, the maximum grant to any show not to exceed the sum of $5,000.

Fair boards, when making application to the Live Stock Branch for this grant, must forward a certified and properly subscribed statement of the auditor's report of all prize money paid out at the last show in the classes previously referred to; as also a copy of the proposed prize list for the succeeding year. For the purposes of this grant, the prize list must be approved by the Live Stock Commissioner. All pure bred live stock exhibited at shows which receive the benefit of this grant must be registered, in the name of the exhibitor, in the Canadian National Live Stock Records. In all questions of policy or matters of dispute the decision of the Live Stock Commissioner shall be final.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a return showing a list of the decoders and censors employed at Halifax since the war broke out, together with the names, dates of employment, total amount paid, by whom recommended, and former employment of each.

Mr. Sinclair.—For a return showing a list of all medicals and chaplains appointed by the Department of Militia and Defence in the military division of Nova Scotia, since August 4, 1914; together with the name, post office address, date of appointment, rank, present position, whether in Canada, England, or at the front, rate of pay and total amount paid each, since the beginning of the war. Also the names of any who have withdrawn from the service, with the date of such withdrawal.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams exchanged between the Government, its district engineer, and all other persons, concerning either the construction or repairing or purchase of the wharves at the following places: Ile Perrot Sud, the Church in the village of Ile Perrot, the village of Vaudreuil, Pointe Cavagnole, Hudson, Rigaud, Graham, Pointe Fortune, and Ile Perrot nord. Also a copy of all specifications and reports already brought down at my request in relation to the documents prior to and since 1904, and a statement of the amounts that have been paid for such construction or repairs, and to whom they were paid.

Mr. Boyer.—For a copy of all letters, petitions, correspondence and telegrams exchanged between the Government, its resident engineer, and all other persons, concerning the dredging work done at the following places: Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Pointe Fortune, Ottawa river channel between Ile au Foin and Ile à Paquin, Graham channel, Rigaud channel, Hudson heights channel, Hudson, Como, Pointe Cavagnole, channel at Vaudreuil village, Dorion Bay channel, Ile Perrot Church, Ile Perrot Sud wharf, and Ile Perrot Nord wharf. Also a statement of the amounts paid to different persons, companies, etc., for such work, the dates, etc., and a copy of the estimates already brought down at my request, the whole since 1904.

Mr. Devlin.—For a return showing who, if any, is director of recruiting and organizations in England for the Canadian service; his name, and his duties; how many are employed upon his staff; and what are the total expenses of his staff.

THE BATTLE OF ST. JULIEN.

COMMEMORATION OF ANNIVERSARY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I desire to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I draw attention to the approach of an anniversary which will always be memorable in the history of Canada. In a few moments I shall have the honour to propose a motion to the House which I have asked Sir Wilfrid Laurier to second.

The Canadian forces now at the front hold to-day a position of honour in the line which the Allies are maintaining in France and Belgium. We in Canada, far removed from the scene of war, surrounded by the conditions of peace to which we have always been accustomed, can hardly appreciate or realize the situation which confronts the people of France and of Belgium, and indeed the people of Great Britain. There lies the long-extended battleline, there the manhood of these two nations defend their country; and there, as I have said, the Canadian forces in the British lines hold a position of honour, which they will maintain in a manner worthy of the best traditions of this country.

Let me recall for a very few moments what has transpired since the commencement of the war so far as the action of this country is concerned. You will remember that the first Canadian force which crossed the Atlantic was the Princess Patricia Regiment, which went to the front in France

or in Belgium about the end of December, and which distinguished itself on many a battlefield by achievements that will always be remembered by the people of Canada. Last July I had the honour of seeing what was left of that regiment. The ranks had been depleted—in fact, had been decimated; but the spirit of the men and of the officers was as dauntless as it was on the day on which they sailed from Quebec.

At the commencement of October the first Canadian division crossed the seas, and about the middle of February they went to the front. I suppose that nearly every hon. gentleman in this House had the privilege of seeing that force while it was assembled at Valcartier. In actual warfare they were nearly all untried; so far as military knowledge and experience were concerned, they were new men, men without previous military experience for the most part. They went to the front in February. Perhaps they did not realize that there was to come to them in the very early future a test such as might have daunted the bravest and most experienced veterans. The story has been well told of that great event. It can never be completely told, as hundreds of instances of individual heroism can never be recorded, because the men who know of these incidents and who took part in them lie under the sod in France or in Belgium. To-day let it be enough to remember that, although their trenches were obliterated by artillery fire, although they were assailed by awful methods of warfare hitherto unknown and unused amongst civilized nations, although one of their flanks was exposed, and they were attacked by overwhelming numbers, they never retired except under direct orders, and from first to last they did not lose one Canadian gun. There is therefore little wonder that, when on the afternoon of Sunday, the 25th of April, 1915, two British brigades came forward to pass through their lines and to make a counter attack, these Englishmen, hundreds of whom were going forward to certain death, paused for a moment to cheer their Canadian comrades, and to say "All hail" to Canada. Well did these Canadians merit the tribute universally accorded that but for them the onrush of the Germans might not have been stayed, and that the events of the past year might have been very different from those which we have known. Canada's heart will always be thrilled when the memory of those days is recalled. The same valour, the same determination and the same tenacity characterized the Canadians at Festubert and Givenchy. Our hearts are saddened day by day with the long lists of casualties which come to us; but the spirit of the Canadian people is as firm and as undaunted and the response of the men of Canada is as ready as in the days of August and September of 1914.

Up to the present time we have enlisted in Canada about 310,000 men; and in the period between the first day of January and the 15th day of April more than 100,000 Canadians came forward to do their part in this great struggle. That recital of itself is enough to convince us that the spirit of Canada is as firm and its determination as unshaken as it ever has been since the commencement of this war.

The military organization of this country was unfitted to undertake so great a task as that which has been accomplished; and I am and always have been ready to concede that but for the whole-hearted support of the Canadian people, and but for the splendid spirit which has animated them, men and women alike, since the commencement of the war, it would not have been possible for this Government or for any Government to do what has been achieved.

The anniversary draws nigh; the war still continues. Perhaps a year ago we may have imagined that events would have shaped themselves otherwise and that the situation would be different to-day from that which now confronts us; but, although the task during the past year has made itself manifest as much greater than we centemplated at the beginning of the war, still we are ready with the same response, and in no part of the Empire is there a firmer spirit than in Canada, nowhere a firmer resolve to do our duty to the end. The determination of the people of this country is as inflexible and as unshaken as ever.

We are approaching the anniversary of the day on which the first great test came to the Canadian troops at the front. How shall we honour those who survive? How shall we honour the men, whether in the British islands or in this country, who have rallied to the colours and who are keen and eager in their desire to go to the front and do their part? As for the men who have survived this test, can we better honour the memory of their achievements than by flying upon all the public buildings of Canada and upon all the buildings which are available for that purpose from the Atlantic to the Pacific the flag of our

country for which they have fought, and will still fight?

What of those who fell? Do I hear someone say that for them we should fly the flag at half-mast, and not at the head? Not such is my conception, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that we shall best honour their memory also by flying at the head that flag for which they made the supreme sacrifice and which symbolizes the ideals of justice and liberty which Canada, in common with the whole Empire, maintains in this war. The memory of those who have fallen will always be a tender and revered but yet a proud memory in the hearts of Canadians, and for them, as well as for those who survive, I conceive this to be a fitting tribute by the people of Canada. So, I have the honour to propose the following resolution, seconded by Sir Wilfred Laurier:

Resolved that this House desires to place on record its admiration and pride in the valour and heroism displayed by the Canadian Expeditionary Force at the front and its profound appreciation of their service to Canada and to the Empire.

That the spirit which animates the Canadian people in this conflict has found its highest expression in the achievements of Canadians upon the battlefields of France and Belgium; and as the anniversary draws near of the first great test to which the Canadian troops were subjected and in which they so splendidly distinguished themselves, it is fitting that there should be a suitable commemoration throughout the Dominion of the service thus rendered to the Empire, to the allied nations and to the world.

That this House commends the proposal that on the 22nd, 23rd and 24th of this month flags should be flown at the head on all public buildings throughout this Dominion and that the Canadian people be invited to commemorate thus the momentous events of a year ago in token of Canada's determination to do her part until the efforts of our Empire and the allied nations shall have been crowned by an honourable and lasting peace.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: When our young volunteers crossed the ocean, to take their part and the part of Canada in the war, which was then and is still going on, and when we realize that alongside the French soldiers and the soldiers of Great Britain they would have to face the best-equipped troops in the world, troops which in the last half-century have ever been victorious, there was in many Canadian hearts apprehension at the thought that they were to encounter such dangers. It is a well-known fact in the history of nations that young soldiers, whatever be the stock from which they have sprung, have always undergone a severe ordeal at the first shock of battle. It would have been folly to have expected that our young soldiers would show the steadiness of veterans. But history has already recorded that, where we expected these young men to act like young and raw recruits, they really acted in a manner which was not excelled by the veterans of the British or of the French army. One with a Canadian heart could not but be thrilled at the news that came to us that these young soldiers on a certain day had beyond all doubt saved the honour of French and British arms, and not only that, but had saved the day for the cause of civilization. It has been established that on the occasion to which my right hon. friend has just referred, in the three days of the battle, when the lines had been lost to the French troops, after they had for the first time come in contact with the poisonous gases, it was the Canadian troops who came to the rescue, re-established the lines, and snatched victory from the very jaws of defeat.

The proposition of my right hon. friend that the Canadian people should remember that day is one that must commend itself to us all. What should be the form of that commemoration? In what manner should we Canadians express our testimony to the valour of our soldiers on that occasion? The proposal which has just been made by the Government, I think, must commend itself to every one. There are many ways in which this occasion might be commemorated, but the best way, I think, is that proposed by my right hon. friend: to unfurl upon the first anniversary of the battle the banner under which they fought on the soil of France for the cause of civilization. Let the banner rise, let it float at the top of every mast and at the top of every steeple throughout the length and the breadth of the land, there to be looked upon with pride by every Canadian, and with the knowledge that it is supremely the banner of freedom, of justice, and of power.

Motion agreed to.

COLONEL DAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for Richmand (Mr. Kyte), inquired yesterday if Colonel Day is still in charge of the 185th Battalion at Broughton, N.S., where the regiment is at present training. The Adjutant General states that from re-

cords at Militia Headquarters, Lieutenant-Colonel F. P. Day is still in charge of the 185th Battalion, C.E.F.

DEATH OF PRIVATE D. CURRY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) inquired yesterday as to the death of Private Dougall Curry at St. Joseph's hospital, Glace Bay, during the past week, and as to the medical treatment which was afforded him. A telegram was sent to obtain the information, but no reply has yet been received.

CENSORED DOMESTIC LETTERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. KAY: I wish to bring the attention of the Postmaster General to the manner in which his censors are dealing with the mail.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. KAY: I have here a letter from the Canadian Bank of Commerce, posted at the town of Bedford, and addressed to me at Phillipsburg, eight miles away. This letter has been censored. I called up the manager of the Canadian Bank of Commerce at Bedford on Monday, and he told me that on the 10th of April a letter addressed from the Union Bank, Quebec, to the Canadian Bank of Commerce at Bedford, had been censored. He further said that a letter posted on April 12 from his bank, that is, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, at Bedford, to the Canadian Bank of Commerce, Ste. Catherine street, City Hall branch, Montreal, had also been censored. I think the people of this country and the members of this House are entitled to know who is doing this censoring, and why it is that our domestic letters are being opened in this manner. Possibly the Prime Minister would be good enough to bring this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall be very glad to direct the attention of the Postmaster General to the matter. Some complaints have come to me of departures from absolutely plain instructions which I know were given three or four days ago with regard to correspondence, not within this country, but from the United States. I cannot conceive how such mistakes should have happened, in view of instructions that I know have been given. It is my purpose this afternoon, in the absence of the Postmaster General, to send for Dr. Coulter to direct his attention to these matters, and to endeavour to bring it to pass that mistakes of this kind shall not occur in the future. I concur with my hon. friend in the view that they are entirely inexcusable.

CASUALTY LISTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. BUCHANAN: A few days ago I brought to the attention of the Acting Minister of Militia the system adopted in reporting casualty lists. It has been represented to me that it is impossible to identify men under the system followed since then. When the next of kin is given, the address may be in England, Ireland, or Scotland, and it is impossible for newspapers in Canadian cities to identify men who have enlisted from those cities. Of course the newspapers desire to identify local men. I have a letter from a newspaper editor in Calgary saying it is impossible to identify men in that way. It has been suggested that the department should resume the old system of giving the names of the battalions, with the understanding that the newspapers would not publish the battalions, but could use this information for purposes of identification.

Mr. KEMP: I was Acting Minister of Militia when my hon. friend brought this up a few days ago; and I thought the arrangement then made was satisfactory. However, I will assist the Prime Minister in bringing the matter to the attention of the proper authorities of the Militia Department with a view to improving it still further, if it can be done, while at the same time carrying out the intention of the order that was first issued.

BOUNTIES ON ZINC.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), the House went into committee, Mr. Rhodes in the chair, to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of a bounty of two cents per pound on zinc or spelter, containing not more than two per cent of impurities, produced in Canada from zinc ores mined in Canada; provided the standard price of zinc or spelter in London, England, at the time of production is less than £36.19.3 sterling per ton of two thousand two hundred and forty (2,240) pounds, when the bounty payable shall be an amount equal to the difference between such standard price per ton and £36.19.3 per ton. Further provided, that in no

event shall bounty be payable when the price received for zinc or spelter by the producer is eight cents or more per pound, and that no bounty shall be payable on zinc or spelter to the producer during the continuation of the war, and in no event on zinc or spelter produced after July 31, 1917.

Further resolved, that the total amount payable under the provisions of any Act founded on these resolutions shall not exceed the sum of $400,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It may be helpful to the committee if I give a brief explanation. Provision is made for the payment of a bounty not exceeding two cents a pound on zinc or spelter produced in Canada from zinc ores mined in Canada. The legislation will not apply when the price received for zinc by the producer is eight cents or more per pound. It will not apply during the period of the war, or after July 31, 1917. That is to say, the legislation is confined to the period between the termination of the war and July 31, 1917. This legislation is in pursuance of a promise which was given by the Government in August of last year to producers of zinc in Canada with the object of providing for the refining of pure zinc in the Dominion. An extraordinary condition prevailed at that time, and, as a matter of fact, still prevails. After the outbreak of the war an unusual demand arose for zinc. To give the committee an idea of the character of that demand, I may say that in 1914 the export of zinc in pigs, bars, plates, and sheets from the United States amounted to only 4,000,000 pounds, whereas, in 1915, the exports had risen to 256,000,000 pounds; that is to say, the demand for zinc from the United States, where the zinc of this continent has been refined, was increased sixty-fold in a period of one year. The price rose from about 8 cents a pound, which was, I think, the price prevailing before the war broke out, to 40 cents a pound in 1915. It was brought to our attention last summer by the Shell Committee that the Canadian manufacturers of brass cartridge cases were unable to obtain pure zinc for their purposes. At that time no zinc was being refined in Canada, with the exception of that being produced by a small experimental electrolithic plant at Trail. The output of that plant was about one thousand pounds, or half a ton a day. As the result of the shortage in zinc, and of the inability of our manufacturers to obtain the necessary supplies for the manufacture of brass cartridge cases, there was a great delay in their output, and the matter became quite serious. We took it up with the view of seeing whether any action on our part would prove an incentive to the zinc producers of Canada, the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company at Trail, and the Weedon Mining Company of Quebec, and others, to establish plants to provide zinc in Canada at reasonable prices for the purposes of the Shell Committee. After several conferences the Government determined upon this legislation, and, accordingly, a promise was given to the zinc producers in Canada. As the result of that promise, the Shell Committee was enabled to make a contract with the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company of Trail for 8,000 tons at the price of 15 cents per pound, with an option upon 8,000 additional tons at a price of 12½ cents per pound.

In consideration of the undertaking which the Government gave to introduce this legislation providing for a bounty, the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company undertook to put in the necessary plant to produce zinc at the rate of 25 tons per day, beginning not later than five months from the date of the acceptance of their offer by the Shell Committee. In a word, therefore, the result of the promise which was given by the Government to introduce this bounty legislation, is that the Shell Committee, and the manufacturers of brass cartridge cases in Canada, have been enabled to obtain domestically a supply of pure zinc at 15 cents per pound at a time when pure zinc was selling in the United States at 40 cents per pound. I think that the price of pure zinc in the United States to-day is about 30 cents per pound. I do not think that any further explanation is necessary, as the resolution is fairly plain in its terms.

Mr. DEVLIN: In view of the promise of the bounty, have many manufacturers given the assurance that they will manufacture this smelting zinc?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There were two companies I have mentioned, the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company at Trail, and the Weedon Mining Company in the province of Quebec. I am not aware at present of any others, but we made the announcement broadcast through the press, and sent a copy to all those engaged in the zinc mining industry in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: There will not be much paid under this legislation at present?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am glad my hon. friend has raised that point. I overlooked

mentioning the reason why it was considered necessary that this bounty should be given. It was this: the producers of zinc were unwilling to establish an expensive plant in view of the possibility of the war coming to an end soon. They were quite content with the price which could be obtained during the war, but what they feared was that if the war should come to an end in the early future, the price of zinc would at once drop and an expensive plant would become unprofitable. They were content to establish their plant should the war last as long as the 1st of July, 1917; so that the contingencies which they had in mind have been provided for in the resolution before the Committee.

Mr. DEVLIN: Did they ask for any advance on their contract?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: At the outset—I am speaking now from recollection, but I am certain that I recall accurately—there was a proposal that the Government should make an advance for the purpose of defraying a part of the cost of the plant. That was not regarded favourably, and the bounty resolution took its place as being more satisfactory.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it understood that the output of the mines, or the product of this industry, will be confined to Canada or to the use of the Allies during the war?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The legislation is general in character, but the Shell Committee was, as I stated, able to make a contract for 8,000 tons at 15 cents per pound at a time when the price in the United States was 40 cents per pound, with an option upon a further 8,000 tons at a price of 12½ cents per pound. I was assured by the Shell Committee at the time that the arrangement which they had made was perfectly satisfactory to them, and, so far as I have been able to learn, there is now no danger of the manufacturers of brass cartridge cases being short of pure zinc.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We had legislation of this nature some years ago. Has it expired?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend is probably thinking of lead.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Did that legislation not apply to zinc also?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend may be right, as his memory is usually good, but I do not recall that it applied to zinc. There is legislation relating to lead very similar in character to this; that is to say, it provides for a bounty on a sliding scale.

Mr. GRAHAM: As I understand it, this merely guarantees to the producer a certain price to a certain date; that is, that the zinc will not go below a certain price. If it remains at a price of over 8 cents per pound, the producer will get no bounty, but should the war cease before 1917, and the price recede to 6 or 7 cents per pound, he would get a bounty.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): I would ask if this is the beginning of a movement on the part of the Government of Canada to deal with the question of handling Canadian ores in Canada, or is it merely a small matter dealing with the production of zinc and guaranteeing a certain price to the zinc manufacturers. It seems to me that this war has shown us that we are very much behind the times in Canada in our general methods of dealing with our mineral products. There is no question that Canada is one of the richest countries in the world in respect to minerals, and there is no doubt also that during the years that we have been mining and shipping our ores abroad, chiefly to the United States, to be handled, we have lost millions and tens of millions, and, I suppose, hundreds of millions of dollars.

Consider what has occurred in the Cobalt country since the camp was discovered some twelve or thirteen years ago. There was charged, on the average Cobalt ore, over $200 per ton to the men who took out the ore and shipped it. There were no proper facilities for dealing with the ore in Canada. The mine owners had to pay the freight on the ore to New York and he had to take practically what was given to him. All the Cobalt ore carried a large percentage of nickel and cobalt, both of them extremely valuable metals, and in most cases the owner of the ore not only did not get anything for the nickel or the cobalt, but if there was more cobalt than nickel, or more nickel than cobalt, he was paid nothing for either, but he was fined so much a ton because the refiners claimed that it cost more to smelt or refine the silver product on account of the presence of these other metals. In many cases the loss of nickel and cobalt amounted to a great many dollars per ton. There is absolutely no shadow of a question that the two big smelt-

ing concerns in the United States saved all these by-products and got an extra profit out of them over and above the large amount that they charged the owner of the ore for taking out the silver. In most cases the ore would run from 1,500 to 6,000 ounces of silver to the ton, but the owner only got 93 or 94 per cent of the silver, and he did not get anything at all for the by-products in the ore, which in many cases amounted to $5 or $10 per ton.

I would like to take this opportunity to point out that something should be done to improve this situation. It is a matter worthy of consideration as to whether the Government should not give some assistance to put the necessary plants up in Canada where all Canadian ores could be treated without having to send them abroad. The same thing applies to nickel, only very very much more so. I

4 p.m.

was taken to task in this House because I make the statement some weeks ago that our nickel ore produced by the Canada Copper Company, a subsidiary of the American Nickel Company, was sent in the form of matte to New Jersey and there refined by the International Nickel Company, which is largely a German concern, and that a great deal of our nickel was going to our enemies during this period of war. I pointed out that we had no possible control and that we could not control the nickel once the ore, or matte, went outside the boundaries of Canada. The hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) took me to task for the statements I had made, sayng that they were all wrong and that I was wrong in particular as to the amount of money that the International Nickel Company was making. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White), a few days after that, confirmed to a large extent my words, because he showed that the International Nickel Company was making twice as much as the Solicitor General had stated. I want to draw the attention of the House to something that was said in the British House of Commons on this subject at that time. I have here a sessional paper containing speeches delivered in the British House of Commons dated January 18, 1916. I want to read one or two short extracts from a speech made by Mr. Hewins, who is a very prominent member of the British House, and who was a member of a commission appointed to look into this matter some time ago. Here is what he says in part about the way in which our ores are handled:

[Mr. Turriff.]

Let me take one important question which plays a very important part in the whole scheme of German finance—I mean the control of our raw material and especially of the shipment of the ore produced in the British Empire. I do not wish to go into any lengthy details about this important scheme, but whether you take the zinc concentrates in Australia, nickel in Canada, or the whole series of metals, I am really giving way no secret when I say they are virtually controlled by German syndicates and have been for years. One of the most effective branches from that point of view of German activity for many years past, in support of the European system which I have described, has been to provide for the security of her manufactures by securing this control, and everybody knows at the present time that, if you once smash the power of these German syndicates, you inflict a most severe blow, not only upon the economic power of Germany, but in particular on those financial methods which they have applied and still apply to support their policy.

I believe the Government are fully acquainted with the development of this important question in the Empire. If I am not mistaken, as long ago as last December twelve months, the Australian Commonwealth approached the Government on the subject. I am speaking entirely from memory, but it certainly was something like that. In Canada measures have been taken in regard to this particular case, and I do suggest that one of the first things the Government might do is not to act alone but to act in consultation and collaboration with the Dominion Government to see that these resources of the British Empire, of which in many cases we have almost a monopoly, are no longer exploited in the interests of our enemies, and we should tell the Germans quite frankly that this state of things is going to cease once and for all. I agree no nation can say, or would dream of saying, that we will for all time make a monopoly of the raw materials which we produce in our Empire. We cannot say that but I think we are entitled to say that the resources of the British Empire shall be held, controlled, manipulated and used by Britishers first and foremost. Very few things would excite more interest and enthusiasm in the Empire than a definite resolve on the part of the Government that at once and forthwith steps shall be taken to secure that result.

If that does not confirm every word, and more than every word, that I spoke in regard to our nickel going to the United States, its going to Germany, and its being controlled by Germans, then I do not know where you could get more confirmation. I thought that when we were on this subject it would be a good time to bring this matter to the attention of the Government. I am doing it partly for the purpose of proving that what I said a month ago was practically correct, but more particularly, that a better state of affairs might be brought about in Canada, so that in the event of another such war as this breaking out we should not be in the position we are in to-day. Minerals are of the utmost importance in manufacturing war material of different kinds, and

if, when this war broke out, we had prevented our Canadian nickel going to Germany, prevented them from using it in making battleships, big guns, small guns, and rifles, we should have been in a position almost to cripple Germany. But we were not in that position until a month or so ago, when after I brought this matter up in the House the Government stopped, to a certain extent, the export of nickel to the United States. But the Government should go further. This war will be over, I hope, in the near future; it will be over before very long, anyway, and we could take this step now as a war measure. Now is the time, when we have an absolute monopoly of nickel, to see that it shall be refined in Canada, and if all our nickel was refined in this country we should be able to control its export in time of war. Assistance of this kind could be given by the Government at a very small cost, and I trust the Minister of Finance will take the matter up with his colleagues, and see if the Government cannot make a beginning along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. R. F. GREEN (Kootenay): I desire to say just a word or two in connection with the proposal for giving a bounty on zinc produced in the Dominion of Canada. Some twelve years ago, I think it was, the Government then in power, under the leadership of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, were wise enough to introduce a measure granting a bounty on lead produced within the Dominion. The giving of that bounty has had a very beneficial effect on the lead industry of our country. It has given the producer the assurance of stability so far as the market is concerned, and it has not cost the Government a great deal. If my memory serves me right, the amount that was originally set aside for bounty purposes was $5,000,000, and the period within which it could be earned was five years. At the end of the five years during which the lead producer was probably experiencing the worst time since the bounty was first given, something like half the $5,000,000 was still unearned. The period was extended for another five years, and at the end of that time there was still left just a little short of $1,000,000. The present Government extended the period still further, until the balance of the bounty should have been earned. I repeat, the bounty has been of great benefit to the lead industry in this country. The Government's promise to give a bounty upon zinc has also had a beneficial effect, enabling zinc producers to establish works for the production of zinc in Canada. I trust the Government will see its way clear at the expiration of this period, if not before, to devise some scheme to enable us to establish zinc production works in Canada large enough to refine all the zinc produced within the country. When those works are established we shall, if they are of the proper kind, be able to compete in the markets of the world. We are producing to-day a certain amount of refined zinc in Canada, and will continue to produce it just as long as the prices remain high, say over eight cents a pound. I am sorry to say, however, the present method of producing zinc in Canada is not so economical as the method in which it is produced in the United States. It has been produced in the past in the United States, Belgium and Germany, by what is generally known as the Belgian process.

Our zinc has been produced by the electrolytic process, which will always be more expensive than the Belgian process. The Belgian process is the cheapest known process in the world to-day. As I understand it, the zinc is driven off in fumes; those fumes are gathered in long flues of one description or another, and the old bag process enters very largely into it, the flues being choked with ordinary bagging, in which the zinc is collected as the fumes cool. That is a very economical way, and will always be cheaper than the electrolytic process. I hope the Government will find some way of assisting the refining of zinc in this country, so that eventually all the zinc we produce will be refined in Canada, and I trust with the hon. member for Assiniboia that the same policy will be followed with regard to nickel, copper and other metals. The hon. gentleman mentioned that producers at Cobalt lost when a certain percentage of different ores were present in their first raw product. I am afraid that will always enter into the question. Most of the lead, silver, zinc and other ores produced in my part of the country were at one time treated at the large smelters in the United States, where they were treated on the same basis as the United States ores, and the situation, so far as zinc ores are concerned, is very similar to that outlined by the hon. member for Assiniboia. I might say that our lead ores contain a certain percentage of zinc, iron, silver-lead, and other metals, and any of these lead ores containing over 10 per cent of zinc are penalized to the extent of 50 cents a unit per ton, and as

the hon. member for Assiniboia pointed out with regard to nickel, not only are they penalized for the zinc contained in the ore, but they get nothing for the zinc contents and are paid only for the silver-lead contents. The same practice is followed with regard to American ores, mined in American mines and smelted in American smelters. Therefore, any assistance that this Government would give would not do away with that particular handicap, because that is a condition that must be overcome. If there is a certain percentage of material that is foreign to the one that is being treated or to the bulk of the material of which the ore consists, that must necessarily be removed in some way before the ore can be treated, and therefore there must of necessity be a penalty after that maximum percentage has been reached. Another reason why I think the Government should encourage the reduction of ores within this Dominion is because in my opinion, we should take care of all our natural resources that we can possibly handle; that we should polish them up and put them in the highest possible state of perfection so that we can market the finished product, thus getting the greatest value out of them. In that way not only would we obtain a higher price, but the money spent in refining and finishing the ore would be spent in the Dominion amongst our own people and would be the means of establishing large industries in this country, and after the refining process was completed, we could sell the finished product in the markets of the world. I hope that the Government will take steps to ensure that every pound of crude metal produced in Canada is refined in the Dominion and placed on the markets of the world as the finished product.

Mr. NESBITT: Apparently, by the resolution, the hon. gentleman is proposing to give a bounty only when the price is below a certain fixed figure, which means that below that figure the smelting company or corporation that proposes to undertake smelting can not make the business pay. My hon. friend (Mr. Green) has told us about using up the raw material in this country. Everyone in the mining business wants to use the raw material in this country if he can get a market for the finished product. Our natural resources have been in existence since the glacial period, and what the people want before they put their money into these industries is a market for the product. The Government, as I understand it, cannot afford to build up a market for zinc or spelter; the smelting companies have to find their own markets all over the world. I would like to ask the minister why, if we have zinc ores in the West, it is necessary to give a bounty so as to enable those who mine zinc ores to make a profit. My hon. friend (Mr. Green) and my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) talk about the enormous quantities of raw material in this country. Why is it necessary to give a bounty if there is such a profit on these things, because we all know that this year spelter has reached an enormous figure? We all know that spelter has risen in price from six cents to twenty-eight cents a pound. I want to see if I am right in my proposition that the reason the minister proposes this resolution is that the corporation or whoever is going to go into the manufacture of spelter cannot make a profit under a certain price, and that to guard against the spelter going below that price he is going to give them a bounty of two cents a pound so that they will be in a position to mine at a profit.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry my hon. friend was not in the House when I made what I regarded as a very full explanation. I shall, however, be glad to go over the same ground again.

Mr. NESBITT: Briefly, please.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Last summer, when we gave the promise respecting this legislation, the only zinc being refined in Canada was by a small experimental plant at Trail which turned out about a thousand pounds or half a ton a day. They employed the electrolytic process. The war created such a demand for this zinc that the exports of zinc products from the United States increased sixty fold and the price rose as high as forty cents a pound. It was brought to our attention by the Shell Committee that the Canadian manufacturers of brass cartridge cases could not obtain pure zinc for their work, and there was great delay in consequence in their output. We called a conference of zinc producers, two companies being represented, as well as the Shell Committee and representatives of the Mines Department at Ottawa, and the whole situation was considered pretty carefully. The producers were unwilling, owing to uncertainty as to the duration of the war, to make a large investment. They were apprehensive that, if

the war should come to a sudden end, the price of zinc would drop to 5 or 6 cents a pound, and that they would lose their investment in their plant. It was to guard them against that contingency that we promised this legislation. My hon. friend will see from the resolution that the operation of the measure is confined to the period between the conclusion of the war and July 31, 1917. They felt that if the war lasted as long as that they would make sufficient profit in the meantime to justify them in the establishment of their refineries. As a result of the action taken by the Government, the Shell Committee was enabled, on behalf of the Imperial Government, to enter into a contract with the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company at Trail for 8,000 tons of zinc, at 15 cents a pound, to be produced at the rate of 25 tons per day. This was a reduction of 25 cents on the then prevailing price, with an option of a further 8,000 tons at 12½ cents a pound. The object, therefore, was to ensure the zinc producer of the continuation of price for such period as would justify him in establishing his plant.

Mr. NESBITT: Then they satisfied you that they could not produce spelter at 6 cents a pound?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is a very limited market in Canada for zinc and spelter, and with the expense of the electrolytic process it was quite clear that there was no chance whatever of their making a large investment for the purpose of going generally into zinc production unassisted by bounty legislation. In answer to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), I may say that this legislation is of a temporary character. It arose out of a situation in which there was a real shortage of zinc in Canada. The larger question to which my hon. friend from Assiniboia and my hon. friend from Kootenay have referred is one of the most important in Canada; that is to say, the treatment in Canada of Canadian ores. It is by no means as simple a proposition as appears upon the surface, because many considerations enter into the question which are not obvious at first sight. One of them is touched upon by the hon. member for North Oxford. The question of tariffs also plays a certain part. It is perfectly plain, however, that since the outbreak of the war there has been a growing feeling in favour of the refining in Canada of Canadian ores, especially those products which may be needed in time of war. I think that not only Canada but the Empire has come to realize as never before that situations may arise in which the nation that produces within its own borders the materials necessary in war times has a decided advantage in war. It is a question that will engage more and more the attention of the public and of legislators as time goes on. We are in the midst of war; our expenditures are very heavy, and they will increase, as I have stated on more than one occasion in this House. But the whole question of our mineral production and of the finishing in Canada of our mineral products is one that will engage my most earnest attention and the attention of the Government within the next year or two. It is clear that Canada has immense mineral resources, capable of almost unlimited development; and, so far as I am concerned, I shall certainly not be wanting, and I believe the Government will not be wanting, in giving consideration to a policy which will lead to the development of those resources.

Mr. NESBITT: The community that I represent are very strongly opposed to bounties—whether wisely or unwisely I would not like to say at the moment. If my hon. friend means by "the encouragement of production from raw material in Canada" that the Government are going into the bounty business again, I think he will find very keen opposition from the farming community of the country.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 94, to provide for the payment of bounties on zinc produced from zinc ores mined in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Prince Edward Island railway, $613,100.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) was obliged to leave by the train. He asked me to request the minister to allow this matter to stand.

Mr. REID: We usually have an understanding that one item should be allowed to stand, and that on that item the hon.

gentleman can discuss the Prince Edward Island railway, or canals, or anything relating to the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: One item will be allowed to stand?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before we go on with the discussion of this item, perhaps the Acting Minister (Mr. Reid), would be good enough to let me know as to the correspondence concerning the operation of the Transcontinental railway by the Grand Trunk Pacific. The hon. gentleman said that he would look into the matter and bring down the correspondence.

Mr. REID: Certain of the correspondence was brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That only relates to the change of grades, but the Acting Minister will remember that in previous sessions I called attention, as I did this session, to the fact that when the late Government was in power the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had offered to take over the Transcontinental by sections as completed, to put on rolling stock to the satisfaction of the Government, and operate the road to the satisfaction of the Government; the accounts were to be audited by Government officials, and, if there should be a profit upon the operation, that profit would go to the Government, and if a loss the Government would bear the loss, but it should be added to the cost of the railway upon which the company would pay interest. It is upon that subject I wish to know if there has been any correspondence. The Minister of Railways assured the House that he would take up that subject and see if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was still prepared to enter into such an arrangement.

Mr. REID: The arrangement for the taking over of the uncompleted sections, if I understand aright, was made with a view of taking over the different sections before the road was completed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, under the statute there is provision for it.

Mr. REID: Before it was completed. But before that was done, they came to a decision to appoint Sir William Whyte as an arbitrator, and on his arbitration they took over the portion between Winnipeg and Superior Junction. That was done under the award of Sir William Whyte. Of course, that is passed and gone, and the road was completed, so far as the Government was concerned, and the Grand Trunk Pacific was asked to take over the whole road as a completed road. That was in March of 1915.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was that by letter?

Mr. REID: Yes, the correspondence was brought down. I have here, in addition, the final letters in which the Grand Trunk Pacific were asked and refused to take over the road. Perhaps I had better read these last two letters. The letter from the minister is as follows:

25th March, 1915.

Dear Mr. Chamberlain:

As intimated to you in previous correspondence the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway is completed within the meaning of section 20 of the agreement between His Majesty the King and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, dated 29th day of July 1903, scheduled to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, chapter 71, of 3 Edward VII, and the said division is ready for operation.

I find a reference in your correspondence to certain additional works still under construction by the Transcontinental Railway Commission, which additional works it was contemplated by the commission and by your company would ultimately be used in connection with the road as now completed. The Government, however, having been advised that the eastern division, for purposes of operation, has been reported by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission as completed and ready to be leased, is of the opinion that it is in the public interest that such lease be now entered into. You will readily understand that were any other interpretation as to date of completion to be placed upon the agreement with your company it would mean the postponement for a very considerable length of time of the taking over of this extensive line of railway by the Grand Trunk Pacific, with results that might be incompatible with the public interest. Such a postponement would be to a date very hard, if not impossible to determine, as in one sense a railway can never be said to be complete. The responsibility for such a postponement I must decline on behalf of the Government to take.

The Government has under section 15 of this agreement ascertained the cost of construction, in the manner therein provided, and in so doing have included only such expenditure as has gone into work on the eastern division as now completed and ready to be leased.

I therefore request that the lease referred to in sections 6 and 20 of the above mentioned agreement be entered into. The Government has had prepared a form of lease embodying the provisions required to be included in the same by statute and by agreements between your company and the Government. The rental reserved is based on the cost of construction ascertained as aforesaid. This lease I now hand you on behalf of the Government. You will observe attached to the form of lease is a Schedule B, which schedule should contain a description of the rolling stock marked and assigned by the company to the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway. I trust that such

rolling stock as the statute directs has been provided and assigned accordingly, and as particulars of the same are now not in our possession, I would request that the schedule be duly filled in by you.

On behalf of the Government I beg to request that this lease be executed by your company and assuming that the schedule as so filled in will represent rolling stock fulfilling the conditions of the agreement, and provided and assigned as therein set out, I undertake that this lease will be promptly executed on behalf of the Government.

It has been and is my desire that there be nothing contained in the lease as drafted and now presented not strictly provided for by statutory requirements, and nothing omitted directed by statute to be included. This desire I believe is lived up to in the form of lease enclosed. Should, however, in your opinion the form contain any feature to which reasonable objection can be taken, or omit any necessary provision, I am prepared on behalf of the Government to confer with your company and to endeavour by every proper means to come to a common basis, and I will make every effort tc do so consistent with the requirements imposed on us by statute.

That you may have before you the method by which the cost of construction, and consequently the annual rental, is arrived at, I am enclosing you a copy of the report of our auditors thereon and of the schedules thereto annexed.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) F. Cochrane.

E. J. Chamberlin, Esq.,
General Manager,
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway,
Montreal, Que.

The reply to that was dated April 27, about a month later, and is:

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway,

Montreal, Canada, April 27, 1915.

Dear Sir,—I duly received your letter of 25th ultimo enclosing certain documents, including a form of lease of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway, which you requested should be executed by this company.

After giving your communication and enclosures careful consideration, I beg to state I cannot see my way to ask our directors for authority to execute the lease. Among the reasons which have influenced me in reaching the decision indicated are:

(1) The great increase in the cost of construction of the eastern division beyond that in contemplation by the parties at the time the agreement of July 29, 1903 was entered into.

That the cost as now computed and upon which the company is asked to pay interest by way of rental is greatly in excess of that estimated in 1903, appears to be admitted. How this largely increased cost has been occasioned has been the subject of investigation by a commission appointed by your Government on the 29th day of January, 1912. The report of that commission was submitted to Parliament last year. I do not think I need do more than call attention to it and to the official record of the debate which followed its submission. I might however, add that to my mind this large excess of cost over the estimate might have been to some extent avoided had our view of the meaning and intention of clause 7 of the agreement of July 29th, 1903, been accepted. That clause, as you are aware, provided that the construction of the eastern division should be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the Government and the chief engineer of the company. In order that full and practical effect might be given to this provision, the company suggested at the outset that all contracts should contain a clause declaring that the expression "chief engineer" meant the chief engineer of the Government and the chief engineer of the company acting together, and provide that payments to contractors should only be made upon the joint certificate of both engineers. Our suggestion, was however, not adopted. Mr. Gordon Grant, chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission would seem to appreciate the purpose of clause 7 by asking as he did in his letter of 2nd February last that Mr. H. A. Woods, our engineer, should sign jointly with him a formal acceptance of the line.

The cost was further added to by the imposition of a duty upon steel rails shortly after the agreement of July 1903 was entered into.

(2) The non-completion, up to the present of the eastern division in accordance with the provisions of the agreements of July 29th, 1903 and February 18th, 1904.

The company takes the view that the eastern division is not yet completed in accordance with the agreements. The claim of the Government to the contrary rests upon Mr. Grant's statement to that effect, which, however, is not acquiesced in by Mr. Woods. Mr. Grant admits that large sums must yet be expended before the line will be completed. I refer to his letter of March 24th last to Mr. A. Bell of the Department of Railways and Canals, with which he submitted statements showing estimated expenditures for work still uncompleted amounting to several million dollars. The letter addressed to you by Messers Bell and King on the 24th ultimo also shows quite clearly that they do not regard the line as completed. In that communication they say:

"The estimated cost of the line when all the works now under way are completed, which completion is contemplated on the 31st December, 1916, will be $179,586,877.35 as set out in statement "A" hereto annexed....The above amount may, of course, be very largely increased by reason of court decisions."

The following paragraph appears in their letter to you of the 23rd ultimo:

"We beg to call your attention to a letter received from the Solicitor General, a copy of which is hereto attached, from which it appears that the 'cost of construction' of the eastern division as completed on the 31st December, 1914, within the meaning of section 20 of the agreement scheduled to the Act of 1903 should not include expenditures made on and in respect of certain works which were still under construction. The result will be that the 'cost of construction as a basis upon which to ascertain the rental to be paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company at this date will be very considerably less than the actual cost upon completion of the said additional works now under way."

If, as appears from the foregoing, it is intended that the company shall eventually pay interest upon the cost of the works still under construction, those works must necessarily be regarded as part of the eastern division, other-

wise the company would be under no such obligation in respect of them.

I would also point out that if the company were to accept the proposed lease we would be called upon to at once assume those payments in connection with Winnipeg terminals which under the agreement of March 1, 1907, between His Majesty, the Canadian Northern railway, and the Company, are to be assumed and borne by the Government until the lease of the completed eastern division has been entered into and its operation undertaken by the Company. The amounts involved are by no means inconsiderable.

(3) The several portions of the eastern division were not constructed in accordance with the Act of 1904, or with sound business principles and as the result, the completion of that portion most useful to the Company and to the country and first required, namely, between Winnipeg and Cochrane, was delayed, to the great prejudice and loss of the Company.

The Company has throughout asserted its claim for loss of revenue by reason of this delay, and takes the position that such claim should be considered and dealt with before it is called upon to execute the lease.

As early as 1908, and at frequent intervals subsequently, the late Mr. Hays called the attention of the Government to the fact that delay in the construction of that portion of the eastern division would mean serious loss to the Company, and referred to section 10 of chapter 24 of the statutes of 1904, which provided that the work of construction of the eastern division should be commenced simultaneously at Moncton, at Quebec, at the junction of the eastern division with a branch to North Bay, and at Winnipeg. Notwithstanding Mr. Hays' remonstrances against delay, the completion of the portion of the line in question has been much delayed, as a result of which the Company has for a number of years not been able to handle over its line and the Grand Trunk railway the large volume of traffic moving between Ontario and the West. In the meantime, interest on the cost of the Company's line west of Winnipeg has had to be paid and to be charged to capital, whereas but for the delay referred to a very considerable portion of that interest could have been earned. For the same reason the earnings of the Company's branch from Lake Superior Junction to Fort William have been greatly reduced. The actual loss to the Company and to the Grand Trunk resulting from this lack of all rail connection between Ontario and the West amounts to a very substantial sum indeed, and I submit that our claim in respect thereof should be fully dealt with and adjusted before the Company is asked to assume the heavy obligations under the proposed lease.

I beg to remain,
Yours faithfully,
E. J. Chamberlin.

The Hon. Frank Cochrane, M.P.,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Mr. Cochrane replied in the following words:

29th April, 1915.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 27, stating that you cannot see your way to ask your directors for authority to take out a lease of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) F. Cochrane.

E. J. Chamberlin, Esq.,
President Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.,
Montreal.

I think that is all the correspondence.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then we may take it for granted that there is no correspondence showing any inquiry on the part of the Government as to whether or not the proposal made by Mr. Hays to the late Government, to which I called the attention of the House, had been met. There is no correspondence dealing with an interim lease, pending the completion of the whole line?

Mr. REID: I understand that, unless anything of that kind was burned, there is no correspondence.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would point out that the first reason given by the Grand Trunk Pacific is based on the brief placed in their hands by this Government in the form of the Lynch-Staunton report, which is what I told the Government would happen. They paid $100,000 for a report which provided the Grand Trunk Pacific with a brief and with an additional reason why they should not take over the line. They cite the report and the speeches of members of the Government, and of those supporting it, in favour of their contention that the line cost more than it should have cost, and, consequently, they would not take it over. That is one reason. The second is one to which we have referred several times, that is, that the road is not yet completed. There is no question that the road is not yet completed under the meaning of the statute or of the agreement. Sir William White said that the shops were part of the eastern division of the Transcontinental, but the shops at Quebec are not yet completed. There is a vote for the completion of the works of the eastern division of the Transcontinental this very session, so that there is no possible escape from that contention of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

The other contention, that the road has not been constructed under the joint supervision of the company and the Railway Commission, is not well founded. I submit that the records will show that if there was a sinner, in the matter of joint supervision, it was the Grand Trunk Pacific, and not the Railway Commission or the Government. One of the chief difficulties we had was—I think I have stated it before—

that in the time of the late Mr. Hays the Grand Trunk Pacific declined at first to make inspections and to approve or disapprove of certain portions of the road as the contractors completed their work. For example, a large contractor would have a certain portion of the line to build, and he would employ many sub-contractors. When the sub-contractor completed his work, and the chief contractor submitted it for approval, it was altogether unreasonable to allow a matter of that kind to stand. It had to be decided, because the men had to get their pay, the sub-contractors had to be paid, and the chief contractor had to get his pay from the Government. The company took a great deal of urging before Mr. Hays consented to have those differences of opinion decided every thirty days, and to have the approval or disapproval of the engineers. It is not true that the work was not carried on under joint supervision, and I make the statement that, outside of some things that were referred to arbitration under the Act, the Grand Trunk Pacific approved of every foot of work done and of every dollar expended up to the time that the late Government went out of power. Consequently, there is no foundation for that objection. I may explain to the committee what the method was. Under the agreement, the road was to be constructed under the joint supervision of the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific to meet the chief engineer of the Board of Railway Commissioners. At one time I think it took me longer to get them together and then not the chief engineer, but the assistant chief engineer, Mr. Wood, was sent.

I do not know whether the company is hanging anything on the difference between the chief engineer and the assistant, but the company sent the assistant. These men met together and when they could not arrive at a decision it was referred to a board of arbitration composed of these two and a third who was, as a matter of fact, Sir Collingwood Schreiber, who is in the Government service. The difficulties I pointed out a few moments ago were, first, the delay of the company in meeting the commission, and, next, of the Government in approving or disapproving of the work of construction. After a good deal of discussion, some of which was more or less heated, as will be remembered by those who were then members of the Government, the Grand Trunk Pacific agreed that these difficulties, if difficulties there were, should be settled every thirty days in order that the work of construction could go on. Where the work was approved payment could be made and where there was a question it could either be referred to the arbitrators or put on one side for further consideration. Their contention in that respect is not well founded, because in every case of importance, except those that were before the board of arbitration, and some of those had been decided, the chief engineer or the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, had approved of every bit of work done.

I submit again that the Grand Trunk Pacific were not in a position, under their agreement, to take over the road as it was offered to them, and I will tell the committee why. It was to be taken over under an agreement which, as in the form of a statute, was ratified by the Parliament of Canada. It was also ratified by the board of directors and by the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. If the road was not completed, as I think the Grand Trunk Pacific had a right to say it was not under the statute, then they could not, through their president, enter into a lease without the consent of the directors and, I believe, the approval of the shareholders, because it then became a new agreement. The minister will see that Mr. Chamberlin says in his letter that he could not recommend the directors to enter into a lease because he had to report that the road was not completed. If that road had been completed under the statute, without any question, he would have reported that to the directors and they would have given him instructions to lease the road under these conditions. I think the Government have made a grave mistake, first, in making changes in the line—the seriousness of which I will not discuss, as they have been discussed before—and in making any changes at all which gave the president of the company an excuse for not taking over the line. If my hon. friend looks at the correspondence he will discover that when the changes were being made in the curves and grades, the president of the company wrote to the Government stating that if the changes were made he would not take over the line. The Government made a mistake at that time in accepting the advice of the engineers, or those who were responsible for that advice, and in persisting in making these changes, because that was the first intimation that the Government had that the company would not take over the line.

Next, there was no semblance of a com-

pleted line at Quebec under the agreement. There was a certain agreement, and under that agreement is was expressly provided tl at the work must have the joint approval of both the company and the commissioners. The changes at Quebec have not yet been agreed to by the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have had all the correspondence up to a certain time, perhaps preceding the correspondence read to-day. In that correspondence there were references made to certain talks, but it always came back to the point where the Grand Trunk Pacific officials backed away from approval, and the correspondence is rather against approval than in favour of it. That being the case, of course it was clear that the Grand Trunk Pacific were preparing, in so far as they were concerned, not to take over the line. I think the Government made a serious mistake in not proceeding according to the agreement, completing the road and getting the approval of the Grand Trunk Pacific, because the company had intimated that if the plans were deviated from they would not take over the line.

I do not know that I shall say anything more. I think it was a great mistake. The country has suffered by reason of there being no operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific east of Cochrane as there should have been. West of Cochrane there is a fair tri-weekly passenger service from Toronto. Those two travel on the line say that the service is excellent. Commercial men who travel on the line to the West have told me that they get an excellent service over the Grand Trunk Pacific from Toronto all through the West. The roadbed is a marvel to railway men who travel over it, the trains are well run and the accommodation is excellent. But, east of Cochrane there is practically no service. The point I raise is that if the line had been completed according to the agreement, the Grand Trunk Pacific could not have evaded taking it over. Then you may say that they could not afford to run it. There was a clause in the agreement which provided against just such a contingency as that. It was provided that for seven

5 p.m. years after the completion of the line the Grand Trunk Pacific was not to pay the Government any interest, which contemplated a small business for a certain number of years. Having to pay no interest, the Grand Trunk Pacific would have been in such a position that they could have run trains merely at the cost of operation. Then the public would have been in this situation all the way from Moncton to Cochrane, a section which is practically neglected now, that they could have compelled the Grand Trunk Pacific to give a fair service. The company are not so compelled, and they take refuge behind the plea that there is no traffic. That view would not have held with the Board of Railway Commissioners, because in Canada, where roads have been publicly aided, even if the traffic is light, they must accommodate the public. A company cannot stop running trains, even on one of our old lines, if the reasonable accommodation of the public is interfered with. The Board of Railway Commissioners have compelled companies, which did not want to run trains, to give a service because the public was suffering by the stoppage of these trains. I think again that the Government have made a great mistake in having left a loophole for the Grand Trunk Pacific by enabling them to say that they had not completed this line according to the agreement, because if they had they would have been in a position to have compelled the company to take over the road, and the people would have been having the benefit to a much greater extent, particularly east of Cochrane, of the vast investment of money that has gone into this great enterprise. The object of the construction of the line is being defeated. East of Cochrane there is only a local service. Quebec is on a side street and not on the main line at all. East of Cochrane it is merely a local service, and, instead of being a part of the great continental railway that it was intended to be, it is being used merely as a local road, with occasional trains, and no service worthy of the name is being given. That refers also to the Maritime Provinces, and I might express the opinion that it is useless to spend the millions which are being spent in Halifax, St. John, and at other points for this great ocean to ocean service if it is not going to be conducted as a through line.

Why develop Canadian ports at Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal, if we are not going to do our best to bring the traffic of the West to them? What happens and what must happen in winter? The Government is running the line from Toronto in connection with the Grand Trunk, and it runs over the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario. Any freight which comes down, and as to which the Grand Trunk has any say, will not be taken over the Transcontinental

from Cochrane east. It will be brought from Winnipeg to Fort William down to Cochrane, then to North Bay, and then, if it has to go east, the Grand Trunk will take care of it at North Bay, and turning east at Scotia Junction, send it on to Portland or Boston, and not to a Canadian port. That will not be serving the object for which this vast amount of money was expended. I had not the honour of being in the House when this measure was put through, but I have read the debates, and everybody knows that a great deal hinged on the development of the ocean ports. While the road was being constructed my hon. friend will remember that time and again we discussed methods of making the Grand Trunk Pacific, when it took over the line take the traffic to Halifax and St. John. But now, when the Government, and not the Grand Trunk Pacific, has got the road, it does the very thing we tried to prevent the Grand Trunk Pacific from doing. It is handing over a large portion of the traffic destined for east of Cochrane to Scotia, and it then finds its way to American ports, as the Grand Trunk has no interest in taking it to Halifax or St. John, or even to Quebec. Whatever the Government intends to do, ought to be announced to the public at once. There is great dissatisfaction in the eastern part of Canada over the way this line is being managed. Whenever I discuss this matter the minister says he thinks I am after the manager. The manager and I are as good friends as the minister and the manager, but he thinks I am all wrong, and I am just as absolutely sure that he is all wrong, and we leave it at that. I am not after the manager at all. We must never look at this road from the point of view that it was intended solely for present needs, or to accommodate merely a part of the people of Canada. This road was constructed by all the people of Canada, and we have no right, particularly when the Government is managing it, to direct the traffic at a point half way along the line, and give those on the eastern end of the road no benefit whatever. Quebec is greatly disappointed and so will Halifax and St. John be if the present method of carrying on the road is persisted in. It is said that along the road east of Cochrane there is nothing to induce operation, but we must remember this, and the members from Ontario will bear it in mind, that when the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario road was first spoken of, a great many people laughed at the idea of building a road into a country of rocks, where there never would be any traffic; but the construction of that line has resulted in the opening up and development of the richest deposit of silver ore in the world, as well as cobalt and other minerals. We do not know what may be found along the line of the Transcontinental east of Cochrane, but we do know, on the authority of the Prime Minister of Ontario, that there is along the line of the Transcontinental land of as good a quality as can be found any where in the world, and the only way to let the people know what we have in this hinterland of Ontario and Quebec is to take them along the Transcontinental. What is the good of building the road there and then practically shutting it up? Let the people travel along the line east of Cochrane and get acquainted with the newer parts of Ontario and Quebec, and then we shall see these new parts opened up and developed, and, it may be, the discovery of some hitherto unknown valuable mineral productions. It is the duty of the Government, even more than of the company, to see that this is done, and I again urge the Government, now that they have taken over the road, to see that the line east of Cochrane is not made merely a local line, but that a service is at once established so that a man can board the Intercolonial at Halifax for Moncton, and there be attached to a train that will land him in Prince Rupert, if he desires to go by the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is what the line was intended for, but so long as we keep the eastern portion of the road closed, everybody east of Cochrane is deprived of the benefit for which he pays his taxes, just the asme as people in any other part of the country.

Mr. REID: As regards the non-completion of the line, and that being a reason why the Grand Trunk have not taken it over, the hon. gentleman understands that that objection might be raised at any time for all time to come.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all.

Mr. REID: They could always say that the road was not completed. I think myself that they did not want to take over the road last spring on any terms, and the best evidence of that is that the Grand Trunk Pacific came to us a year ago and asked for assistance for the western portion of the line. The hon. member says that if the road had been completed so that the com-

pany could have taken it over under the lease, the Railway Commission could have compelled them to operate the road. Now we know from experience, and they know, that to operate the road from Winnipeg to Moncton will mean a serious loss every year for a number of years to come. That being so, how could we force them to operate the eastern portion, supposing they had taken over the road, when they had just received a large amount of money to assist the western end of the line. At all events the Minister of Railways and Canals was satisfied, and the correspondence bears him out, that the company would not take over the road at that time. But, be that as it may, it is perhaps not worth while discussing just now. What I wanted more particularly to deal with was the hon. gentleman's remarks regarding the operation of the road. Everybody agrees that the road between Cochrane and Winnipeg has been operated satisfactorily, not only to the people along the line, but to the general public as well. With reference to that portion of the road between Cochrane and Moncton, I think I stated the other evening that conditions there were not the same as west of Cochrane. I admit that it is not a satisfactory service east of Cochrane, and the Government never intended the service to be left in that condition. When the road was taken over, without an engine, car, or equipment of any other kind, we had to take some 75 engines off the Intercolonial and many cars as well. It has been a very difficult matter to get the equipment that is necessary to operate the road from end to end in a way that would be satisfactory to the public. I think I also stated that the Department of Railways and Canals had been trying to arrange a through train service from Halifax and St. John—I am not forgetting St. John, as the hon. member states—to Winnipeg.

Mr. GRAHAM: You did the other night.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Even for small favours we are thankful.

Mr. REID: I also stated that the service between Halifax and St. John and Winnipeg would be arranged at the earliest possible date.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What date is that, may I ask?

Mr. REID: I am just coming to that if the hon. member will be patient. I discussed the matter with the general manager of the road and he told me we would have a through train service between Halifax and Winnipeg, and, of course, that means through to Prince Rupert.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You did not ask him about the through service from St. John.

Mr. REID: Halifax and St. John. I overlooked St. John again.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You overlook St. John pretty frequently.

Mr. REID: I must not do that. The people of St. John are very fine people; they treated me well when I was there, and I would not like them to think for a minute that I have forgotten them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think you told them on one occasion, if I remember aright, that if they thought Mr. Pugsley had not made large enough provision for harbour improvements to come to you as Minister of Customs and you would give them millions and millions more.

Mr. REID: The hon. member will remember that since that statement was made, we have been trying to economize.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Things have tightened up pretty considerably.

Mr. REID: We expect to be running a through train service from Halifax and St. John to Winnipeg on or about the 1st day of June.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Of this year?

Mr. REID: Yes, that is what I meant. We expect to run a through passenger service, with pullman cars attached.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will that be a daily or a tri-weekly service?

Mr. REID: I have not gone into that, but it is altogether likely that we shall run a tri-weekly service. We will, at least, run a service that will be satisfactory. We have ordered cars and we are trying to get more power as soon as possible, and I think that what we have done so far and the arrangements we have made for a through service ought to be satisfactory to the House and to the country. So far as the freight for Quebec and St. John and Halifax is concerned, the hon. member knows that we have been carrying quite a large quantity of freight through to Quebec and to St. John and to Halifax over the Transcontinental via Quebec, where we have a ferry that takes the cars over, and until the bridge is completed, of course, we must use—

Mr. GRAHAM: Does not my hon. friend remember that the other day, when he was making a statement about the Intercolonial, he said that freight coming from the West was handed to the Intercolonial at Quebec, and that that was the reason of the congestion? Is it not a fact that the reason why the Intercolonial receipts are so swollen and there is so much congestion is that the freight that comes over the Transcontinental to Quebec is handed to the Intercolonial and does not continue its journey over the Transcontinental?

Mr. REID: My hon. friend, of course, understands the Railway Department better than I do, as he has had considerable experience in it. The Intercolonial railway has a first class equipment, one that could handle any quantity of freight or passengers between Quebec and Halifax and St. John over the entire system. Then the Transcontinental system was handed over and attached to the Railway Department. There was at once taken away from the Intercolonial 75 engines and a large number of cars to run on the Transcontinental. We had not a single engine or any car at all that we could put on that road between Quebec and Moncton. We could not rob the Intercolonial of any more engines or cars.

Mr. GRAHAM: Could you not run them right through?

Mr. REID: No, because they were required between Winnipeg and Quebec. We had not nearly enough power to get the freight to Quebec; but by getting that freight to Quebec and overworking the Intercolonial equipment, we were able to handle that freight through. That may have been one reason for swelling the Intercolonial earnings; but the hon. member knows that, having taken every engine that we could get to work west, we could not take over any more to put on the Transcontinental. We did use a part of the Transcontinental from Lévis down, using the Intercolonial engines, and if we had had cars and sufficient power to use both lines, we would have used them and we would have received earnings from them. I think that is a fair answer to give to my hon. friend. There is no great advantage in swelling the earnings of the Intercolonial. We want to use both lines to the advantage of the public and of the Government railway system as a whole. If we get the equipment that is already ordered, there should not be any delay of any freight between Quebec and the lower provinces when we have both lines running, and both lines will be used to ensure that the freight is carried through. The whole trouble has been that there has not been enough equipment. If we can get the passenger service and the equipment ready for the 1st of June, I think the public will be satisfied.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Reading the correspondence and listening to the statement of the minister as to what is on file—and I presume he has brought here everything which is of importance—I think it is very clear that the Grand Trunk Pacific are absolutely in the right in reference to the completion of the contract, in claiming that the time has not yet arrived when they can be called upon to enter into a permanent lease for the operation of the road. It might be just as well to read some of the important portions of the correspondence so that they may appear upon Hansard. In this connection I wish to charge upon this Government that, in my opinion, for the purpose of in some way discrediting the late Government, of in some way making it appear, as the Solicitor General stated to the House when the matter was under discussion at the last session, that the Government had not been careful in making such an agreement with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific which that company could be forced to live up to, and being desirous of being able to say, as they have been repeatedly saying to the people in this country that, owing to some weakness in the contract, this Government had not the power to compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to enter into a lease, and that that company had defaulted in their agreement, this Government, influenced by that desire, have deliberately asked the Grand Trunk Pacific to do what they knew that company were under no obligation to do. They have not approached the matter in a way in which a government ought to approach any important question such as this. They have not said to the company: we will perform our part of the contract and then we will expect you to perform yours. But, before this road was completed, before the contract had been finished on the part of the Government, the Minister of Railways asked the company to enter into a lease which it was not under any obligation to enter into, and which, as the president said, he could not properly ask his directors to authorize.

Mr. REID: I may remind the hon. member that all that is in Hansard of last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY: And it will do no harm to put it on Hansard again.

Mr. REID: No objection.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As one member of the House, and representing that portion of the Dominion which feels that it is being wronged day after day by the action of this Government with respect to the Transcontinental, I feel it my duty to put the matter again before the public and to press it upon their attention in the hope that this wrong may yet be righted. All parts of Canada are interested in having the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company undertake the operation of the line from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is not a matter only for St. John, Halifax and all other important towns in the Maritime Provinces, but the city of Quebec, and a large portion of the province of Quebec and a large part of Ontario, and indeed the whole Dominion, is vitally interested in having one operation of this system, and not a divided operation with the Government in control of the eastern and the company in control of the western portion.

Take the statement of the auditors, Messrs. Bell and King, who, apparently, were appointed by the Minister of Railways to deal with this question of the cost of the road. In the letter which is contained in the return, and which is dated 23rd March, 1915, they say:

> We beg to call your attention to a letter received from the Solicitor General, a copy of which is hereto attached, from which it appears that the "cost of construction" of the eastern division as completed on the 31st December, 1914, within the meaning of section 20 of the agreement scheduled to the Act of 1903, should not include expenditures made on and in respect of certain works which were still under construction. The result would be that the "cost of construction" as a basis upon which to ascertain the rental to be paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company at this date will be very considerably less than the actual cost upon completion of the said additional works now under way.

Here was a contract for the completion and equipment of this line from Winnipeg to Moncton. In March, 1915, the Solicitor General seeks to advise the company that the road may be operated, and therefore it must be deemed to be completed, even though most important works regarded both by the Railway Commission and by the company as necessary to the completion of the line are still under construction, involving an additional cost of several millions. So, you have a clear admission that the road was still uncompleted and the work was still going on. But the question apparently was whether the rental was to be paid on the basis of the cost at that date or upon the cost with the additional works under construction. Of course they held that if a lease was to be entered into at that time it should be on the basis of the cost up to that date, leaving the cost of the works uncompleted to be arranged for later. There is a letter from the Solicitor General dated 11th March, 1915, in which he admits, from the statement of the chief engineer, that the Leonard shops were not completed, nor the branch line to those shops, nor the Quebec joint terminals. How could a road be said to be completed until its joint terminals in one of the great ports of the country which it was designed to reach have been completed, I fail to understand. Yet this gentleman who occupies the important position of Solicitor General is trying to make the auditors and the chief engineer believe that the road may be completed under section 20 of the agreement, even though these important terminals which were to form an essential part of the Transcontinental line have not been completed and will cost several millions yet to complete. Nothing could be more absurd. There could be no greater evidence that the Government were simply humbugging, so far as the Grand Trunk Pacific was concerned, and seeking some excuse to proclaim to the country that they had made default to their contract, when it was this Government that had made default, not only in altering the grades but in not completing the line under the contract.

Then we find Mr. Gordon Grant admits that these very important parts of the work have not yet been completed. He admits that in a letter dated March 10, 1915. We have a letter from the Solicitor General on the 6th of March, in which he refers to the statement of Mr. Woods and says that it is to be noted that Mr. Woods appears to base his refusal—that is his refusal to sign

> —upon the claim that the road at present cannot be said to be completed within the meaning of section 20 of the agreement scheduled to the National Transcontinental Railway Act 1903. Mr. Woods, I presume, had in mind certain portions—

—not of certain work outside the agreement or outside the Transcontinental line, but

> —certain portions of the works—

That means certain portions of the Transcontinental line.

—which at present, or rather on 31st December, 1914, the date up to which audit is being made, may be said to be under construction. I have always understood, both from yourself and from the commission, that although there are such portions that are still under construction the same are not essential, for the immediate operation of the entire line.

We may say with respect to any railway that you can operate it even without station houses. You can operate a railway without a telephone or telegraph line, if you are careful, if you do not run more than ten miles an hour and keep a good lookout. You can operate a railway without water tanks, if you carry portable tanks with the trains to supply the engines with water. You may operate your line with one locomotive and one train, if you are willing to run trains one way one day and back the next. But if your contract requires station-houses every ten miles, terminals at the ports where they ought to be provided —if you are to have all the equipment which belongs to a first-class railway, then, though you might operate your railway, it cannot be said to be completed until the terms of the contract have been carried out. That is what Mr. Woods, the Chief Engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, stated and that is what the Solicitor General admitted—that portions of the work were still under construction. And portions of it are under construction to-day; the minister is asking in these very estimates for $1,500,000 to pay for the construction of the Transcontinental line. Yet notwithstading, these gentlemen have—may I be permitted to say—the assurance to tell the members of this Parliament and the people of this country that the Grand Trunk Pacific have made default in their contract and therefore the Government has been obliged to take over the operation of the Transcontinental line.

I never heard of any pretense put forward by a Government which had less foundation to rest upon than the pretense which the Government has been putting forward against the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. That company has never made default. After reading the correspondence from end to end, I say that they have never made default so far as the carrying out of their agreement is concerned; that the fault is on the part of the Government; and that the Government is treating both the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the people of this country in a most unfair manner when it seeks to throw the blame upon the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and to make it responsible for the fact that the Government has undertaken the operation of the line. The Solicitor General—oh, what term can I get that would adequately express what he does? Although he admits that the work of construction is still under way, he asks the Government engineer if he will be good enough to state that, in his opinion, the eastern division was, on the 31st September, 1914, completed so far as was essential to the efficient operation of the entire line at that time. Even although the specification had not been complied with, even although the work of construction was still under way, yet, in order that these gentlemen might get a little kudos for themselves, and throw some discredit upon the late Government and upon the company which the late Government, through this Parliament, created, and make the people believe that the company was in default, the Solicitor General asked the chief engineer to be good enough to state that the road was completed, when he had before him positive evidence that the road was not completed, but that the work of construction was still under way.

Then we come to Mr. Chamberlin. We will see the ground on which he bases the refusal of the company to enter upon the lease. He says, in a letter of February 15, 1915:

Dear Mr. Cochrane,—I beg to acknowledge your communication of the 3rd instant, in regard to the provisions of the agreement of 29th July, 1903, relative to the providing of equipment for the eastern division. In reply I would call your attention to clause 20 of the agreement, which, as you will see, provides that when completed the said eastern division shall be leased to and operated by the company for a period of 50 years.

Clause 22 also indicated quite clearly that the equipment of the value of $20,000,000 to be provided, of which $5,000,000 worth is to be supplied for the operation of the eastern division, is to be the first equipment "for the completed road." I do not understand that the Government claims that the eastern division is as yet completed in accordance with the agreement, and your other letter to me of the 3rd instant bears me out in this. That being so, you will, I think, agree that it would be improvident and unwise on the part of the company to proceed to acquire under the present unfavourable conditions, equipment involving the expenditure of so large a sum, and which, pending the completion of the line, and to a very great extent, at least, not only remain idle, but materially decrease in value.

Now, is that not a reasonable letter? Is that not just such a letter as any prudent official, having charge of the interests of

the railway company, would write to the Government. He says:

I do not understand that the Government claims that the eastern division is as yet completed in accordance with the agreement and your other letter to me of the 3rd instant bears me out in this.

This letter of the 3rd I shall read later on. Mr. Chamberlin here positively states that Mr. Cochrane had written to him on the 3rd of February, 1915, a letter in which he admitted that the road was not completed in accordance with the terms of the contract. I find here another letter from Mr. Grant to the Solicitor General, under date of February 15. In it he says, among other things:

I enclose herewith Mr. Woods' letter to me, of the 11th instant, refusing to sign the acceptance and refusing to acknowledge the line as completed.

Surely nothing could be clearer than the ground upon which the company is putting its refusal, namely, that it is the Government that is in default, that it is the Government that has not completed the line—but always intimating that, when the Government carries out its part of the agreement, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will be prepared to carry out its part in good faith, and to enter upon the agreement. But, Sir, can you blame a company, can you blame the president of a company, whose duty it is to guard the interests of his shareholders, when he refuses, before the road is completed and before it could be operated in such a way as to earn to the fullest capacity which a completed line would be able to earn, to enter into a lease under which, within a certain period after the lease was signed, the rental must necessarily be paid, and which would involve large obligations upon the company? It was his duty to stand out until the contract was completed upon the part of the Government. He would have been negligent in his duty towards the shareholders, he would have been guilty of a gross breach of duty towards the shareholders whom he represented, if he had departed from the original agreement and bound the shareholders prior to the time when the agreement provided that they should be bound. On the 11th of February, 1915, Mr. Woods, the chief engineer, writes to Mr. Gordon Grant a letter in which he says:

This is the first intimation I have ever received that even the Government considered the line fully completed.

Mr. REID: The word "fully" is in there.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely. How can you have a line completed if it is not fully completed? If it is not fully completed, it is only partially completed, is it not? If it is not fully completed, it is partially completed, and yet my hon. friend says: Oh, no, the line is not fully completed, yet it is completed. I think it would require a Philadelphia lawyer, ten Philadelphia lawyers, to explain what the minister means by the distinction between a line being completed and being fully completed. I am unable to discover any difference. This line is either completed or it is not completed. If it is completed, then it is fully completed. If it is not fully completed, it is only partially completed. I can see now what is the trouble with these gentlemen. They have been of the impression that the line might be completed even although it was only partially completed, and, this line being partially completed, they thought they had a right to call upon the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to enter into the lease. Well, I am sorry for the minister if he has been led away by this definition, which must have been given to him by the Solicitor General.

Here is the letter of the Hon. Mr. Cochrane, dated the 3rd of February, 1915. This is a most interesting letter as showing what perhaps he meant by partial completion as distinguished from completion:

3rd February, 1915.

Dear Mr. Chamberlain,—With further reference to my letter of 23rd January in which I enclose a statement of the cost of construction of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway, I beg to point out that it is not intended that the item therein inserted as necessary to cover the completion of certain works shall be included at the present time in the amount on which interest should now be calculated.

What may be incomplete is not at the present time an essential portion of the National Transcontinental railway, and it is only upon the cost of the work as completed that it is proposed to calculate the interest.

What work? The work of building the Transcontinental railway, and that part of the work of building the Transcontinental railway which is not yet completed is, he says, in his judgment, not essential to the operation of the line. As I have said, the same remark might be made with regard to the station houses, the houses of the section men, the water tanks, the telegraph and telephone lines and other things which enter into the equipment of a first-class line of railway. The statement is made by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr.

Cochrane) that the works which are not yet completed form part of the work of construction of the Transcontinental railway. They were included in the specifications, and form a part of the railway, and he admits that they are not yet completed. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) calls my attention to the fact that on a reference to the workshops at Transcona and at Quebec he found that both formed an essential part of the Transcontinental railway.

I would like to know what is really underneath this business. It certainly strikes me as a most singular thing that when the Minister of Railways merely acknowledged receipt of the letter sent by the president of the railway company, as long ago as April 15th, setting forth the grounds, which in his mind are sufficient, for not entering upon the lease, showing that the road has not been completed, that the specifications have not been lived up to, and calling attention to the excessive cost of the road, based, of course, on the report of the two commissioners who were appointed by the Government. We have no evidence of any negotiations; no evidence of any attempt to meet the views of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company in any way; no evidence of a desire to leave the question to arbitration. Without anything further being said on the subject, this Government makes arrangements to operate the Transcontinental railway itself. That is what the correspondence shows, and it looks to me as if Mr. Gutelius, the general manager, who has the ambition to extend Government operation all the way to Winnipeg, and who may look toward Government operation all the way to the Pacific coast, was the influence behind the Minister of Railways. Or it may be that the Minister of Railways himself is wedded to Government operation, and would like to get rid of the Grand Trunk Pacific and assume charge of this road from east to west. Whatever the reason was, it strikes me as a most extraordinary thing that, without making any reply to that letter, and without attempting any negotiations with reference to it, the Government assumes the operation of this road.

In the remarks which I have made I have felt it my duty to find fault with the Government for the way in which they have treated the Grand Trunk Pacific in regard to these important letters. Let me ask the Minister of Railways if it is not possible to impress upon the Government the desirability of making arrangements to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific to enter upon the operation of this line If there are any questions still to be settled, let them be taken up and settled. If it will take six months or a year to finish the line so that the Grand Trunk Pacific may enter upon operation, let arrangements be made as I think they could easily be made, to go on and complete the line. Let it be arranged that the seven year period will begin to run from the time the road is completed, so that no injustice will be done to the Grand Trunk Pacific in that regard. Let some arrangement be made under which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will undertake and carry on the operation of this Transcontinental line all the way from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean. That is the only way in which we can have a proper service. We do not want divided operation in Canada; divided operation is contrary to the spirit and to the letter of the agreement which was entered into when the contract for the Transcontinental railway was executed. We know that there were many people in this country who thought that the Transcontinental line should have its eastern terminus at North Bay. There were many people who thought it would not be of any great advantage to extend the line east of North Bay, that being the point at which the Grand Trunk Railway system would join the Transcontinental railway. But those of us who are interested in the development of Canadian ports, both in summer and in winter, and in having the traffic of Canada carried through Canadian channels, took the ground—and to that view my right hon. friend who then was leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was strongly wedded—that it should be an essential feature in connection with the new Transcontinental line that, as far as possible, all Canadian traffic should be carried through Canadian channels and pass through Canadian ports to and from the markets of the old world.

In the contract it is provided that all traffic which is not otherwise routed shall be carried through Canadian channels. I do not believe that the people of Canada would ever have thought of engaging in this great enterprise if that had not been an essential feature of the scheme. What is this Government doing now? It is proposing, I believe; it is hoping, I believe, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will not enter upon the operation oif the eastern division. If that hope is

realized, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, closely allied as it is with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, will have every possible interest to carry its traffic, not through Canadian ports, but through American ports, and the grand patriotic idea which was at the bottom of this vast undertaking will be wholly defeated. Hon. gentlemen ought not to forget that the Grand Trunk Railway Company have a line running all the way from North Bay in the province of Ontario, through Ontario into Quebec to the city of Montreal, and from Montreal east to the port of Portland in the state of Maine. They have large terminals there, they have made great developments at that port, and it would be very convenient for them, and, from many aspects, very desirable for them to carry Canadian traffic to the port of Portland in the state of Maine. That is why, as I have said, the late Government determined that they would have the line constructed, not simply from Winnipeg to North Bay, but from North Bay to Moncton, passing through the city of Quebec, and that there should be imposed upon the Grand Trunk operating the eastern division as part of and in connection with the Transcontinental system, so that they would be interested in carrying their traffic through Canadian channels and Canadian ports.

Now, to come back to this Government, I hope they will realise the importance of this question, that they will take it up and endeavour to solve it as speedily as possible. It will be infinitely better for the country, even at some sacrifice, even if they have to make an effort to meet the views of the Grand Trunk Pacific, that the Government and the country should come together and that at the very earliest possible day the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should operate this whole line from the ports of St. John and Halifax through Quebec and all the way to the Pacific ocean. My hon. friend knows very well that there are advantages in many other respects in having only the one system of management, only the one transportation company to deal with, and only one operation between the two oceans. What would the Canadian Pacific have been, in so far as the development of Canadian trade is concerned, if they had stopped at Winnipeg and some other company had operated the line between Winnipeg and the ports of the Atlantic ocean? It would not have been, even to the very slightest degree, the wonderful factor in Canadian development which that transcontinental railway has been in the past. I believe that the same remark will apply to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Get them to engage at once in the operation of the line; make an arrangement with them, a reasonable arangement, such as I know it will be possible to make, for this operation; let them become interested in the development of traffic along the line; and you will have a growth and a prosperity infinitely greater than you will have if you continue this operation by the Government, an operation which for a number of years must necessarily be temporary, because no one can say but what, if this road is completed under the terms of the contract, the Grand Trunk Pacific will then be in a position to take over the road or enter into a lease, and the Government will be ousted from the operation of the line. Therefore my hon. friend must see that the operation by the Government must be of a temporary character, and neither the Government nor its general manager will be interested in developing traffic along the line, in encouraging the establishment of industries and in giving a good service as the company will be interested, because whatever traffic and development there may be in the immediate future will inure in the end to the benefit of the company, which, when the road has been completed, will demand that a lease be made and will enter upon the operation of the line.

Mr. REID: I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but as it is six o'clock, and as there is an arrangement that we shall adjourn until Tuesday next, I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would leave the balance of his remarks until Tuesday, and I would also ask the leader of the Opposition if he would concur in one item passing now and allowing the other items to remain until Tuesday.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the minister will say to this committee that the Government will take up with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company the question of settling the basis on which the company shall operate the road I will have no more to say; I will not take any more of the time of the House on this question. But if the hon. gentleman will not do that I will not promise just how long a time I am going to take up, because it is of great importance. My hon. friend knows very well how important it is to the people of eastern Canada and the Maratime Provinces.

Mr. REID: I always enjoy the remarks of my hon. friend, and I would do anything to encourage him.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Tuesday, April 25, 1916.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

DEATH OF PRIVATE D. CURRY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Inquiry was made in the House on the 18th instant with regard to the case of Private Dougall Curry, who died at St. Joseph's Hospital, Glace Bay. The following telegram was sent to the General Officer Commanding, Military District No. 6, Halifax, N.S.:

Reference late Private Dougall Curry who died at St. Joseph's Hospital, Glace Bay, and your telegram dated 21st instant: what was cause of delay in notifying Captain Calder of admission of Private Curry to hospital? Give name of person responsible for Captain Calder not being notified promptly. Urgent.

(Sgd.) Adjutant-General.

The reply was as follows:

Reference death of Private Dougall Curry, St. Joseph's Hospital, Glace Bay. Patient first complained eight p.m., April 2; was kept in bed and seen daily by Captain Munro, battalion medical officer. Felt himself improving until April 5, when within a few hours he became worse. At five p.m. was sent from Broughton by special train to St. Joseph's Hospital, Glace Bay, in charge of an orderly who had a note from Captain Munro asking for patient's admission to hospital. Patient arrived in hospital 7 p.m., April 5. Captain Calder, who attends military patients in hospitals, Glace Bay, was not notified until noon next day of patient's arrival in hospital. Captain Calder states that the delay in seeing Dougall Curry in St. Joseph's Hospital had nothing to do with patient's death as it was a case of tubercular meningitis. Medical Board also reports that case was tubercular meningitis.

A medical board was also assembled in this case, and its findings were as follows:

This board, in view of the above, is of the opinion that Private D. Curry died of tuberculous meningitis.

(Sgd.) W. E. Hodgins, Major General,
Acting Adjutant-General.

ENLISTMENT UNDER AGE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CARVELL: I desire to ask the Premier, as the Acting Minister of Militia, if any policy has been adopted regarding boys who have enlisted who are under age or who are very much under the age of eighteen years. I have here a letter, which I will send over to my right hon. friend, from a lady living in the county of Victoria, who lays a very serious complaint against the recruiting officer at Andover. She claims that her boy was inveigled into joining the army at fifteen years of age, and that when the recruiting officer was told over the telephone that the boy was only fifteen years of age, he stated that the boy had told him he was eighteen and that he had as good a right to believe the boy as to believe his mother. The boy was signed on, and now he wants his discharge, and his mother is anxious to have him discharged. I do not want to mention names. I believe this matter has already been brought up by the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), and I do not know exactly what decision has been reached. If any policy has been adopted, I would like to know what it is, and I would like if the Prime Minister would reply in regard to the letter, either publicly or confidentially, as he sees fit.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not had my attention directed to the subject recently, but I have always understood that the policy is not to enlist boys under eighteen years of age. If that is not the policy, it ought to be the policy. I will take up the case to which my hon. friend has drawn my attention and see that steps are taken that the boy who is of the age of fifteen years or under eighteen shall be discharged and returned to his parents.

Mr. CARVELL: That is very satisfactory. I did not want to read the letter and make it public; but the Prime Minister, when he reads it, will understand the reasons why I brought the matter up.

REBUILDING OF PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROGERS: May I once again direct the attention of the House to the rebuilding of the Parliament Buildings? Good progress is being made with the preparation of the plans, and we are now ready to give more detailed consideration to the carrying out of the work, and it has been suggested that the committee to be appointed should be increased to four from each side of the

House. I have no objection to the suggestion, and if it is agreeable to the Prime Minister and to the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I shall be very glad to have the names of four from each side of the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already intimated to the Minister of Public Works the names of three of my colleagues. I told him, when my attention was drawn to the matter about a week ago, that I would name a fourth, and I did so. Therefore, so far as we are concerned, we are ready to confer with the Minister of Public Works. If my right hon. friend would name four gentlemen from the other side of the House, the work could be taken up at once; and it seems to me, in view of the hope, somewhat remote, that we may have the buildings ready for next session, that no time should be lost.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will send the names to the Minister of Public Works this very day.

CENSORED MAIL MATTER FROM THE UNITED STATES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CARVELL: I desire again to call the attention of the Postmaster General through the Premier to the present status of the censoring of correspondence coming from foreign countries into Canada. There is at present experienced in this country an enormous amount of difficulty in transacting business, which I think every member of this House must have observed if he has talked with his constituents during the holidays. I find that it takes usually about a week to get an ordinary business letter from Boston to the province of New Brunswick, when it ought to take about a day and a night. I saw it stated in some newspapers during the recess that the censorship was to be discontinued after Wednesday of last week, and I know of one letter passing between Canada and the United States which was not censored, but I have found others which have been censored since then. If the Government claim that they are compelled to carry out this work of censorship, I suppose the public have nothing to do but submit; but I would like to have a pronouncement from the Premier upon the subject.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We are not compelled to carry it out, because it is a matter which the Government of this country has the right to determine. Secret documents of an important character were sent to us by the Imperial Government. If I am not mistaken, my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has been made acquainted with the terms of that communication. We felt, under the circumstances, that if it was reasonably possible we should comply with the request that was made. There has been an earnest endeavour on the part of the Postmaster General and his officials to have it carried out in an effective way and with the least possible disturbance and delay. The magnitude of the task, I understand, has been very great, it having been undertaken without the assistance of any additional officials. If I am not mistaken at certain of the offices to which mail for the United States must be sent for censorship—technically called exchange offices, I believe—it has been necessary to deal with some 250,000 letters a day. Considering the enormous number of letters which have thus to be dealt with, the number of complaints that have come to the Government have not been very great. Undoubtedly mistakes have been made, and sometimes they have been made the second time even after they have been pointed out and the instructions made more emphatic.

Mr. CARVELL: If the Prime Minister will permit me—would not he tell the House at what points in Canada this censoring takes place? Does it take place in every little country post office?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. There are these exchange offices to which I have referred. Mail for the United States originating within a certain district is sent to Toronto, originating within a different district is sent to Montreal, and so on with other places. All the work of the censorship takes place at these exchange offices and not at the office of origin. In the same way letters from the United States addressed to any point within a certain district go to Montreal, and others to other exchange offices, from which, after being censored, they are sent to their destination. It is at these exchange offices, which have been called upon to handle such an enormous number of letters, that the errors and delays have taken place.

Mr. CARVELL: I thank the Prime Minister for the information he has given the House. I am sure it will relieve a great

deal of anxiety that has been felt all over Canada because of the fear that letters may have been opened by practically any country postmaster. While I am on this subject, I would like to suggest that some mark be put upon a censored letter to show that it has been opened by an official of the department. As things are now, the letter is simply slit open and then a piece of paper market "censored" is pasted on the envelope. Any body could go to a newspaper office and get thousands of such slips printed. So any country postmaster, or any one having access to postal matter, could open correspondence and having done so mark it "censored," and there would be no means of knowing by whom it was done. If our correspondence must be censored, means should be taken to give us assurance that the censoring is done by officials of the department. I can understand, after the Prime Minister's explanation, that, as letters have to go to central clearing offices, there might easily be delay. Before I sit down I would like to point out that it is almost impossible to conceive of the necessity for censoring letters of members of Parliament and well-known business concerns carrying on their ordinary business. But, if there be a good reason for it, I think the Government should tell us what it is.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: For the purpose of identification, every person employed in the work of censorship has a number. When he censors a letter and puts on the slip, he must put on his number, which indicates to the department that he has censored the letter. I am not sure that this system has prevailed from the first; but in consequence of the errors that were made it was found necessary to adopt means that would show who was responsible for errors, and this is the plan adopted, as I am informed by the Postmaster General. The Deputy Postmaster General has informed me that the procedure followed in censorship in this country is the same as that followed in Great Britain.

PUNISHMENT OF PRIVATE SOLDIERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister, who is the Acting Minister of Militia to a matter of importance. We have in Moosejaw the 128th Battalion. There is a generally-accepted belief that the following incident occurred in that battalion. It is reported on such authority that I believe it to be true; but it is not impossible that it is only a rumour: that a short time ago the officer commanding inflicted a punishment upon a private who came under his displeasure by suspending him by the arms for an hour or so until the boy fainted; and that a similar mode of punishment has been adopted by the same officer in other cases. I have looked into the matter as carefully as I can, though, of course, anything occurring in military circles is closely walled about. It looked so serious that it seemed to me to be my duty, the boy having no other recourse, to call the attention of the Government to the matter. Different public bodies in Moosejaw have taken it up, but have failed to get the light on the subject that would easily be afforded in any matter non-military. If the facts be as reported, the barbarous bully who would inflict such punishment should be removed; and if the report be not true, it should be contradicted at once, so that a rumour so prejudicial to recruiting may be set at rest. I would ask the Prime Minister to take the matter up, by telegraph if that course commends itself to him, and have it settled one way or the other.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can hardly believe it possible that any such incident could have taken place. But it will be my duty, of course, to make inquiries. If the hon. member for Moosejaw will send me a memorandum, giving me the name of the commanding officer, and of the private who is said to have been punished in this way, it will facilitate the investigation.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Prince Edward Island railway—bridges, etc., $613,100.

Mr. CARVELL. I wish to direct my hon. friend's attention to the present status of the negotiations with the Government of New Brunswick regarding the St. John and Quebec Railway. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, in the absence of the Acting Minister of Railways, gave us a great deal of information on this matter—information so valuable that it has created quite a stir in the province of New Brunswick. I do not want to be uncomplimentary, but I sometimes have a little doubt whether we could get as much information from the minister himself; I think possibly he would have been a little more reserved. Now that we have got that information from the Min-

ister of Public Works, would my hon. friend tell me whether there has been any change in the status of the arrangements between the Government of Canada and the Government of New Brunswick concerning the construction and operation of that railway? Before he answers I may tell him that, as I understand the information given by the Minister of Public Works something like a month ago, the Government has gone back on its pledge to operate that road and pay 40 per cent of the gross earnings to the province of New Brunswick. That may be putting it very bluntly, but no other language would express it as well as these words. On different occasions from 1911 to 1914 legislation was passed in this House agreeing that if the province of New Brunswick would construct a railway from Grand Falls to St. John the Federal Government would take it over and operate it as part of the Intercolonial, paying to the province 40 per cent of the gross earnings. We were told by the Minister of Public Works that the Federal Government would not carry out that legislation, on the ground that it was hardly a fair arrangement so far as the Dominion of Canada was concerned. We were told also that, under an agreement between the two Governments, the Government of New Brunswick was not to construct the road from Centreville to Andover. It seems to be admitted all round that the branch at Grand Falls was abandoned long ago. It was agreed also that the Government of New Brunswick was not to construct bridges across the St. John river at the Mistake, or across the Kennebecasis river; that it was to build the road along the west side of the river, possibly to Westfield or to Welsford; and that it was to build a branch to Vanceboro from some point on the railway north of Fredericton, the exact point not being given—the only place named by the Minister of Public Works was Meductic. I do not think that could be the intention of the Government; it would be utterly nonsensical to build a branch to Meductic.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Meductic Falls?

Mr. CARVELL: No, to the village of Meductic, some ten or twelve miles above the Falls. The Minister of Trade and Commerce knows the place.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Grosvenor place.

[Mr. Carvell.]

Mr. CARVELL: That is the place. Of course, a road could be built from there, but the difficulty is that we should be compelled to build 25 or 30 miles on American territory in order to strike the Maine Central, so I think that idea will have to be abandoned. I have stated to the acting minister the substance of the information given us by the Minister of Public Works on a former occasion, and I would be much obliged if he would tell the committee the actual status of the negotiations and agreements at the present time.

Mr. REID: I was sorry that I could not be present when the matter was brought to the attention of the House by the Minister of Public Works. I had made arrangements to be away that day, and unfortunately could not be here.

Mr. CARVELL: I find no fault whatever with the acting minister.

Mr. REID: I expect to bring in some legislation in regard to this railway in the course of a day or two, and a discussion of the matter might perhaps take place at that time, if that would be satisfactory to the hon. member. I can explain to him, however, in a few words, the situation so far as I understand it without the papers being before me. The hon. gentleman will remember that the original intention was to build this railway from Grand Falls to, I think, Rothesay on the Intercolonial, and then into St. John. At that time bridges were to be built over the rivers, the cost of which was estimated at about $1,000,000. Afterwards it was represented to the Government that these bridges would cost some $3,000,000. The hon. gentleman will remember that a Bill was introduced and passed by which the Government agreed to build these bridges.

Mr. CARVELL: I remember that very well.

Mr. REID: Since that time there have been changes in the railway situation in New Brunswick. At that time the Grand Trunk Pacific was to operate the Transcontinental through to Moncton, and the St. John Valley railway was to make connection between the Grand Trunk Pacific line and the city of St. John. For that reason the line was to be built to Grand Falls. When the Government took over the Transcontinental, so far as St. John was concerned it was not necessary to build between Andover and Grand Falls, as this would be parallelling the Canadian Pacific

railway, and as the Intercolonial had connection with the Transcontinental at McGivney Junction.

Mr. CARVELL: Then I understand that the branch from Andover to Grand Falls has been absolutely abandoned.

Mr. REID: I cannot say that; that would be for the New Brunswick Government to take up and determine. So far as we are concerned, any negotiations had up to the present are in respect of the line to Andover, but there is no reason why the matter should not be taken up at some future time if it should be thought advisable. What I mean is that, so far as the connection between St. John and the Transcontinental is concerned, we have it by running over the Gibson road, I think they call it, and connecting at McGivney Junction. As I understand the situation, a passenger can connect with the Transcontinental by going over the St. John Valley road to Andover, and then over the Canadian Pacific railroad to the Transcontinental.

Mr. CARVELL: That is almost correct. At the present time there is no connection between the Canadian Pacific railroad and the Transcontinental. Of course, one may be effected.

Mr. REID: The situation up to the present, so far as the St. John Valley road is concerned, is this: the road has been under construction for some time, and the Department of Railways and Canals, as I understand it, have taken over each portion as it was completed and operated it pending the completion of the connection into St. John.

Mr. CARVELL: But they are not paying the 40 per cent.

Mr. REID: I refer to the portion from Centreville to Gagetown. The understanding at the time, if my memory serves me rightly, was that they were to pay the 40 per cent and the 60 per cent for a certain time. That arrangement remained in effect until about the beginning of this year, when the Minister of Railways and Canals took the matter up again with the New Brunswick Government, and made an arrangement that the Intercolonial authorities were to operate that section pending any new arrangement that might be made with the New Brunswick Government.

Mr. CARVELL: I think my hon. friend is in error. As I understood him, he stated that when those different sections were completed they were operated up to the beginning of the present year under the original arrangement providing for the payment of 40 per cent to the Government of New Brunswick. That is not correct; I have a statement to the contrary. A special arrangement was made by the Government of New Brunswick with the Intercolonial authorities about the beginning of 1915, by which the latter were to operate, and I do not know what percentage of profits, if any, were to go to the Government of New Brunswick. But, if any loss was incurred, the Government of New Brunswick was to pay one-half of it, which is certainly not carrying out the original arrangement. That is one of the things of which we in the province of New Brunswick complain so bitterly.

Mr. REID: Perhaps I am in error, so far as 1915 was concerned, as I had nothing to do with the negotiations, and perhaps I had better let that part of the matter stand until I get fuller information. But, commencing on January 1, 1916, the arrangement, as I understand it, was that the Intercolonial was to operate the sections when completed, and that whatever arrangement was made it would be retroactive, commencing on the 1st of January, 1916. I have been myself conducting negotiations with some members of the New Brunswick Government, with reference to this matter, and the information was given by the Minister of Public Works. The correspondence is in Hansard, so that it is not necessary for me to go into that any further, except to say that, when I bring down this measure, it will show that we will take over the road and pay 40 per cent and 60 per cent from the 1st of January, 1916. We will operate the section between Centreville and Gagetown after it is completed, and other parts, as completed, will be taken over on that basis, until the road is finished to Westfield. When the Andover section is completed we will take it over on the same basis.

Mr. CARVELL: What about the branch connecting the St. John Valley road and the American system at Vanceboro?

Mr. REID: The hon. member says Vanceboro.

Mr. CARVELL: I will change that to any point on the Maine Central.

Mr. REID: If we were to connect with the Maine Central at Vanceboro there is a bridge that could be crossed. That is at

the terminus of the Maine Central in the United States. Of course, the Canadian Pacific railway runs to Vanceboro. If we connected at Vanceboro we would have to build about forty-five miles of railway in Canada. We have had a proposition to connect with the Maine Central at another point, Meductic, which would mean that only twenty-five miles of railway would require to be built in Canada, while the Maine Central would have to build about 15 miles on the American side. Negotiations have been going on to have a connection in that way, which would probably serve the purposes of the Transcontinental better than a connection at Vanceboro. I do not know what the final conclusion of the negotiations will be, but there is a possibility that the connection may be made, not at Vanceboro, but at some other point. The portion from Centreville to St. John will be completed this fall, I understand.

Mr. CARVELL: This fall?

Mr. REID: Between now and January. At all events, the date is set in the agreement, and it strikes me that it is within the next eight or ten months that they are to be at Westfield. There are a good many reasons for changing the original arrangement. It would probably take two or three years to build those bridges, and the cost would be a least $3,000,000.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Maxwell puts it at $2,000,000.

Mr. REID: The hon. member will agree with me that our experience in this House has been that very few public works are completed within the estimate of the engineers; at least that has been my experience.

Mr. CARVELL: It may be the minister's experience.

Mr. REID: The hon. member has been here a good many years, and I think it has been his experience also. At any rate, that is the situation so far as I know it. When the matter comes before the House again, I will see that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., has an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. CARVELL: That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. GRAHAM: These Estimates amount to $19,000,000. The acting minister has told us that he intends to introduce legislation in regard to the St. John Valley railway. Would not this be an opportune time for the acting minister to tell the committee frankly what other legislation, besides that dealing with the St. John Valley railway proposal, he or any other member of the Government intends to introduce during the present session? It is persistently rumored in the press that the Government is going to bring down measures providing for aid to two railways and more than aid to a third one. In the Estimates here, we have a peculiar item providing for a subsidy, not brought down in the usual subsidy bill but brought down in the Estimates. That, to my mind, is done to cover up the retreat of the Government, so that they may be able to tell various people who have applied for subsidies that the Government are not bringing down any subsidy Bill, the same object is achieved as would be under such a Bill. What I think the Government ought to do now, before the Railway Estimates go into the House, is to tell the House frankly what further amounts they propose to give to any company or companies, or what amounts they have promised to give during the present session? The acting minister will readily see that if this estimate for capital expenditure were $40,000,000 instead of $19,000,000 it would make a difference in the Estimates going through. Unless the Government tell us this, we might pass the Estimates, and then they would be in a position to say to the House: "We have got the ordinary estimates of $19,000,000 through, and now we propose, in another measure, to obligate the country to a very much further amount." Do not the Government think that it would be wise and fair that they should tell the committee exactly what legislation they propose to bring in, and what the whole amount of any further obligation of the country to these railway companies would be? I read this morning in the press that aid would be given to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, and the Quebec & Saguenay. If the press knows about it, and it seems to, is it fair for the Government to ask this House to plod along in the dark and vote $20,000,000 of Railway Estimates here, while at the same time the minister keeps up his sleeve three other Bills that perhaps will impose an obligation upon the country of more than $19,000,000. Let us have it all at once so that, while discussing these Estimates, we may know what further amount the Government is going to ask the House to provide for during the present session.

Mr. REID: As far as the St. John Valley road is concerned, the bringing in of this Bill will save the country an expenditure of some $3,000,000. The intention was, as I explained to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), that when the last arrangement was made to build the bridges across the Kennebecasis river. Under this new arrangement we do not have to build the bridges and we save their cost. As far as the subsidy to the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway is concerned, the hon. member will recollect that last year there was great pressure to have this railway extended through a portion of Alberta. There was a lot of grain to be moved, and in order to assist that section it was agreed to give them this subsidy for a number of miles. As I understand, there was an enormous quantity of wheat raised in that district, and the advantage has been very great. It was put in there for the reason that if no other subsidies were brought down, this subsidy would have to go in this way, unless we brought down a special subsidy Act. As far as any further legislation is concerned, I may say that I have not heard of any more being discussed or being brought down at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM: How far does the present extend ?

Mr. REID: It extends up to this time.

Mr. GRAHAM: Or to the end of the session?

Mr. REID: Up to this time. As to something having been published in a newspaper with regard to this matter, all I have to say is that you cannot always believe what the newspapers say; at least I do not always believe it. But, so far as these Estimates are concerned, even if we pass them, there is no possibility of their getting through without the hon. memoer knowing whether any further legislation will be brought down. The hon. member knows as well as the rest of us that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern have had a great deal of difficulty in carrying on their great enterprises. The war has put them into a very serious position; but whether there will be any other legislation I cannot say, for the reason that it has not been taken up yet and dealt with by the Government.

Mr. NESBITT: I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say that you cannot believe everything you read in the newspapers. But, when the hon. member says he does not know whether there is any further legislation to be brought down in reference to these railways, I think he is asking us to draw on our imaginations considerably, because it is generally understood not only in the newspapers, but outside of the newspapers, that there will be further legislation on behalf of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific. I thoroughly endorse what my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) says, that if there is going to be further legislation in reference to railways, this is the time to let us know. In the first place, we are anxious to wind up the session, and, in the next place, it is necessary for us to know at some time and we might as well know now as at any other time and be prepared for it. If the rumour that we will be asked to vote more money to the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk Pacific is correct, it would be well to take that into consideration at the same time as the other estimates. We have an item here of $3,000,000 for the Hudson Bay railway. If we are going to be asked large amounts of money for some other purposes, surely we can do without certain amounts in the items that we are asked to vote here, because we have actually to limit the amount of money that we vote this year for various purposes. These things may be required and they may not be required. Personally speaking, I do not think the Hudson bay item is required, but I am afraid that the majority of members on both sides of the House do not agree with me in that respect. At the same time we have to cut our coat according to our cloth to a certain extent. No business man would consider the expenses of part of his business without considering the whole. If he did he would not be long in business. Why the Government should not adopt the same policy, and why they should not give us their confidence as to what they expect us to vote, is more than I can understand. The acting minister must know if there is to be any further legislation brought in, and, if so, I cannot understand why he does not let us know now—because we hope this session is not going to last all summer—just what assistance to railways he will expect us to vote. We could then consider all these items at the same time, and probably get the minister to curtail some of the items he is asking us to vote now.

Mr. TURRIFF: Did I understand the minister to guarantee that if we put through this subsidy for the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, no further railway aid legislation would be brought down this session?

Mr. REID: As far as I am concerned, I have no other subsidies under consideration at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM: A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister knows very well that he has not answered my question. He knows that the Government had expected this session would be closed by this time or shortly after, and he knows perfectly well whether or not any further subsidies are to be asked for, and what railway legislation it is proposed to bring down this session.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not think they know that.

Mr. TURRIFF: If they do not know that, they should not be there.

Mr. KNOWLES: They have to fix the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) first.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. TURRIFF: They all say "carried" to fixing the hon. member for Calgary. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is a very sensible one. Before we pass that $19,000,000 item, I think we should know exactly what railway assistance the Government proposes to give this session—what they propose to do with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern railway, and the Quebec and Saguenay railway. Until we have that information I think we should be amply justified in postponing consideration of these items, and I would suggest that some other minister go on with his Estimates until my hon. friend or some other member of the Government is in a position to come down and say: "We propose to give such and such assistance to such and such a railway;" and if no assistance is to be given, the House should be given that assurance. But, with no information before us as to what the Government intend to do in the matter of railway legislation between now and the end of the session, which we all hope will be in the near future, it is asking a great deal to ask the members of this House to vote this $19,000,000, and I would suggest that we postpone consideration of the matter until the Government is in a position to give the House the information we have asked for.

Mr. REID: It was the intention to take up the Estimates of some other department this afternoon, and it was in order to accommodate certain hon. gentlemen who could not be present at another time that I took up my Estimates to-day. If there is any objection to passing any of these items, I am willing to let them stand; but, as there are many that hon. members wish to discuss I see no reason why we should not go on and discuss them now. If we do not do that, some hon. members might not have an opportunity later on of discussing them. With regard to future legislation, the answer I gave the hon. member just now explains the position at present.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would suggest that what has been said by my colleague the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals might be taken into account. It seems that hon. gentlemen do not want all the Estimates to go through until they have been given certain information they desire, but I see no reason why some of these items should not be taken up and discussed and perhaps passed. There is no particular objection to holding an item or two for a general discussion and for eliciting any information that is desired; but at this time of the session, when we want to get all the business done as rapidly as possible, I think there is some force in the suggestion of my colleague that we should go on with some of these items.

Mr. GRAHAM: Ordinarily that would be the part of wisdom. The difficulty is that to these items, which are all large, there will probably be added other items, in the way of Bills, either providing for the expenditure of large amounts of money or increasing the obligations of the country to railway enterprises of more or less significance. If this were an ordinary case I should have no objection at all to getting rid of some of these small items; but the point is this. The press tells us that these items will be augmented very materially, and, until we know what these further items are to be, I do not think we should be asked to vote these large amounts. I would suggest that the acting minister tell the House now

4 p.m.

what other railway legislation is to be brought down which will further obligate the country. That information may bear on the discussion of the items before us, many of which are large, such as the Hudson Bay railway, the National Transcontinental, and the Welland canal. If we are to undertake other large expenditures in addition to these, it is only fair that the House should know what they are going to be. We are a little dubious as to what may happen. The Government has seen fit to slip in a subsidy amongst the ordinary Estimates, which is establishing a precedent. Hon. gentlemen know that subsidies are invariably brought down in what is know as a Subsidy Bill—separate altogether from the Estimates. Each item is discussed on its merits, if the House sees fit, and a separate Act is passed. A year ago the Government assured a lot of applicants that no Subsidy Bill would be brought down; but here, in the Estimates, not in a Subsidy Bill, they are providing for the payment of a subsidy of $384,000. If this practice is to be followed, a dozen subsidies could be placed in the Estimates. Under the circumstances, then, I think it would be wise for the Government to put their cards on the table and tell us what they propose to do in the way of aid to railways. We shall then be prepared to discuss intelligently the items before us, and perhaps we may have to cut some of them down if the other expenditures are to be large. I repeat that this is not an ordinary case of taking up the items one by one, and allowing one or two to stand on which all the information can be given. If we pass all the other items, the information as to these subsidies will not help us out of the difficulty.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is force in some parts of what my hon. friend says, while in other parts there is not quite so much force, if he will allow me to say so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is a great deal of force.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Item 110 introduces a new principle, that is, voting a subsidy as a Supplementary Estimate.

Mr. GRAHAM: That was not my point. My point was that the Government may bring in half a dozen subsidies as Supplementary Estimates.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If they do they cannot surprise you with them, as they will be brought down in the regular way.

Mr. GRAHAM: In an irregular way.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are, however, a number of items, which, whether others are brought in or not, have, to put it mildly, to be passed, because the work must go on. For instance, with reference to the Prince Edward Island railway, there are items for strengthening bridges, original construction, surveys and inspections, increase of accommodation and facilities, also a small amount to provide for the car ferry. That is an old matter, and this vote is to carry to completion and to operate what has already been agreed upon by both sides of the House. Then there is an item to bring the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway line up to Intercolonial railway branch line standard.

Mr. GRAHAM: We passed that the other night.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Then there is the item to bring the International line up to the Intercolonial branch line standard.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have already passed a number of the items which my hon. friend has mentioned. These are yet to be passed: numbers 103, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 118, 120, 123.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The different items in item 103 are all ordinary items for carrying out a policy which has already been agreed upon in reference to the car ferry. Item No. 106, the Hudson Bay railway, is also an old subject. That item is to carry out what has been under progress for a considerable length of time, and the work must be proceeded with, I suppose, unless the House comes to the conclusion that we are to stop operations on that road. The same is true of item No. 107, National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend, if he keeps on, will make out too strong a case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought the Transcontinental was completed a long time ago.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Unless my hon. friend wishes to push the matter as far as not to allow anything to pass, because he is afraid that something else may be put in the Supplementary Estimates—which is not very brave of my hon. friend—I think we should make some progress with these items.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Trade and Commerce is not putting the matter quite rightly. I did not say "for fear that

something may be put in the Supplementary Estimates." I said that that could be done. There are yet to come before the House three railway measures asking for aid.

Mr. ROGERS: Are you sure of that?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Government press will have to be muzzled if that is not true.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That will be a hard operation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That announcement by the Minister of Public Works will send the stocks down to-morrow.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the hope and full confidence that that additional legislation will be introduced, several things are taking place every day. The chief point that I raised was this: we shall be here only a short time, we all hope. We ought, therefore, to know now what the railway legislation is to be, particularly that part of it which will put the country under further obligation. If it were early in the session that these Estimates were up, it would be a different matter, but there cannot be more than a few days between the passage of these items and the introduction of that railway legislation. The Government, therefore, ought to give us an idea of their programme in reference to railway legislation so that the members will know what they are asked to vote for railway purposes including the Estimates. I would suggest that we discuss this Prince Edward Island railway item for a little while, and then perhaps the Government will be in a position to give us their programme in regard to railway legislation.

Mr. KNOWLES: Last fall it was announced that the Government had made a rate of six cents per bushel, or ten cents per cwt. on grain shipped all-rail from Armstrong to the East. So far as I know, no statement has yet been made in regard to that, just as no statement has yet been made in regard to the commandeering of wheat, anxiously as we have been looking for it. We would be pleased to have a statement from the minister as to the policy and how it worked out.

Mr. REID: I explained that matter the other evening in the hon. member's absence, but I will do so again. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) made a rate of six cents from Armstrong to Montreal and Quebec during the season while navigation was closed, and so far as the Transcontinental is concerned that rate is still being kept in force between Armstrong and Quebec. A quantity of grain has been carried over the Transcontinental during the season between the closing of navigation and the opening.

Mr. KNOWLES: What was the reason for giving that special rate?

Mr. REID: It was in order to relieve the congestion in the West by taking the grain East. There was a very large crop, and the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur were filled.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did it relieve the situation?

Mr. REID: Eight million bushels were carried over the Transcontinental.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a mere bagatelle.

Mr. REID: I think it was quite a help to take out 8,000,000 bushels. I do not know whether the member from the West will agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. KNOWLES: Where did the grain go to?

Mr. REID: To Quebec, St. John, Halifax and Montreal. Some was shipped through to St. John for export.

Mr. KNOWLES: Via Quebec?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: How much?

Mr. REID: I cannot tell off-hand.

Mr. KNOWLES: Approximately? That is a very important matter.

Mr. REID: I can get the figures. I know there was grain shipped to the elevator at Quebec for storage until the opening of navigation.

Mr. KNOWLES: What is its storage capacity?

Mr. REID: One million five hundred thousand bushels. Some went to Halifax for export, and of course a lot went to Montreal for export.

Mr. KNOWLES: What went to Montreal does not concern us, because it would not go by the Government road.

Mr. REID: All the ports were congested.

Mr. KNOWLES: How much grain went to Halifax and how much to St. John for

export? What route did it go by, and what was the rate from Winnipeg to the shipping point?

Did six cents carry it to the seaport? If not, how much did it cost to carry the wheat from Winnipeg to the seaport? Can the minister state now what that rate was?

Mr. REID: I have not these rates before me. But six cents is the summer rate to Montreal, and that rate would be added to if the grain had to be sent to Portland, St. John, or Halifax. But the six-cent rate must have been quite a help, I should think, because it mean that they got the summer rate from the closing to the opening of navigation. The rate from Winnipeg to Armstrong is similar to that from Winnipeg to Fort William.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman will see that this was equalizing the rate between Winnipeg and Montreal. The six-cent rate would be practically the same as that by rail to Port Arthur and thence by vessel to Montreal, and thus it should have been a great advantage to those who were able to ship during the winter season.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it not true that there is really no elevator system to speak of in connection with the Government system of railways? The elevator at St. John was burned down two years ago, and not a step has been taken to rebuild it. St. John formerly had good elevator accommodation. There is no elevator accommodation whatever in connection with the Transcontinental. So, while the rate was given to Quebec, there was no encouragement to shippers, no facilities were provided for handling the grain at the seaport. The result is that little advantage was taken of the rate. The minister speaks of eight million bushels as though it were a large quantity. With proper elevator accommodation and train service the Transcontinental ought to have carried ten times as much. Why, there is over ten million bushels of wheat, on the Goose Lake Branch of the Canadian Northern alone, hung up during the season to the very great loss of the farmers. Yet, the minister talks about eight millions as a large quantity to be carried over the Transcontinental, one of the finest railways in the world—at least it is one of the finest so far as it was carried out under the auspices of the late Government. If the Government had got to work at the proper time, had rebuilt the St. John elevator, and had enlarged the elevator accommodation at Halifax and Quebec, the Transcontinental might have been made a real factor in the transportation situation. Surely, before these Estimates pass, the Government ought to give an explanation of their want of activity, their want of foresight, their want of attention to the necessities of the case. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is one that ought to be acted upon. The Minister of Railways coming before this Parliament is like a board of directors coming to consult the shareholders—we representatives of the people are here on behalf of those who have to bear the burdens. The minister tells us: I want you to vote $19,000,000 for various works to be carried on. The people, through their representatives in this Parliament, say to the Government: When you are asking for these vast amounts of money you ought to show your hand, you ought to lay your cards upon the table, and let us know what further obligations you are going to ask us during the present session to bear. The hon. member for South Renfrew says that the rumour is widespread and the statements made are specific and positive. And to enforce what he said, I saw the statement to-day in the Toronto News. If there is a newspaper in Canada that is close to this Government, that finds a resting place in the very bosom of many prominent members, it is the Toronto News. I believe the editor of that newspaper enjoys with reference to this Government a stronger position than Colonel Allison enjoyed with the Minister of Militia. The editor of the News is the guide, philosopher, friend and adviser of this Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And biographer?

Mr. PUGSLEY: He wrote biography in the days before sin had spread so widely over this country and before many good men had been led astray, the editor of the Toronto News among them.

Mr. REID: What about yourself?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend knows all sides.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will tell my hon. friend something about that. I was once a Conservative; but it was a long time ago. My hon. friend knows that there was then the same inactivity with regard to transportation, the same want of attention to

the maritime ports as there is unfortunately to-day; so that many good Conservatives fell away from my hon. friend. Much as they like him personally, yet politically they could not quite stand him, because he did not seem to have that regard for the interests of the country that he should have had. It was about that time too that I took to reading my Bible very carefully. I found that in the old biblical times there were two parties, there was the Liberal party and the party that stood in the place of the Tories of the present day. They were called churls at that time. And I found that the Liberals, even in those old days, had a reputation and enjoyed a popularity for their virtue which has remained with them even down to the present time. I am sorry to see that the party of my hon. friend, the party opposed to the Liberals are not given a very good character in the Bible. I have great faith in the good book. I recommend my hon. friend to read it. If he likes, I will call his attention to passages which he will find particularly interesting.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman might quote, just as a test of his knowledge.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would ask the Acting Minister of Railways why it is that although the Government elevator at St. John was burned down at least two years ago, no steps have been taken to rebuild it. To my mind, it appears inexplicable, especially in view of the fact that, immediately on the outbreak of the war, the Government urged upon the farmers of the West the need of increased production, and, to that end, the planting of more land in grain. Of course, that implied an undertaking on the part of the Government that, so far as it was concerned, it would do everything possible to have the grain sent forward as cheaply and expeditiously as possible and would afford every facility for transportation.

It strikes me as very inexcusable that the Government should allow that important plant in connection with the Government railway system to remain unbuilt. I should like to know, also, why the Government took no steps to provide elevator accommodation in connection with the Transcontinental railway. The other day the acting minister stated that the Transcontinental was completed away back in September, 1914, even though it was only partially completed. By some peculiar process of reasoning the minister seems to think that a railway—or house, I suppose, or store—might be completed when it was only partially completed. However, that was the view the Government took, and from that time to the present they have provided no elevator accommodation in connection with the Transcontinental railway. I think the minister ought to explain that. In view of the fact that the minister is unable to deny the rumours that are being circulated in the press that Parliament will be called upon to assume further obligations on behalf of the people, he ought, as would be the act of a prudent minister, to say to us: We will not ask you to pass these items just now. We will wait until we can lay before you all the obligations which you shall be called upon to assume on behalf of the people, and we will ask you to consider with us whether we shall have the means, through direct and indirect taxes and other sources of revenue, to provide for these other burdens, as well as all the amounts which are included in these Estimates; we will consider the whole matter carefully and in the best interests of the people. Does the minister not see what madness it would be for us to vote $19,000,000 if next week we shall be called upon to assume on behalf of the people obligations amounting to $20,000,000, or $30,000,000, or $40,000,000 in respect to other railway companies? It seems to me that the suggestion of the hon. member for South Renfrew—the suggestion of a prudent member of Parliament, who represents some of the people who are to bear these burdens—is reasonable and should be adopted. I should be glad if the minister will explain why the elevator accommodation has not been replaced upon the Intercolonial, and why it has not been enlarged in view of the necessity of providing for increased transportation of grain; also, why no elevator has been provided in connection with the Transcontinental?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: In reference to the question asked by the member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), may I ask the minister how the Government came to undertake to secure this low rate for carrying wheat? Were they requested to do so by any set of men or by any association? I would ask also if they have carried all or nearly all the grain that has been offered in connection with this low rate to Quebec?

Mr. REID: The arrangement to which the hon. gentleman refers was made by the

hon. Minister of Railways himself. As I understand it, it was represented to him that there was such a large crop that the Fort William and Port Arthur elevators would not be able to hold all the grain that the railways could carry to them. It was shown to him that the lake-and-rail rate from Port Arthur to Montreal was about 6 cents a bushel, and he was asked if he could not put that rate in force, say from Armstrong, which would be practically the same point as Port Arthur or Fort William, during the winter season, and thus relieve the congestion in the West as much as possible. He put that rate in force, and relieved the situation to the extent of about 8,000,000 bushels of grain that were carried. More grain might have been carried if we had had fuller equipment. Taking the railway over on the 1st of July without any equipment whatever—no engines, no cars, nothing at all to operate the railway—we were forced to take some seventy-five engines off the Intercolonial and as many cars as we could spare in order to operate the line between Winnipeg and the East. With the small facilities that we had, we could not do any more than we have done. There is no doubt that many requests came from the West for operation of the Transcontinental to as great an extent as possible, in order that the grain might be carried over that line, thus relieving the situation in the West.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Has any effort been made to get the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific railway to give similar rates?

Mr. REID: I cannot say that. The Minister of Railways made the arrangements. I will find that out, though, and let the hon. member know at the next sitting. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) asked a question regarding the elevator at St. John. The elevator that we had there was burned down. We all realize, of course, that that elevator was not of a sufficient capacity for the Government railway system at that port.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was it not of the same capacity as the elevator at Halifax?

Mr. REID: Yes, but I mean for the future.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The capacity was about 750,000 bushels.

Mr. REID: I understand it is the intention to have a very much larger elevator located on Courtenay bay. Of course, that is in connection with the Public Works Department, and I do not know exactly what the conditions are.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to correct the minister, if he will allow me. Mr. Gutelius, General Manager of the Intercolonial railway, has said that the elevator will be built, not upon Courtenay bay but in the vicinity of the sugar refinery.

Mr. REID: I understand that the elevator is to be built near the sugar refinery out on the point.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is not on Courtenay bay.

Mr. REID: The trackage that is necessary in connection with Courtenay bay is really a part of the elevator scheme. I realize that it is absolutely necessary to have an elevator there. It is necessary to have an elevator in the western section, near Winnipeg or Transcona. This fire, however, occurred since the war started, and we have had a great deal of difficulty so far as finances are concerned. At any rate, expenditures are so large that if we have been able to hold off anything for a short time we have tried to do so. The hon. member for St. John has been complaining very seriously about expenditures that we are making—expenditures that we cannot stop; at St. John he wishes us to make a very large expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That elevator was burned down before the war began.

Mr. REID: I think it was after the outbreak of war. It may have been just about that time. I have urged strongly that the elevator at St. John be constructed as soon as possible. We also require an elevator in the neighbourhood of Transcona, so that the grain can be weighed and inspected at that point instead of being taken during the winter months to Fort William and Port Arthur before being passed on to Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax. These elevators must be built. We must have elevators at St. John and Halifax with very large capacities in order to meet the demands during the winter months.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is what the people there have been thinking for the last two years.

Mr. REID: I cannot understand why the hon. member for St. John should object to work being done at any other point. He wants it all done at St. John. He will vote

for millions to be expended on Courtenay bay or in the building of elevators at St. John, but objects to one dollar being spent in Montreal or at any other place.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend must take that back. The statement he has made is absolutely wrong, and absolutely untrue. I do not say that it was deliberate; the Acting Minister of Railways would never be guilty of a deliberate untruth. But the trouble with him is the extraordinary forgetfulness from which he suffers. Does he not remember that at the last session of Parliament I almost took my political life in my hands, so far as St. John was concerned, when I stated that I would favour cutting the appropriations in half. The cutting down was done all round, and when the Minister of Public Works asked me if I would consent to the appropriations for St. John being cut in half, I said that I would, and I was attacked most bitterly by the Conservative newspapers in St. John for my statement at that time. I have never hesitated to vote for all needed appropriations for other parts of the country, and while I am not afraid to stand up for my own constituency and demand justice, I have always tried to be fair. I would not regard the grain elevator at St. John as a new work at all. The old elevator was part of the equipment or plant connected with the Government system of railways. It was a necessary adjunct of the railway, and a necessary part of its plant. That elevator was burned down upwards of two years ago, I think; I am quite sure it was before the war broke out. But a new elevator would not be a new work in the sense in which we speak of hundreds of new works provided for in these Estimates. It would be a case of merely restoring a portion of the plant of the Government railway system which had been destroyed by fire. The rebuilding of that elevator is just as necessary in the interests of western Canada as it is in the interests of the port of St. John. There are elevators in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway at the port of St. John which are not entirely in the interests of, or for the benefit of, St. John. If we did not have elevators there, either the grain from the West would not be shipped at all, or it would be shipped in the winter season wholly from American ports. I am sorry to say that a vast deal of the western grain is being shipped at the present time from American ports, but, if it were not for the elevators of the Canadian Pacific railway, it would likely all go that way. The acting minister said that I ask for millions and millions of dollars for St. John. I have never done so. I remember that when the minister came to St. John, shortly after he took office, he tried to make the people believe that I had been very sparing in making appropriations for St. John, that I was not treating St. John well at all. At a banquet which was given to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works, my hon. friend will remember he was called upon to make a speech, and he said that he had had an opportunity of visiting Courtenay bay, that he was much impressed with the wonderful possibilities of a great harbour there. He said: "Pugsley has provided, so far as I can see, for only eighteen or twenty docks; now, gentlemen, I want you to understand that if you are of opinion that he has not provided docks on a sufficiently large scale, all you have to do is to come to me, as Minister of Customs, and I will enlarge this undertaking, and you can rely upon getting millions upon millions of dollars provided out of the overflowing revenues of the country." I merely wish to put my hon. friend right. I am sure he will be the first to apologize for the very unfair remarks which he made with reference to me.

Mr. BURNHAM: It seems to me that there is some sort of an arrangement by which the motive originally underlying this discussion should be lost sight of. We had first of all a reference which I did not quite understand by the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). He suggested that the cards be put on the table. What kind of game is he proposing to play? Then we had hardly got through with that very doubtful suggestion when another hon. gentleman suggested that the Liberal party was speaking from the loins of Judas Iscariot, or made some such Scriptural reference as that. These things, however, did not suffice to obscure the illusion which both the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made, namely, that they did not wish to express their opinion on this $19,000,000 item because they wished to keep it fresh for the $20,000,000, $30,000,000, or $40,000,000 subsidies that they believe are to be brought down later on. That is, they must be quite willing to grant some of the subsidies which they pretend to object to, because they do not want to impair

the present item in the event of their being brought down; otherwise, there is no sense in their references at all. They would give the impression to the country that they are strongly opposed to any money being paid to any of those other undertakings. They back up into position, giving the people the impression that they are facing one way when as a matter of fact they are going another way. But I go further, I strongly object to giving those roads another dollar. I have objected all along, and I object now; and I know that the people object. As for the Conservative journals, especially the Toronto News, it is diametrically opposed to giving any of those roads another cent, let alone another dollar. I think it should be well understood that this is the opinion of the country. But I think the situation is dangerous, and therefore I have ventured to protest. I think it extremely dangerous that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) should say that in the event of this $19,000,000 item being reserved, he would be ready and willing to undertake the consideration of a $20,000,000, $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 subsidy. There is something wrong somewhere.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member for St. John did not happen to say that.

Mr. BURNHAM: I think the hon. gentleman will find that he did say so; otherwise why did he mention $20,000,000, $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my hon. friend want an answer?

Mr. BURNHAM: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I said was this: if the Government intends to come down with a proposition to impose upon the people an obligation of $20,000,000, $30,000,000 or $40,000,000, this item should stand so that the whole matter can be considered, having reference to the resources of the people and their ability to pay.

Mr. BURNHAM: Precisely so. What I say is that this matter should not be considered at all. The hon. gentleman is prepared to consider it. That is exactly the statement I am making: I am not prepared to consider it. The farmers whom I represent—and I am partly a farmer myself—are not so green as not to see through this veiled reference, this pretending to take a stand and then backing up into position so that the hon. gentlemen will be ready to be convinced at the last moment and be overawed by the Government majority, after they have put up—and I say it without disrespect—a fake opposition. I am opposed to it.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend says that he is opposed to any further assistance to either of these railways; but if the Government comes down and proposes to give them assistance my hon. friend will back it up just as every other hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will.

Mr. BURNHAM: I did not do so before; I walked out.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend was talking about backing up to a position. He backs out of a position altogether. I cannot see that he is half as courageous as his colleagues. His colleagues stay in the House and support the Government that they were elected to support, right or wrong, but my hon. friend gets out of the difficulty by walking out of the House.

Mr. BURNHAM: If he gets out of the difficulty what is the matter with that?

Mr. TURRIFF: What I rose for was to ask the minister if the rate of 6 cents a bushel that the Transcontinental railway gives from Armstrong to Montreal or Quebec is going to be continued in force during the summer as well as during the winter? I would also like to know whether there was a profit or loss to the railway in carrying wheat at 6 cents a bushel from Armstrong to Montreal or Quebec. I have always understood that that rate would give a very handsome profit on a road constructed like the National Transcontinental railway, with good grades, upon which one engine could take sixty cars loaded with 1,100 bushels each, or about 65,000 bushels, and haul them from Armstrong down to Quebec. I would like to know if the railway made a profit or a loss for the Government.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Does the hon. gentleman know what the distance is from Armstrong to Quebec?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes; about 950 miles.

Mr. REID: There was no profit in it; in fact, there was a loss when the wheat was taken to Montreal, for the reason that there were three railways that had to get a portion of the six cents; there was the Transcontinental, the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario, and the Grand Trunk

from North Bay to Montreal. You can see that if you have to divide that rate up, it makes a very small portion for each railway. We can carry grain from Armstrong to Quebec at a profit, but we cannot do so when the grain has to be hauled over three railways. I think we probably made a little out of taking the grain to Quebec.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am very glad to hear that grain, at 6 cents a bushel, can be carried from Armstrong to Quebec at a profit. I would expect that to be the case, because the object for which the railway was built was to carry grain out of the western country. What was the through rate during the winter from Armstrong to tidewater at St. John or Halifax? My understanding is that although the Government gave a rate of 6 cents a bushel from Armstrong to Quebec or Montreal, the through rate over the Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to St. John was exactly equal to the old Canadian Pacific rate from Winnipeg to St. John, and that, instead of there being a lower rate, instead of it being something good for the people of the West and of Canada, it was nothing more or less than a fake rate arrived at by charging less on one portion of the Government road and charging more on the balance of the Government road.

Mr. KNOWLES: You mean that it was a gold brick?

Mr. TURRIFF: It was a gold brick, nothing more or less, and it gave no outlet for the wheat. The only advantage that there might be in it was the storage that might be secured in Montreal or Quebec. It was generally understood that when the Government gave this rate they were giving something that would be of advantage to the people of Canada. But when they fixed a rate of 6 cents a bushel for 950 or 1,000 miles, and then added to the rate for the balance of the journey so as to bring it up to the old Canadian Pacific rate and so that there should be no competition whatever, how much good were they doing to the people of Canada? That is the information I have, and I believe it is correct.

Mr. REID: I would like the hon. member to give me his authority for that statement. There is a through summer rate on the Canadian Pacific, lake and rail, from Winnipeg to St. John. It goes by Port Arthur or Fort William, then by water and rail to St. John.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. TURRIFF: What is that summer rate?

Mr. REID: I cannot give the exact rate. The rate from Winnipeg to Port Arthur and Fort William is the same as the rate from Winnipeg to Armstrong. Then, from Armstrong to Montreal and Quebec the rate is 6 cents, the same as the summer lake-and-rail rate. When the grain reaches Armstrong on the Transcontinental, it takes the 6-cent rate and goes to Quebec and then on to St. John at the same rate as they carry over the Canadian Pacific in the summer time, that is, the summer rate from Winnipeg to St. John, lake and rail.

Mr. TURRIFF: I understand that perfectly well. If the Government. on the Transcontinental, can carry grain from Armstrong to Quebec for six cents a bushel at a profit, why cannot they carry it at the same proportionate rate from Quebec to St. John? That seems to be reasonable. That is the only advantage that the people of Canada can obtain. There is no object in cutting down the rate on 1,000 miles of the road and doubling it up on the remaining portion. If you can carry grain at a profit, with a rate of 6 cents a bushel, for the distance between Armstrong and Quebec, surely you ought to make a better profit if you carry it down to St. John at the same proportionate rate per mile, because you will not have the stoppages and all the loss incidental to stoppages. My hon. friend said a moment ago that the equipment allowed them to handle only 8,000,000 bushels, and he spoke as if 8,000,000 was a very considerable amount of wheat. In some ways it is, but it is only one-fortieth part, or 2½ per cent of last year's crop. What was this road built for? What has the Government been doing when, after four years when the grain is there and cannot be taken out in any other way, when the business is offering and the Government road could carry it at a profit, as the minister says—what has the Government been doing in those four years that their equipment is only capable of handling 8,000,000 bushels during the winter season? My hon. friend has a great deal of explanation ahead of him to convince the people of Canada that the Government has been dealing fairly with the National Transcontinental. Here was the business offering, here was the wheat in danger of being lost—and a great deal of it has been lost for lack of storage capacity in the West—and here was the National Transcontinental, a first-class road,

built at large expense; here was tide-water at St. John and Halifax; and, according to the minister, the grain could be carried at a profit by the railway. But the grain has not been carried; the farmers have not been relieved; they have lost tens of thousands of bushels of grain; and the Government comes forward and says they are able to carry only 8,000,000 bushels. Surely the minister has some better explanation than that, because that is no explanation at all. Let me draw my hon. friend's attention and the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to another thing—something that the Minister of Trade and Commerce might have done when he commandeered the 16,000,000 bushels of wheat. Some time towards the end of last October I was out West in the town of Estevan, in my constituency. The men on the market there were quoting 93 or 94 cents, I forget which, for wheat on the track; that is, a farmer could get 93 or 94 cents if he was able to get a car and loaded it up. If he could not get a car and could not get the wheat on the track, he could only get 83 or 84 cents a bushel, or exactly 10 cents a bushel less than what the wheat brought on the track. The wheat buyer is not to blame for this. If he buys wheat toward the end of October and is unable to get a car, he puts the grain in his elevator, and has to figure on storage, insurance of the wheat, and interest on the cost until the following May. That means that he is going to pay just that much less for his wheat. I say that the Transcontinental could have

5 p.m.

taken the wheat from Estevan or any other point along the line at the rate of 6 cents a bushel that the minister has spoken of as being the rate from Armstrong to Montreal or Quebec—roughly speaking, a distance of 1,000 miles—and could have carried it at that rate to St. John. It could certainly carry it at a cheaper rate than the Canadian Pacific railway by lake and rail; therefore, there is no reason why the farmer in the West should be soaked 10 cents a bushel towards the close of navigation, simply because he is not sure of being able to get his wheat out. If the Government had had the necessary equipment and facilities for carrying the grain to St. John and Halifax, the farmers would have got 10 cents a bushel more for their wheat. After all this amount has been put into the railway, apparently hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem anxious to give the railway a fair show. If the Government had been desirous of doing the right thing by the Transcontinental they would have provided the necessary equipment, the rolling stock, and the necessary facilities at tide-water, so that the grain could have been taken at any time of the year down to St. John or Halifax at the rate the minister gave last winter for the 1,000 miles. The wheat could have been loaded into the ships there and the farmers would have saved a large amount on the price of their wheat. It would have added easily 10 per cent to the price they got. Every body from the West knows that towards the close of navigation the price of wheat goes down to cover the expense of keeping it during the winter. Here was a road built for the purpose of relieving matters, and well suited for the work; and if it had had the necessary equipment and technical facilities it could have handled the wheat to the advantage of the whole country, not only giving the farmers a much better price for their wheat, but enabling the road to earn interest on its cost.

With regard to the wheat that was commandeered I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce could have bought wheat after the close of navigation at considerably less than the Fort William price. The wheat could have been hauled over the Transcontinental to tide-water, and shipped to whatever point it was destined for; and in that way, either the purchasers would have got the wheat for a lower price or the farmers in the West would have got a higher price; and the railway, built by the country at a large expense, would have had an opportunity of doing the very thing for which it was built, and of earning interest on the money that had been put into it.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is the minister going to tell the House how this rate of six cents a bushel, from Armstrong to Montreal or Quebec, or ten cents a hundred, which is the same thing, was going to relieve the situation so much? We are all very much in the dark how it could relieve it. The point is that the rate to the seaboard from Quebec, which in winter is of course ice-bound, was more than as much again as the rate from Armstrong, although the distance was not half as much as the distance from Armstrong to Quebec. The Government owns two sets of rails—the new Transcontinental and the old Intercolonial—and has every facility for giving a cheaper rate. If they were sincere—and I am not saying they were not—in their desire to get this wheat to a place of export, the minister should

tell us why they did not put in a cheap rate for export purposes. This rate to Quebec was a joke so far as export purposes were concerned.

Mr. REID: I explained that a few minutes ago. In the summer season the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific railway companies have a certain rate between Winnipeg and St. John and Halifax. The lowest rate of the whole year is the rate during the summer season. What was done by the Minister of Railways and Canals was this: he estimated the rate between Winnipeg and Armstrong, which is at a point equal to Port Arthur or Fort William. Then between Armstrong and Montreal he put into force a six-cent rate, so that the farmers in the West would have during the winter season the advantage of the lowest rate they could get on any railway for lake-and-rail transportation during the summer season.

Mr. KNOWLES: Where did the grain go in the winter time?

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that the terminus of the Canadian Pacific railway is St. John, and that during the winter time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company charges a much higher rate from Winnipeg to St. John than it does in the summer. The reason for that is that there is lake-and-rail transportation during the summer.

Mr. KNOWLES: There is no rate to St. John in the summer?

Mr. REID: There is to Montreal, and there is a rate to St. John in the winter. The farmers of the West had the advantage of the summer rate between Winnipeg and Montreal, and from Montreal to St. John they had the Canadian Pacific railway rate.

Mr. KNOWLES: What advantage did they have by using this combination rate over what they had by using the Canadian Pacific rate before your rate went into effect?

Mr. REID: When the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William were filled the farmers of the West had to leave their grain either in their storehouses, or in the fields, or ship it over the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern railway from Winnipeg to St. John, or to Portland, and if they shipped it over the Canadian Pacific railway they had to pay the winter rate. By shipping the grain over the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental they had the advantage of the summer rate between Winnipeg and Montreal.

Mr. KNOWLES: What advantage did they receive by sending it to Montreal?

Mr. REID: They could send it on to St. John or any other winter port at the summer rate. Suppose a farmer had a thousand bushels of wheat to ship from Winnipeg. If he shipped it over the Canadian Pacific railway to St. John or to Portland, he would pay a high rate, because the Canadian Pacific rate is higher in the winter than in the summer. If he shipped it over the Government railways, he would get the advantage of the summer rate between Armstrong and Montreal; and the rate over the Canadian Pacific railway or the Government railway between Montreal and St. John is the same. The Transcontinental relieved the congestion in the West to the extent of 8,000,000 bushels. Hon. members complain that we did not ship out more. They say that we should have been ready to transport millions upon millions of bushels from the West. I have explained several times that we took over this road on the 1st of July; the Grand Trunk Pacific operated it for a month or two until we could get some engines and cars from the Intercolonial, but we robbed the Intercolonial of cars and engines in order to operate the Transcontinental as well as we did during the past winter. Hon. members know that it is an absolute impossibility to have engines and cars manufactured in a few days; they know that it takes several months to get equipment. We are trying to get it as quickly as possible, but a large number of cars and engines are necessary to operate a thousand miles of railway between Winnipeg and Moncton. This winter I was very sorry that we had to take seventy-five engines and a thousand cars from the Intercolonial in order to operate the Transcontinental; because if we had had those engines and cars on the Intercolonial, we would have moved a very much larger quantity of freight between Montreal and St. John and Halifax during the winter.

Mr. GRAHAM: You leased a number of engines?

Mr. REID: We leased twelve or thirteen engines from the Canadian Pacific railway and one or two from the Bangor and Aroostook railway. We did everything possible to get more engines. We had no equipment of any kind to start with, and I think we did very well with the equipment

that we were able to put on the Transcontinental.

I do not say that there is very much profit in the six-cent rate between Armstrong and Quebec, but it pays with a trainload such as I have stated. The Transcontinental has to be operated during the whole year, and in the summer months not very much freight is carried over this railway owing to the lake-and-rail transportation. When I say that the six-cent rate paid, I mean that it paid a small amount over the operation of the train.

During this year we are going to buy more engines and cars, so that when the crop is harvested, we shall be able to carry a very much larger quantity of grain than we did last year. It is only along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific that we can assist in relieving congestion, because there is enough grain along that line to keep us busy.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: The minister has admitted that about a thousand cars and seventy-five engines have been taken from the Intercolonial to operate the Transcontinental. What steps does he propose taking to restore that equipment to the Intercolonial? A great many complaints have been received at Moncton of the inefficient service rendered by the Intercolonial during the past year. Lumbermen, cattlemen, stock dealers, and mining corporations have been complaining that they could not get cars. The passenger service during the past eight months or so has been almost disgraceful, the engines being wheezy, broken-down affairs, worse than the horses sold in Kings county to the Militia Department; in fact, those horses were Arabian steeds compared with the engines on the Intercolonial. There has been scarcely a passenger train that has not been two or three or four hours late, and the general complaint through the Maritime Provinces is that the service has been very bad. The reason was not apparent then, but it is apparent now: The Intercolonial was robbed in order that the Transcontinental might be operated. I do not think that is fair. The people of the Maritime Provinces have a right to receive as good treatment as they have been accustomed to receive in years gone by. The Intercolonial is a Government road and the service should not be impaired in the manner it has been. The minister must have known, when he was taking over the Grand Trunk Pacific, that he would require cars and engines, and it is altogether nonsense to say that it is impossible to procure cars and engines. Had he taken the precaution he would have had no difficulty in getting them; there are many car-building establishments in the country who would have been only too glad to be employed at any time within the last two or three years. I would like to ask if he has taken any steps to restore the efficiency of the Intercolonial—which was none too good before?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think it would be better that the question that has already been referred to, the reduction of rate from Armstrong to Montreal, should be more fully dealt with before we go into other matters. I do not know whether the minister can say now what the rate was from Armstrong to Montreal before the reduction was made. As I understand the situation, we are paying the same rate exactly from Winnipeg to Armstrong that we paid before, that is, six cents a bushel; and, as I understand further, we are paying the same rate from Montreal to St. John that we paid before. I am not trying to support the Government in not making a greater reduction, but I wish to be fair, as no doubt they wish to be fair. If the rate from Winnipeg to Armstrong is the same as it was before, and if the rate from Montreal to St. John is the same as it was before, and if the rate between Armstrong and Montreal has been very much reduced, then certainly there must have been a reduction on the whole.

Mr. KNOWLES: No, for this reason: The freight rate to St. John is not made up by the addition of these three rates, but it is a through export rate.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Has the through rate from Montreal to St. John been added to? Is it more than it was before the Government undertook to make this reduction?

Mr. KNOWLES: It will cost a person more now to the seaboard if he uses these rates over parts of the route, and also uses the local rate from Armstrong to Quebec.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I understood that the rate was the same as it had been from Winnipeg to Armstrong and the rate was the same as it had been from Montreal to St. John. If, then, the Government made a reduction over a thousand miles of rail haul, there must have been a benefit to the farmers of the West.

Mr. REID: Undoubtedly, there was a large reduction. There is a through rate between Winnipeg and Montreal, which obtains now in the summer season. In the winter time the grain has to go over the railway right through to Portland, St. John, or Halifax, and on that there is a through rate. But the rate on the Canadian Pacific was higher than it was on the Transcontinental and Government railways through to St. John or,—if it went over the Grand Trunk—to Portland.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister give us the rate?

Mr. REID: I cannot give it offhand.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister have this in mind—that owing to there being no elevator accommodation at St. John, there was no way by which the grain could be shipped from that port unless it came from the east side of the Interoclonial terminus, across to the docks on the west side? Does not he know that that would have to be added to the freight on grain coming over the Transcontinental to St. John? It would be very interesting to know what rate was actually paid from Winnipeg to West St. John by Transcontinental and the Intercolonial. I think he will find that the rate is the same as the rate by the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. KNOWLES: The same to a cent.

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister is in error. The rate was lowered for a stretch in the middle of the haul. But to seek to take advantage of that would yield no advantage to the shipper. If an exporter had 10,000 bushels of grain, and decided that he would take advantage of that low rate from Armstrong to Montreal or Quebec, and then were to pay the local rate from Winnipeg to Armstrong and the local rate from Quebec to salt water, he would be out several cents a bushel.

Mr. REID: As compared with the rate between Winnipeg and St. John on the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. KNOWLES: As contrasted with the through rate to St. John, either by the Canadian Pacific or by the Grand Trunk. If the minister were to go into the shipping office of the Government railway in Winnipeg and then were to visit the shipping office of the Canadian Pacific, he would be quoted the same figures to a cent and even a decimal of a cent. The rate is 33¾ cents per hundred or 20¼ cents a bushel. Unfortunately, the minister does not know the figures, nor have I the figures by me; but the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and I have gone into this carefully, and we ascertained clearly that if a shipper were to try to take advantage of this lower rate he would be money out of pocket on the haul over the whole route. This is the one thing that the minister's department pretended to do for the farmers—and I do not use the word "pretended" offensively. Now, when we try to ascertain what it really means, a remarkable thing is that neither the acting minister nor the bevy of officers attending him on the floor, can tell us the through rate. One would have thought that this would be the one thing that they would have been able to state. Of course, I am not here to criticise the officers; it may not be reasonable to expect them to have this information or they would have had it.

Mr. REID: I will get it.

Mr. KNOWLES: And I hope the minister will find out how much grain went to St. John from the West and how much to Halifax, and what he paid. And would he ascertain whether the amount so paid was arrived at by taking account of the rate of six cents a bushel from Armstrong to Quebec, or was a through export rate obtained from Winnipeg, or from whatever point the wheat started from, to salt water? I am sure that not one of the minister's officials will tell him that the through rate from the prairies to salt water was one cent a bushel less over his railway than over the Canadian Pacific The minister talks about the summer rate to Quebec or Montreal. But what is the good of that on wheat that is going through in the middle of winter?—you might as well tell the shipper that his bill of lading is of a pretty colour. The story we get from the Government is that the Allies want our wheat, and we are anxious that they should get it. But the Government do not in fact promote this trade. We have Government internal storage elevators that we cannot get filled. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has the wisdom not to get into this discussion though the matter relates in part to his department. When the announcement was made that this benign Government—and I think a great deal of the Government in some respects—would make this concession for the

benefit of the farmers, naturally the farmers were greatly pleased. But when they came to take advantage of it, they found that they had been acting under a misapprehension and that the change would not benefit them by a single cent; the figure is the same by the two railways, and there is absolutely no reduction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A gold brick.

Mr. KNOWLES: I did not say that, though I confess the word was in my mind; but I do not wish to talk party politics in this matter. It was a gold brick that did not do anybody any harm. But, on the other hand, it did not do them any good, because it was soon found out. But there is this criticism that we have to make—if they can carry the wheat from Armstrong to Quebec at six cents a bushel and make money, or even pay expenses, it is a crime for them to charge eight and a fraction cents per bushel from Quebec to salt water. Because in doing this they are charging about one-third more for a haul of only half the distance. There is a nigger in the fence somewhere.

They either did not want the farmer to get the good price, or they did not want to make this new railway a success. They are no fools in the Railway Department. They knew when they put that rate on that the stuff would not go to the salt water; they did not want to see it go through and make a booming business over that railway. Why did they not establish just as good a rate on the Intercolonial, instead of maintaining a rate that is more than double? If they can afford to carry grain at that rate through that new country in Northern Ontario and Quebec there is no excuse for charging a rate doubly as high from Quebec to St. John and Halifax. These are points that I would like the minister to look into and to inform himself upon.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Hon. gentlemen on the other side are difficult to please. I suppose the Minister of Railways had not the least idea that he would be called upon to operate the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, which was not taken over, I understand, until the first of July of last year. That road was built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and was supposed to be operated by them; yet hon. gentlemen on the other side have been calling the Minister of Railways to book because four years ago he did not start to provide rolling stock for the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Is that quite a fair thing to do? Surely not. Again, when the Minister of Railways tried to alleviate the situation—and my hon. friends from the West know it to have been serious—in the interests of the Western farmer, by taking from the Intercolonial railway what the Intercolonial could ill spare, a number of engines and a large number of cars, and sent them to do that Western duty for the Western farmer, then came forward a member from Nova Scotia declaring that it was a crime against nature and the Maritime Provinces that seventy-five engines, or any number of engines and cars, should be taken from the Intercolonial railway, which, to the infinite disgust and discontent and confusion of Maritime Province dwellers, was left with only wheezy consumptives. He had not the heart to allow the Western farmer to get a single bit of solace or comfort; he and his own home must be looked after, no matter what became of the farmer's wheat. That shows the infinite difficulty of pleasing everybody. I am sure my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways will take a little comfort from the fact that he has steered the right course. The member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) contends that no good has been done to the western farmer by the moving of 8,000,000 bushels of wheat out by this line during a portion of the winter. I think that this has been beneficial to the western farmer.

Mr. KNOWLES: I did not say that it had not been beneficial; I said that the western farmer did not get the grain to the salt water any cheaper.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Throughout the country west of Winnipeg and west of Saskatoon there was insufficient storage for the farmers' grain, and quantities of it were lying in a more or less exposed condition, and therefore liable to injury. The elevators became filled with grain, and storage could not be extended. This 8,000,000 bushels of grain was so much extracted from the storage capacity of the West, which left a vacancy for 8,000,000 bushels to be salved and put into that storage. My hon. friend says that that did no good to the western farmer unless he got his grain into the consumer's hands; getting it down to Quebec and Montreal was of no use to the farmer of the West and did not make his position any better. I think my hon. friend is wrong in that. The grain got down at a summer rate to the elevators

of Quebec and Montreal. No greater storage charge was paid in those elevators than would have been paid, I imagine, in the western storage position. The western farmer got this 8,000,000 bushels down at a summer rail rate, partly into storage and partly perhaps into ships. This grain was taken to eastern ports and placed in storage, thus relieving the storage capacity in the West and allowing grain which otherwise would not have had storage to get storage there, and it was a relief to the situation to that extent. My hon. friend stated that this road should have been thoroughly equipped, and should have begun to draw the grain out immediately after the crop had been gathered in the West. Well, little of it would go out by that route until the season of lake navigation was at an end. When the lake season is at an end and that line of out-go is closed, then the railways take hold of it and carry it as best they can. If my hon. friend had got out 8,000,000 or 18,000,000 or 30,000,000 bushels by the last of October, or the middle of November at the latest, not one bushel of it would have got any the quicker into the hands of the European consumer, simply because there was not the ocean tonnage to carry it. I think we ought to take that into consideration. Every bushel of wheat that was necessary and called for to fill the tonnage which it was possible to bring to the Atlantic ports, whether in Canada or not, was answerable to that call. That more did not go, that more could not go, was due to the fact that there was not the tonnage to take it away. The commandeered grain has been passing out through the Atlantic ports from the middle and later port of December until the present time, and there never was a moment when more grain was not waiting for the transports than there were transports to take it. What is true of that grain is true of grain generally, and would have been true of all grain that might have been brought out by that route or by any other route to Atlantic ports, whether Canadian or more southern Atlantic ports. Even if equipment had been available and the grain had been carried, it would not have passed into the hands of the ultimate purchaser and consumer in European countries any quicker. Whatever was carried did get the advantage of being close to the seaboard and of having got there at a summer rate; moreover, it will be ready when navigation opens in the summer, and further tonnage comes to take it away. Taking all these things into consideration I think that the congestion in the West was materially alleviated by bringing out these 8,000,000 bushels of grain, thus giving place to grain which would otherwise be deprived of storage.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not object at all to my hon. friend trying to defend the Government for its want of foresight, for its failure to equip the Transcontinental road. He and his colleagues have to make the best case possible, and I am quite content to leave their action or inaction to be judged by the public. But I do complain of the reference which my hon. friend made to the remarks of the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm). I think he rather twisted that hon. gentleman's remarks and gave them a meaning which they did not bear. What that hon. gentleman meant, as I understood him, was that instead of waiting until they had to get rolling stock for the Transcontinental and robbing the Intercolonial railway of its proper equipment, the Government should have taken time by the forelock and provided a proper equipment for the Transcontinental. That is what I understood the hon. member for Antigonish to say. Was that not reasonable? This Government, under the Act for the building of the Transcontinental railway, is given the power to operate various sections of the road pending its completion, and pending the time when the Grand Trunk Pacific would be required to enter into the 50-year lease for that portion of the road. This Government ought, I think, to have done one of two things when they came into office nearly five years ago. It should have made up its mind whether it was going to operate the road pending its entire completion, or whether it should enter into an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific to operate it. I have already called the attention of my hon. friend, but with very little effect apparently, to a statement which was made two, or perhaps three, years ago to the Minister of Railways in this House that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had offered to take over the road as the various sections were completed, pending the completion of the entire line; that they had offered to thoroughly equip the road with rolling stock to the satisfaction of this Government, and to operate it under the direction of the Government, and subject to examination by the accountants of the Government. They offered to hand over any profits

of operation to the treasury of the country, and all they stipulated for was that, if there should be any loss in the operation of the road, that loss should be added to the cost of the Transcontinental upon which they would be called upon to pay interest at the rate of three per cent.

I want the committee to remember that the Minister of Railways promised distinctly and positively to take the matter up with the present president of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and that he stated that he would inform this House of the result. But from that day to this, so far as appears from the statement of the acting Minister of Railways, this Government has made no effort whatever in that direction. Therefore, what was the obligation resting upon it? The obligation was that it should provide the equipment and get ready for the operation of this line of railway. That was their duty to the great producers of the West, and their duty to the people of the whole Dominion in whose interests this great undertaking was entered upon. But this Government does nothing, although, as I have said, it has been in power now for nearly five years. Having apparently made up its mind that it was going to operate the road; having done everything it could do to prevent the Grand Trunk Pacific from entering upon its operation, and having disregarded the contract and the specifications, thus rendering it not only possible but reasonable for the Grand Trunk Pacific to delay entering upon its operation, the obligation was on this Government. Did they not know what the railway was built for? My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce spoke as if he thought it was a great thing, as if the Government was entitled to infinite credit, because 8,000,000 bushels of wheat had been carried over the Transcontinental. What was the road built for but to carry grain and all kinds of products? It seems to me that far from being entitled to any credit for carrying such a small amount of grain, for the small equipment it had, and for the poor facilities it provided, it should be condemned because it did not make the necessary arrangements and get the necessary equipment. Did the Government not know that one of the grand ideas which was put forward in connection with the Transcontinental was that it was to give a cheap rate in the winter, so that wheat and other products could be carried in winter as well as in summer, and in summer as well as in winter. That was the object in getting the low grades; that was the object in building a splendid roadbed; that was the object in going to very large expense to build the road to a very high standard instead of building it to a secondary standard. Yet we find that though this Government had apparently for a long time made up its mind that it was going to operate this road, it was absolutely without equipment, absolutely unprepared to transport the products of the West to the markets of the old world.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that there was as much wheat carried as could be carried, because vessels were not available. Here again, we find a want of foresight. Ought not this Government to have foreseen, when the war broke out, that there would be transportation difficulties? Should it not have thought that vessels would be needed? Should it not have given some attention to the question of providing a Canadian merchant marine to meet the deficiency in vessels which has taken place. Not one step did it take to meet the transportation difficulty, and to-day, after twenty months of war, with the ships of the Empire disappearing from the ocean in too great numbers for the comfort of the people of Canada and of the Empire generally, we are in the same state of lethargy; at least, this Government is as before. Not a thing has been done; not a thing is being done to provide proper transportation, and the only excuse the Minister of Trade and Commerce makes for hauling a paltry quantity of 8,000,000 bushels of grain over the Transcontinental railway, is that, even if more had been hauled, it could not have been transported to the markets of the old world. That is the excuse for not building the elevator at St. John to replace the one that was burned; that is the excuse for not enlarging the elevator at Halifax; that is the excuse for not providing any elevator accommodation at the port of Quebec. Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce know that at the port of Buffalo there is elevator accommodation for 50,000,000 bushels of grain? The grain of the West is brought there and stored preparatory to being sent over the American railroads to Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia and transported to the markets of the old world. In this country, we have spent millions upon millions of dollars on this great transportation system, and yet the only elevator accommodation we have in Eastern Canada is that provided by the small elevator at the port of Halifax, with a capacity of

750,000 bushels. After being in office for nearly five years, that is all this Government has to show: our ships declining, no effort at shipbuilding, our elevators burned down, and no steps taken to rebuild them. The elevators which were burned down having demonstrated that they were not sufficient even for the traffic of the Intercolonial, and still less for the traffic over this great Transcontinental system, no effort has been made to enlarge them, and no effort has been made to give adequate elevator accommodation at Quebec, St. John, Halifax or any other port on the Atlantic coast. The pitiable excuse that the Minister of Trade and Commerce gives is that, while it is true that we brought but a little grain, we brought little because we did not have the equipment in the way of locomotives and cars, that even if we had brought more we had no elevator accommodation. that if we had brought it to the sea coast we had no ships to transport it; so that altogether, we have been obliged to allow millions upon millions of bushels of grain to remain rotting on the prairies of the West and we have hundreds and thousands of our farmers reduced to a state almost of poverty with thousands of bushels of grain, gathered after laborious toil, for which they can get no return. That is the condition in which our western country has been left. The minister has made his apology but I do not think it is an apology which will satisfy this House or the people of the country.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would like to ask the acting Minister of Railways and Canals a question. Grain can be hauled from Armstrong to Quebec, a distance of 932 miles, at a profit for 6 cents a bushel. The mileage from Winnipeg to Armstrong and from Quebec to St. John is 961 miles. Thus, two end pieces between Winnipeg and St. John have a mileage of 961 miles and the centre piece, from Armstrong to Quebec, a mileage of 932 miles, so that these portions are practically equal. Naturally, with a long haul, without breaking bulk, you can give a little cheaper rate. Will the Government, in order to help both the railway and the farmers of the West, be willing in future to give a rate of 12 cents a bushel in the winter from Winnipeg to St. John and put up the necessary handling facilities at St. John? If you could do something like that you would do away with the great big squeeze that is made on the farmers after navigation closes. I suppose this is more or less a question of policy and if the minister is not able to give an answer right offhand, I will not be surprised, but I would ask the minister if he would find out and give an answer on another day.

Mr. REID: I have been taking up the question of providing increased elevator facilities at St. John and at a point near Winnipeg—Transcona, or some place in that locality. We require an elevatoir there so that when the grain is passing through it can be inspected and graded. I understand that those interested in the grain can raise money on the bills of lading but the grain has to be inspected first. We require an elevator there and one at St. John. We can get along fairly well with the one now at Halifax until the terminals are completed there. I have been taking that question up with the view of seeing if we cannot bring in an item in the Supplementary Estimates to cover these two points that my hon. friend has referred to. That, of course, will have to be taken up and discussed when the time comes. With reference to the question that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has asked me about the rate, I may say that the Transcontinental was taken over by the Government in July and that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals took up with his officials the question of rates and put this six cent rate in force. He has been working along in the best way he could in order to get rates established along the Transcontinental railway that would be proper and workable in the future. I think the hon. member would hardly expect me to answer fully as to the policy of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals in regard to rates, management and operation of the Transcontinental railway. My hon. friend the minister has been very ill; he has not been able to be here—

Mr. GRAHAM: How is he?

Mr. REID: He is a little better, but he will not be able to be here during the present session, I am afraid.

With reference to the equipment, if I remember the arrangement, money was advanced for the purpose and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company were to provide proper equipment for the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental railway. They were to have a sufficient amount of equipment when the road was to be taken over.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When it was completed.

Mr. REID: When it was completed.

Mr. GRAHAM: There were bonds set apart for that purpose.

Mr. REID: Exactly. If the Grand Trunk were to take the road over, naturally you would expect that they would have provided all the equipment that would be necessary for its operation. But, when we started operation, the Grand Trunk Pacific were not able to let us have any equipment at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They would not get the equipment until the road was about completed.

Mr. REID: The hon. member was finding fault because we had not proper equipment. In a matter of this kind arrangements must be made for a considerable time ahead. Every one knew that the road was about completed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, it is not completed yet.

Mr. REID: Well, that is the opinion of myself as Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, and that must have been the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals when he notified them as he did. But they had not any equipment at all. We could not get any equipment from them. They required it all, and in the discussions which have taken place in this House from time to time, and in which members from the West have taken part, it has been stated that they did not have sufficient equipment for the Western business.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not think anybody ever said that.

Mr. REID: It may be that I am wrong in that. That may have been said of some other railway.

Mr. KNOWLES: Just lately the Railway Commission ordered the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry a great deal of the Canadian Northern traffic.

Mr. REID: That Bill we put through had the effect of relieving the situation in the Goose lake district.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the road in which this Government is a partner.

Mr. REID: The Canadian Northern took the grain to Saskatoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Canadian Northern has a Goose lake branch.

Mr. REID: I know, but I say that the Canadian Northern carried the grain to Saskatoon, and, under the Bill that we put through, the Railway Commission compelled the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry the grain from Saskatoon to the Transcontinental railway and the Transcontinental railway carried it through. The Railway Commission, operating under that Bill, were able to relieve the situation in the Goose lake district by having the grain hauled out and carried through.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That shows that the Grand Trunk Pacific had the equipment then.

Mr. REID: I was going to add that my information is that the Grand Trunk Pacific had not enough equipment to give the cars that they were asked for at Saskatoon; otherwise we would have carried quite a lot more grain from Saskatoon east. That is my information. We could have hauled several hundred cars more, if the Grand Trunk Pacific could have let us have them, taking away the grain from the elevators.

Mr. KNOWLES: They supplied some as auxiliaries to the Canadian Northern.

Mr. REID: Yes. The Railway Commission made the Canadian Northern put, I think, 1,200 cars on the Goose Lake division, and the Grand Trunk Pacific a number of cars between Saskatoon and Winnipeg, so as to relieve the situation as the Canadian Northern brought the grain in to Saskatoon. These companies did this willingly. If these instructions of the Railway Commission had not been given not so much grain would have been taken out of the Goose Lake district.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the Railway Commission thought it reasonable to tell the Grand Trunk Pacific to put 1,200 of their cars at the disposal of the Canadian Northern, does not that show that the Grand Trunk Pacific was pretty well equipped? It shows that the Railway Commission thought they were much better equipped than the Canadian Northern, notwithstanding that this Government is junior partner in the latter company, and ought therefore to be a little bit responsible for its proper equipment.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is not putting the matter fairly. The Grand Trunk

Pacific did not take the 1,200 cars or one car off their own road, but used them on their own road between Saskatoon and Winnipeg. The Canadian Northern were using their cars between the Goose Lake district and Fort William, and it took a car three weeks to go from the Goose Lake district to Fort William and back. What the Railway Commission compelled the Canadian Northern to do was this. They made them use their own cars on the Goose Lake line, and rush the grain to Saskatoon, only a short distance away. The cars were kept running backwards and forwards, unloading at Saskatoon, where they connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific. The 1,200 cars, or whatever it was of the Grand Trunk Pacific were used between Saskatoon and Winnipeg.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not that show that in the opinion of the Board of Railway Commissioners the Grand Trunk Pacific had not only enough cars and locomotives to handle the traffic originating on their own line, but 1,200 more cars to be devoted to traffic originating on the Canadian Northern?

Mr. REID. All I have to say is that I took the matter up with the Railway Commission and urged them to get out all the grain they could. They urged the Grand Trunk Pacific to get all the cars they could and use them on their own line. With regard to the hon. member's suggestion that the Grand Trunk Pacific had a surplus of cars, all I can say is that we did our best to get some equipment from them and we did not get any.

At six o'clock the House resumed and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill No. 89, respecting the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. W. M. Martin.

SENATE AMENDMENTS.

Further consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 32, respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—Mr. T. J. Stewart.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the amendment?

Mr. REID: There is just one change in section 3 of the Bill, which reads:

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Notwithstanding the provisions of section two of this Act or of the agreement hereby ratified, the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada as to the routing of traffic shall not be deemed to be thereby impaired or restricted.

The word "two" is changed to "one." That means that section 3 refers to section 1; it was evidently a mistake to make it refer to section 2.

Amendment concurred in.

SECOND READINGS.

Mr. SCHAFFNER moved the second reading of Bill No. 88, to incorporate the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Bible Society.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does this society conflict in any way with the Canadian Bible Society?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Absolutely not. This Bill was passed by the Senate, and therefore it is likely all right.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman does not always think so in regard to Senate Bills.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think so in this case.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Robert Charles Vondrau.—Mr. Scott.

Bill No. 93, for the relief of Percy Lynn Woods.—Mr. Boys.

SUPPLY.

Prince Edward Island railway, $613,100.

Mr. OLIVER: In the discussion that has taken place in regard to the railway rates over the Transcontinental which were put in force some time last winter, no reason has yet been given why there was a difference in the rate per mile between that section of the line from Armstrong to Quebec and that section from Quebec to St. John.

The conclusion to which we are driven is that the rate was left as it was left so that it should not be, in fact, a competitive rate to an open winter port. The rate to St. John over the Transcontinental was identical with the rate over the Canadian Pacific, and the difference in the rates for the intermediate sections of the line only made the difference mentioned by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster): It gave the benefit of storage capacity at eastern points instead of the capacity that would be needed to keep that grain stored in the West.

Not to discuss these points at any greater

length, let me place before the committee the question in its general aspect. It appears to me to be of very much greater general importance than those who have spoken, on the Government side at any rate, seemed willing to accord it. If there is one thing upon which the future welfare—the immediate as well as the distant future welfare—of Canada depends more than upon any other, it is the increase of Western production. That, I think, goes without argument. We are today faced with the statement, made on good authority, that, instead of production in the prairie country being likely to increase during the season upon which we are now entering, the area of production will be decreased as compared with last year. Some estimates are as high as twenty per cent decrease, some only fifteen per cent; but I have not seen any estimate less than fifteen per cent. That, at a time when the country and the Empire and the world may reasonably be expected to need increased production on the part of our western prairies, is a most serious consideration. It is not for lack of industry, nor is it for lack of enterprise, nor lack of opportunity, that the productive area is in prospect of decreasing this season as compared with last. We had, last year, besides a maximum area of production, a phenomental crop. The result was an abundant return such as we have never seen before and such as, I am afraid, we need not expect again at any short interval. Had it been possible for the producers to realize upon that crop promptly and at the value that the demand in the world's market gave it, it would beyond any doubt have produced a condition of prosperity amongst the men actually engaged in production in the West and would have put them in a position to increase their production during the coming season. I am aware that there are difficulties in the way of increasing production this year that did not exist last year. But the great thing that stands in the way is that many of those who were successful beyond their expectations in producing last year have not been able to realize upon that production in time to put them in funds to go on with their enterprise this year. If I spent my money and my credit in producing an enormous crop last year, and have not been able to pay the debts I incurred in that production, I am not in a position to make extra exertions to produce a similar abundance during this coming year. It is not a question of whether I have the will or not, I have not the ability; I cannot do it, no matter how much I may want to do it. And I need not say to the House that, if I have been disappointed, as thousands of our people have been, in not being able to dispose of my crop under satisfactory conditions, I have not the heart, even if I have the ability to go on and make those exertions during the current year that must be made if the great results that we hoped for and that we need are to be achieved.

Until this present year, after the close of navigation on the lakes, it was not possible—or it was not reckoned to be possible—to bring grain forward to the seaboard. The western market was bottled up for a period of five months and was subject to such fluctuations of world prices and world conditions as might occur in the meantime. The result of that was, as was explained by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), that every fall between the date of the harvesting of the crop and the date of the closing of navigation on the lakes—unless the crop was a partial failure—there was what was called a grain blockade, a condition of congestion caused by the farmer's desire to get his grain out before the close of navigation, thereby saving the cost of storage and the extra cost of hauling during the winter months. Obviously, the grain that did not go forward before the close of navigation had to be held until navigation opened in the spring, at the cost of storage, interest, insurance, and possible unfavourable market fluctuations. The consequence was that there was a premium on grain that could be got forward and a discount on grain that could not be got forward. As I have said, this occurred year after year; it was a necessary result of the conditions of the country whenever there was a large crop. Each year that condition of congestion meant tremendous loss to a large proportion of the producers of the West. I had the honour of drawing the attention of the Government of the day to that condition in 1911—a condition which resulted in tremendous losses during that year. It was believed that the construction of the Transcontinental railway over the shortest possible route, with the lowest possible grades and with the best possible construction, would not only increase the possibilities of traffic throughout the Dominion of Canada, but also eliminate—wipe off the slate absolutely—this condition of recurring

congestion or grain blockade. It was believed that this could be accomplished by creating a condition under which grain could be sent forward from the prairies to ocean ports all the year round at a favourable rate of freight. That was the purpose of the building of the Transcontinental railway; it was thought wise and prudent and economical to spend millions, tens of millions, even hundreds of millions, in the construction of that line in order to achieve that result. As the country increased in production, there was a corresponding increase from year to year in the disabilities resulting from the stoppage of the eastward flow of grain on the close of navigation. The time came when that road was completed. The last rail was laid in December, I think, of 1913, and in the session of over a year ago the Minister of Railways declared that the road was completed. It was stated—and the matter has been discussed since in the House—that there was a difference of opinion between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Government as to whether the road was completed or not, the railway company holding that it was not completed, and that, therefore, they were not required to take it over; the Government holding that it was completed and that the railway company were defaulting when they did not take it over. Briefly, that was the condition a year ago; the last rail had been laid in the winter of 1913 and the Government in the session of 1915 declared that the road was absolutely completed and was entitled to carry traffic to the full, and that the railway company that refused to take it over was actually in default. Following on the heels of that condition of over a year ago came the greatest crop that our country ever saw; came the greatest prices for that crop in the market of ultimate consumption that we have seen in a lifetime; came the greatest demand for the crop that our country had ever seen. We had the crop; we had the railroad; we had the demand, and we had the pressing and urgent necessity. This railroad is under the management of the Government itself, with all the resources of the Dominion of Canada at its disposal. Yet, under all the conditions that I have sketched, the Government tells us that they have moved 8,000,000 bushels of grain over that line to relieve the condition that existed, to establish the fact that a grain blockade, or a grain congestion, should not and need not occur in the prairie west as long as that line is in existence. This was not meeting the case as the welfare of the country and the needs of the people demanded. We are asked to believe that the Government has done its full duty, has done everything that it is possible for a government to do, when it has moved 8,000,000 bushels out of a crop of something like 250,000,000 bushels. With 50,000,000 bushels of grain to-day at the elevators at the head of the lakes, this railroad is said to have moved 8,000,000 bushels. I do not wish to speak harshly; I do not wish to take up time, but these are the conditions. When we find that the Government, in fixing the rate that was to prevail in the case of grain carried over that road, actually fixed a rate absolutely the same as that which had prevailed in previous years, before the railroad was constructed at all, we cannot reach the conclusion that there was an earnest desire on the part of the Government to meet the case as it actually existed. Had that road been operated from the beginning of the season; had it carried all the grain that was available to be carried, and that must be carried, or this country will suffer stupendous losses within the current year —because we must turn that grain into money in some way—had that been done there would have been a distribution of money in the western country that would have been largely to the benefit of that country directly and of the eastern country in the ordinary course of business, and there would have resulted a further increase of the acreage of production during the season that we are now entering upon if the men or the means to put that crop in could be secured. Whereas ordinarily every man would have used every exertion of which he was capable in order to increase his acreage, under the discouragement that he has suffered he will not use the same exertion even if he have the ability—and he will not have the ability to the same degree.

We have in this country three great Transcontinental railway systems. Two of those railway systems are supposed to be lame ducks. There are people in our country who hold that these two railway systems—I speak of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific—are in advance of the needs of the country; that they are institutions not that lift the country along, but that have to be lifted along by the country; that they are a burden rather than a benefit to the nation as a whole. Whatever the condition may be at

the present time, no man who has a proper idea of the extent and value of the Dominion of Canada can do other than believe that at some time in the future there will be every need for these two railroads. What I want to point out is that, if it is a fact that these two roads, or one of them, is not earning interest on its bonds, is not paying its way, is not carrying itself along, it is not because the traffic is not there, it is not because there is no demand for the products. Surely we cannot say that the Grand Trunk Pacific is a failure because there is no business for it, or because it was built ahead of time, when there is in our elevators at the head of the Lakes to-day 50,000,000 bushels of grain seeking an outlet, and in the elevators behind that, another 50,000,000 bushels of grain seeking an outlet, all of which grain, given rolling stock and management, is available for shipment to the seaboard at the same rates as would be charged on the Lakes during the season of open navigation. It is not because we have to wait for the business. The business is there; the grain is there in the West, and it is wanted across the water. We want to get it there, but it has been lying in the West while we had the rails on which to haul it to the eastern coast.

Mr. BURNHAM: What about ocean tonnage?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know anything about ocean tonnage.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would it not be as well to know something about it?

Mr. OLIVER: What difference does it make when the grain has to get to the seaboard?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: There are no elevators at the seaboard.

Mr. OLIVER: If it cannot get to the seaboard, it cannot be turned into money.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no storage at the seaboard, and no tonnage.

Mr. OLIVER: Is my hon. friend going to tell us that the grain lying in the elevators at Fort William and further west has no value? Unless there is tonnage, it will have no value.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: It cannot be done in a day, or in a month. The grain will be just as safe in the storage elevators at Fort William as if it were lying on cars at Halifax and St. John. There are no storage elevators there, and there is no tonnage. It is only a question of when the grain can be moved.

Mr. OLIVER: So long as the grain is in the elevators at Fort William and further west, it is practically of no cash value.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, yes, it is, 80 cents on the dollar.

Mr. OLIVER: Precisely; it is of value because the people who pay for it believe that it can get tonnage. It ought to have the tonnage.

Mr. MORPHY: Stop the war.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the war keep the grain in the elevators?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Eighty-two ships have been sent to the bottom within the last ten days.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend cannot have it both ways; either that grain can be taken across the ocean, or it cannot be taken.

Mr. BENNETT: It cannot be taken all at once.

Mr. OLIVER: Then, if it cannot be taken across the ocean, it has no value.

Mr. BENNETT: It will ultimately be taken across the ocean, not all at once.

Mr. OLIVER: If it can be taken across the ocean, it might just as well have been rolled on wheels during the past winter as kept lying at Fort William; and the railroads could have been earning money instead of losing money during that period. There is no other way for it. The grain has to be brought forward. It does not have to lie at Fort William until the shipping trust of the Great Lakes can get their fingers on it. There is no necessity for that; it could have been rolled over the railroad tracks to the ocean ports during the winter at the very rates which the Government put in force, so far as Quebec was concerned, but which they refused to put in force between Quebec and St. John.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I am sure my hon. friend would not want to add to the congestion at the terminals by loading up cars with grain, thereby congesting all the traffic to and from Halifax and St. John. He knows that there is limited storage accommodation at Halifax and St. John, and I am sure that he does not mean that cars should be loaded up with grain at these ports, thereby congesting the traffic and preventing other traffic from being handled.

Mr. OLIVER: I mean this, that the grain lying at Fort William has to be got forward, or it has not. It has to be got forward if you are going to turn it into money. I say that we have the railroads to carry it. We have to get it across the ocean some time, and it has to get to the seaboard some time, and it might just as well have been going to the seaboard during the winter as have the railway companies which might have hauled it go bankrupt because it is said they have no business to do. It goes throughout the world that Canada has built railroads for which she has no traffic. The traffic is there, and the country is suffering because it has not gone forward. That is the puzzle which this Government has to solve. That is their business, and I desire to place the responsibility for that condition exactly where it belongs.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: My hon. friend should blame the empires of Europe.

Mr. OLIVER: The empires of Europe want wheat. My hon. friend says that there are no facilities for storage at the seaboard.

Mr. BENNETT: Not for large quantities.

Mr. OLIVER: Why are there not facilities? Is it not elementary that there must be storage facilities at the seaports if grain is to be transported?

Mr. REID: Why did you not build elevators when you were building the Transcontinental?

Mr. OLIVER: We did not need them until the Transcontinental was finished.

Mr. REID: It takes years to build them.

Mr. OLIVER: The Government of the day knew when the Transcontinental railroad was to be completed, and they completed it. This Government declared that the road was completed a year ago, and surely it knew that elevators were needed to store and handle grain at the seaboard. I did not wish to bring this into the argument, but if it comes to that, there is no argument about it; that is where the responsibility rests. What I want to emphasize is that we have the produce, and we have the traffic for transportation; and if the roads that are available for carrying that traffic are not utilized, it is not the fault of the country, and it is not the fault of the roads; nor is it the fault of those who conceived and carried out the idea of having such railroads and of having such an outlet to the seaboard all the year round for the producers of the West.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have listened with a good deal of interest to the speech of my hon. friend. Though I am sorry to take up any time, it strikes me that a proposition, put just as my hon. friend has put it, for consumption in this country, and particularly in the West, ought to be analysed at about the same time that it comes from the lips of the hon. member. I am afraid that, whether he wished to put it in an unfair way or not, either he has not got to the bottom of the whole question and does not understand fully all the conditions, or, if he does, he has not taken the trouble to place them in their proper perspective. I want quietly to make two or three remarks in reference to some of the things that my hon. friend has discussed. He has declared that there has been a year of unrivalled production in the West, a year, probably, such as will not be seen again for a long period; a big crop has been realized; and when he puts these two propositions, a great productive year and a big crop, my hon. friend lays the foundation for the argument which follows. But the first part of his argument commences with an "if." It is not laying down an absolute premise; it is not stating an actual fact; it is a supposition from the very start. He says if there could have been a quick realization on the heavy crop in the West at real world values at that time, such and such would have been the result, the people would have had their money, and they would have had heart then to go into production for the succeeding season. But does not my hon. friend know, a reading and thinking man as he is, that the supposition with which he started the argument was an absolute impossibility? That "if" never could have been got out of the conditions at that time. If there could have been a quick realization at the then present world values, certain things would have taken place! Now, what I want to say is that that supposition could not have been turned into fact. World conditions made it impossible to do so. Suppose there had been a quick and sudden rush in order to bring about that realization, into the markets of the world of 200,000,000 bushels of wheat from the Northwest, in the short period of which he speaks, I would like to ask him to think what the result would have been upon the world prices. There was more wheat in

the world than was raised in our Northwest. There was all through the world a bumper crop, one of the largest crops the world has ever garnered. More wheat was raised by the world last year than was necessary for the world's existence, taking into account all the waste and all the consumption outside of the waste; and, if the Northwest, by some magic power, could have landed 150,000,000 or 200,000,000 bushels of its wheat crop in the European capitals and markets within six weeks of the time at which it was reaped, what would have been the position, what would have been the price, what would have been the realization? The problem for solving ultimately in reference to the Northwest is the problem of storage and of equable, reasonable, moderate selling, and until that problem is solved the best conditions cannot be obtained for the West. So much in reference to that.

My hon. friend then leads up to a conclusion that he wants the West, the House, and the people of this country to take, and it is that, although this has been a problem insolvable up to a certain time, the Grand Trunk Pacific was to make it solvable, and that when that road had been laid down and put into order for carriage such a condition would no longer exist, for the road would take the place of the lake carriage when the ice had seized the waters, and would bear out that surplus from the west in a continuous stream and a stream large enough to quickly exhaust the source at the other end. My hon. friend knows that that could not take place. Suppose we take his own calculation that there were 120,000,000 or 150,000,000 bushels of grain in the Northwest, in storage and in the farmers' hands, at the time that the lake waters were closed by the ice and you had the Grand Trunk Pacific with the best roadbed, the heaviest rails and the best equipment; would that have solved the difficulty for the people of the Northwest and enabled them to come to that quick realization of world values which would have set them up? My hon. friend has simply to take his leadpencil and a piece of white paper and calculate what it means to draw 150,000,000 bushels of wheat, together with other grain, over the track of a railway. Suppose you take out 500 cars per day in the winter season. It is a good road and a good bit of haulage if every train will take out fifty loaded cars. If every train took out fifty loaded cars, and each car carried 1,000 bushels, 500,000 bushels would be taken out by 500 cars, running every day through the winter season, which would be an achievement worthy of any great carrying road. But with 500 cars daily, with their half million of bushels, it would have taken 300 days to have carried out the 150,000,000 bushels, and there are not 300 days in the four winter months which intervene between the last of December and the opening of navigation upon the Great Lakes in April.

Another point which my hon. friend must see, which his practical knowledge must make him thoroughly aware of, is this: You have not only your commodity to sell, but you must have at the other end some man who is willing to buy that commodity from you, and there must be a means of getting that commodity from the hand of the seller to the hand of the purchaser, or else you have a very difficult problem intervening. I am going to make this statement, and I would like my hon. friend and the members of the committee to think it over: if it had been possible to have transported that grain out of the West—that one hundred and fifty extra millions of bushels—by means of this road within three months time, you would not have had, comparatively speaking, one single bushel more of that wheat in the European markets than you have to-day, because every bushel that has been asked for to fill the tonnage that was possible to be obtained has been at the call of the tonnage and more waiting on every railway and in every port on the Atlantic seaboard. If you had shipped 100,000,000 or 120,000,000, or 150,000,000 bushels, and sent it down to the Atlantic seaboard, where would it have found its resting place? It would have caused a congestion and embargo in this whole country which would have tied up the available rolling stock of the railways and would have prevented them from carrying the merchandise products and goods which were absolutely necessary to be carried. Where would he have put that 150,000,000 bushels of grain if he had brought it down to the Atlantic seaboard in the months of January and February? No storage room for it in Montreal; that would have been soon filled. No storage room for it in Quebec; the storage capacity there is limited, and would have been soon filled. No storage capacity in St. John or Halifax beyond a comparatively small and trifling amount. No storage at Portland, at New York, at Boston or at Baltimore, to have

received a single bushel of that grain, for the storage facilities at these ports are not large, and were more than taken up by the United States grain, which, from Buffalo to the extreme West, crowded down on the railroads, causing embargoes and blockings and congestion, until it was backed up, and backed up clear out to the Western prairies. When you take these things into consideration, what way on earth was there for my hon. friend's view to be realized? If this road had done its duty, as he says, and had taken out that 150,000,000 bushels of grain in January and February it would not have realized to the people of the West one single dollar more than it did realize resting in its resting places, and for two reasons: first, because the purchaser was not there to buy, and secondly, because there was not transport between the producer and the purchaser sufficient to have carried the grain to him if he had been disposed to buy it, as in many cases he was. Neither was there any storage room in the ports of Great Britain, even if ocean tonnage could have been got to take it across the ocean. All the wheat and flour that has been necessary for the food of civilians and the food of the armies has been sent there for those purposes. These things can be turned into actual money only in proportion to the consumptive demand, and the world is not able to eat up in three months the resources that are to do it through the whole year. Consequently, the producer, the purchaser, and transport have all to be taken into consideration as factors before that ideal thing which my hon. friend said would have produced such a change in the West can be brought about in practice. I say these things simply that the people in the West may have alongside the statement of my hon. friend some of these restraining, restricting and counteracting statements which I think will enable them to understand the position better. I do not know that I have any more to say on that; that is all I intended to say at the start; that is all that I will say.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to prolong the argument, but I am afraid my hon. friend hardly appreciates the importance of the argument he has made. According to the statement of the Trade and Commerce Department, we had 50,000,000 bushels in the elevators at the head of the lakes on the 7th of April. I fancy that there is further west, behind those elevators, not less than another 50,000,000, or perhaps 100,000,000 bushels.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Probably 100,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER: We are putting in our crop now, and shall be harvesting it in September, in about five months. Are we to believe that we shall not be able to dispose of that 150,000,000 bushels between now and next harvest? That is the conclusion we are bound to draw from what the minister has said. He speaks, no doubt, from information, and if his conclusion is correct the condition is much more serious than I had contemplated. We cannot have it both ways; we cannot have increased production and increased wealth, and, at the same time, a decreased market. If we cannot get the market, we cannot sell the stuff, and we need not produce it. I quite bow to the minister's argument and to his information, but to my mind he has proved too much. I cannot accept his argument for the reason that I do not want to. I say frankly that I cannot bring myself to believe that that is our position, namely, that we have grain on hand that we cannot get rid of between now and next harvest. If this our position it is very serious. However well entrenched my hon. friend may be, I am going to take the contrary position and maintain that we have not yet overstocked the world, and that there are means, or we ought to find means, to bring to market the produce that we have available.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend is in that position and feels badly about it, I had better administer a little solace to lighten his mind, and not allow him to go up against the dead conclusion that I did not come to, and do not wish him to come to, that there is no hope for the coming crop because the intervening surplus cannot be got rid of in the meantime. My whole argument has been directed to what my hon. friend started out with, namely, the realization within two or three months of the value at world rates of that 150,000,000 bushels which is now in the West, so that the blood current could come back and vivify the veins of the West, and start them in to the work of the present season. I say—and I maintain it because I believe it to be actually true—that as much wheat has been carried as could possibly have been carried if there had been 200,000,000 bushels more waiting at sea-board during

9 p.m.

that intervening time. Now there are certain conditions which lighten the matter. In the scarcity of tonnage, the distance that a boat travels is of importance, and if it is possible for a boat by travelling a shorter distance to make two or three voyages where otherwise she should make only one, and carry exactly the same cargo, that is so much in favour of the nearer country which has produce to sell. In that respect Canada has a great advantage; it lies on the main tracks of ocean commerce and trade, where the vast majority of the world's vessels are going to and fro, and its distance from European centres is 2,500, 3,000 or 3,500 miles. In that respect Canada and the United States, in comparison with the Argentine, another large producer, and especially in comparison with Australia, which has been a very large producer this year, have the advantage of the shorter distance. Now, tonnage is growing scarcer every day. Do not let us deceive ourselves. Tonage is scarcer to-day than it was yesterday, and will be scarcer to-morrow; it will be scarcer next month than it is this month; it will be scarcer day after day and month after month till this war ceases. It is impossible, however much you may desire or pray or objurgate, to get rid of that condition of things. Now, Sir, what happened? The Australian Government undertook by Governmental intervention to procure all the surplus wheat of Australia, and became the sole charterer of vessels to take that surplus to Great Britain. She made advances to the farmers upon their grain with that idea.

But what has become of it? Where you have to make an 8,000-mile voyage to Australia for a cargo of grain the difficulties become greater than where you have to make but a 3,000-mile voyage across the ocean in order to get an equal cargo of grain. To-day the tonnage is not going to Australia, and the necessities of the wheat market in the old country will be met, first of all, by those countries that are closest to it and that have the reservoirs of wheat.

Another advantage that Canada has over the United States is this, that the Canadian wheat of last season was, on the average, infinitely better in quality than the American wheat, and whilst some of the American wheat, by virtue of its poorer quality and lower price, is going in certain directions, those who want the best wheat are coming to Canada for it, and are finding it in Canada. Therefore, in the next few months, when the supply has to be largely kept up , there is an opportunity for Canada to dispose of her surplus and to get her shelves cleared before they are filled again by the coming crop.

Mr. OLIVER: Canada was, during the past winter, in exactly the same position in which she will be during the coming summer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not quite able to follow my hon. friend. In the first speech with which he favoured the committee he said that if you take the full capacity of the railroad, running ten trains a day, it can take out only 500,000 bushels per day, and it is going to take 300 days to transport the wheat of which my hon. friend speaks.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Not going to, but would take.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is the same thing. A thing that will take is going to take.

Mr. BENNETT: Now we have water carriage.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) rebuked the Minister of Trade and Commerce for presenting such a dark picture, saying that it was very discouraging for the farmers of the West if they would still have last year's crop on their hands when the crop of this year was harvested. Then the Minister of Trade and Commerce said: "Oh, in the next two months the farmers will be able to get last year's crop cleaned up." The two statements strike me as exceedingly inconsistent. What is the use of speaking about the enormous advantage Canada possesses by reason of the better quality of her grain, by reason of her nearness to the markets of the Old Country, if this Government does not take steps to provide requisite transportation facilities, both on land and on the sea, and also the requisite storage facilities? You may have all the advantages of a fertile soil and of excellent grain; but unless the farmers can get the grain properly taken care of and cheaply transported to the markets of the world, all the natural advantages will be of no avail.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Do you suggest that the Government should go into the shipbuilding industry?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do indeed. It almost makes one shudder to have the Minister of Trade and Commerce tell us to-night: "Ocean tonnage is scarce to-day; it will be

scarcer next month; it will be still scarcer the month after; it has been growing scarcer since the war began." Yet up to this, I think the twenty-first month of the war, this Government has taken no steps whatever to increase the ocean tonnage of Canada. Is not that fact enough to make one shudder?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Do not shudder.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I cannot help it. My hon. friend may think it is a light matter—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You do not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is a serious matter for the people of this country; it is a serious matter for the farmer out on the Western prairie, who works there day after day from sunrise to sundown putting in his crop—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not the time he works; he works before sunrise and after sundown.

Mr. PUGSLEY: —suffering all the hardships of the lonely life on the prairie, to find, after he has harvested his great crop, that, owing to his not being able to get his grain to the market, it is rotting in the fields and he is losing thousands upon thousands of dollars. That is not an exceptional case. There are hundreds of people who are in exactly that position. The minister speaks of ten trains a day. Let me tell him that he will find many railroads on the continent of America which are hauling twenty trainloads a day.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: With a double track.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, with a single track. It is the easiest thing in the world for a railroad to run twenty trains a day on a single track. There would be no difficulty at all for a railroad with a track like that of the Transcontinental to run twenty trains a day, and, instead of 500,000 bushels, a million bushels could be taken out a day. With the three great railroads in the western provinces, properly equipped, you could take out 3,000,000 bushels a day, so that in sixty days you could take out 180,000,000 bushels of grain. What did this Government do? According to the showing of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, they hauled out during the past winter what with ten trains a day could be hauled out in sixteen days. That is the extent of the wonderful assistance which the Government have been trying to make the people believe they were giving the farmers of the West.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Unless we have transportation on the ocean, the Government can get all the grain to the seaboard and yet have accomplished only half its purpose; if the Government does not have proper storage facilities in its elevators, it can only half assist in the proper development of the West; and I do not see how any one can disagree with me when I say that the Government in respect of these matters has wholly fallen down. What does the Minister of Trade and Commerce say to the fact that, at the great port of St. John, which was the first port to take a forward step to divert the traffic from Portland in the state of Maine to Canadian seaports and through Canadian channels, and which has developed the winter-port trade very rapidly during the past twenty years, although the elevator connected with the Government railway system was burned down over two years ago, this Government has not yet replaced it? What does he say to the fact that the only storage in connection with the Government system of railways, including the Transcontinental, is the one small grain elevator at Halifax, with a capacity of 750,000 bushels? What does he say to the fact that 80 per cent of the grain of the Canadian West has gone this year through American ports? What does he say to the fact that at least 60 per cent of that grain is housed in the elevators at Buffalo, if my information is correct?

Mr. ROGERS: It is not correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What percentage has gone through there?

Mr. ROGERS: A little over 50 per cent—nearly 60 per cent all told.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is getting pretty close to 60 per cent.

Mr. ROGERS: You said 80 per cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The attention of this Government has been called to the absolute necessity of having storage facilities east of the Great Lakes and on the Atlantic coast. Sir William Van Horne, over and over again, spoke of the necessity of carrying out this policy. Yet, as I have said, notwithstanding that these facts were brought to the notice of the Government, no step whatever has been taken to increase the elevator capacity in the East. If the Transcontinental had been properly equipped with rolling stock, or if the Government had handed that road over to the Grand Trunk Pacific on the terms on which it had been arranged by the late Government that they should take it over in sections as completed,

it would have been able to haul, not eight million bushels but forty or fifty million bushels, and that without the slightest difficulty. Then if the Government had provided storage capacity, grain could have been stored at Quebec, Montreal, St. John and Halifax, and, as the ships were available from time to time, it could have been sent forward to the markets of the world. If the Government had taken the steps that I think they ought to have taken, and that I beg them to take even at this late date, to send our grain forward to the markets of the world, the problem will be nearer to a solution than it is. The situation to-day is not by any means a satisfactory one. The Government ought to give thought to the question, instead of treating it lightly, and laughing and jeering at the suggestions made for improvement and development. Even though the thoughts I express may not be of the loftiest character, they might bring their great minds down to the practical, and endeavour to settle this question, to the very great advantage of the people of Canada.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend has asked me three questions, and I am quite willing to answer them. It may be that then he will not shudder so frequently and so obviously as he has been doing when reciting this terible condition of things. The statement is made that there is not sufficient storage at St. John, Halifax and Quebec. I just want to say this—and the hon. gentleman knows that what I have to say is true—that, as far as relieving the situation this year is concerned, any additional storage which could reasonably have been provided in St. John, Halifax and Quebec, would not have made one iota of difference as regards the quantity of grain actually delivered in Europe from Canada—not one iota. In this Dominion of Canada, there is elevator storage for about 150,000,000 to 165,000,000 bushels of grain. It is not a good argument, it is not reasonable, to say that you must have all this storage, or indeed a majority of this storage, at the seaports themselves. The all-year seaports on our Atlantic coast are not the places where the big storage capacity is provided, or where it is best to provide it. These ports are for transfer purposes, not for storage purposes. In order to transfer quickly and well you must have a certain storage capacity in proportion to the vessels that come there seeking for loads. But you do not need more storage capacity than this, and it is better to have your grain stored in the interior than at the ports themselves, it is less costly and less burdensome to the port itself and in every way better for the distribution of the grain. Now, it will not be pretended that for transfer purposes it would have been necessary to provide at St. John additional storage for more than 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 bushels. If you had had that all these months since the close of navigation, you would not have shipped one bushel more out of St. John than actually has been shipped, because there never has been a time when a vessel came for a cargo of grain and the grain was not there for it. The reason why more was not shipped is that it was not possible to get tonnage for it. The commandeered grain that has been passing out from this country since the last of December and up to the present time, and which will not all be out probably until the middle of May, has been carried under transport conditions directed by the Governments of Great Britain, Italy and France. And Great Britain, Italy and France, those powerful Governments, have not been able to provide more ships for that commandeered grain than there was commandeered grain at the seaports ready to put into the vessel.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was the commandeered grain going to Italy or to England?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To Italy mainly, a portion of it to France, and a portion to Great Britain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the bulk of it to Italy?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, and when that is cleared out of the way, the bulk of it will go somewhere else unless Italy wants more, as she probably will. You are up against certain conditions, and it is foolish, it is no argument at all, to say that any particular individual or any particular government is responsible for these conditions. The greatest problem these nations have to solve to-day is the problem of tonnage for the supply of the army and of the people, but particularly for the supply of the army. You are up against a condition which neither the Canadian Government, nor any other government in the world, is able to cope with successfully. We have simply to live out these conditions and make the best we possibly can of them; and it is assertion and only assertion, for

my hon. friend to say that the Government is responsible for an insufficiency of tonnage at these ports to carry the grain of the Northwest. The Government is not responsible for it, and no government, however powerful it might have been, could have made better headway than this Government has made against the conditions which have existed for the last twelve months.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If to do nothing is to make progress, then the Government has been exceedingly successful; for it has done —and I defy contradiction—absolutely nothing since this war broke out for the encouragement of shipbuilding in Canada, or the establishment of a Canadian merchant marine. It has done nothing in any direction whatever. The minister says that tonnage has become scarcer month by month—

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Does the hon. gentleman seriously suggest that vessels could have been built since the war began?

Mr. PUGSLEY: With proper encouragement we could have had some steel ships completed. We could also have had—I am told on good authority, at least—two hundred wooden vessels built, each with a capacity of from four to five thousand tons, and equipped with auxiliary motive power so that it could make a trip across the Atlantic in about double the time occupied by an ordinary tramp steamer. These vessels would have been of enormous benefit. In the United States they are being built and used with very great success. It is hardly necessary to say that this would have relieved the stringency of the situation enormously. In a conversation that I had with him, Mr. McNichol, for a long time general manager of the Canadian Pacific railway, spoke of the very great necessity of having large storage capacity east of the Great Lakes. In Buffalo, as I have said, they have a storage capacity of about 50,000,000 bushels. What would be the difference between the desirability of storage at Buffalo or east of the Great Lakes and that of having it at ports on the St. Lawrence, or the Atlantic? The idea that elevators upon the seacoast are intended for transfer purposes proceeds upon the assumption that vessels would be constantly coming to take away the grain as it arrived by train. Would it not, therefore, be just as desirable to have large storage capacity at the seacoast as it is to have it east of the Great Lakes?

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. OLIVER: I could not follow the argument of the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he suggested that within the next few months the position in regard to ocean transport was going to improve. Canada is to-day geographically situated where it was a year ago; whatever advantage we ever will have we have had during the past winter. If it is a fact—and there is no doubt that it is—that tonnage is getting scarcer from day to day, our position will be that much worse during the months to come than it was during the months that have passed. I see no relief for the situation that confronts us through the facts placed before us by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. With regard to elevator capacity, the hon. minister says that it is not necessary to have elevators at ocean ports. Well, our greatest ocean port is Montreal, and we have a very large elevator there.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend must not put it in a manner more extreme than I did. I did not say that it was not necessary to have storage facilities at ocean ports. What I meant to say was that ocean ports are chiefly for transfer purposes, but that a reasonable amount of storage is absolutely a safety and an assurance even at transfer stations.

Mr. OLIVER: I would think it is absolutely a fact that there is a necessity for elevator capacity, even storage capacity, in some degree, at an ocean port. In fact; the Government is building an elevator at Vancouver, having that point in view. The Government, therefore, is stripped of any justification for not having adequate elevator facilities at St. John, Halifax and Quebec. Since this Government has been in power it has built three very fine interior elevators in the Prairie West which until the present time have found no serious usefulness. It would have been just as competent for them to have built at the ocean ports the elevators that they put up at Moosejaw, Saskatoon and Calgary. With all due respect, I think they would have served a more useful purpose at these ocean ports.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think that.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend knows that until the last two or three months these elevators had not served any purpose at all.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Why did the farmers not use these elevators more?

Mr. OLIVER: Because they were not needed.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Why not?

Mr. OLIVER: Because they were not; that is all. Why should a man pay for hauling grain to an interior elevator and have it remain there if he could get the grain forwarded to the ocean port?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I thought they could get their money, or a large part of it, if they got their grain to these interior elevators?

Mr. OLIVER: If they could forward to an ocean or lake port just as well, certainly they were going to do it. The only possible usefulness of these interior elevators would be in the case of an unfavourable season, when it would be necessary to have the grain dried—in this case their drying plants would be useful—and where there was a prospective congestion or blockade at the close of navigation, in which case the railroads would have a short haul to the interior elevator instead of going down to Fort William. But with an open road all the year round to the Atlantic ports, that condition did not and should not arise—as a matter of fact, would not arise if the lines to the Atlantic ports were operated as it was intended that they should be operated. There could not be any fall congestion, because the conditions in the fall would not give rise to it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Then it was not a good policy to build these elevators?

Mr. OLIVER: There is no doubt that until within the last two or three months the money spent upon these elevators was thrown away, for they were not used. Conditions might arise through unfavourable seasons which might cause the elevators to be very useful. They are being used now, but the reason they are being used is because the grain is not being carried forward to the ocean ports. We have the trackage facilities, but apparently we have not the rolling stock, or we have not the intent or desire to send the grain forward. The hon. minister contends that if we got it forward we could not ship it. Well, if we had it forward we would have that much of the work done, and be in that much better position to ship it when the opportunity arrives. However, the serious point is this: if circumstances were such during the past six months as absolutely to prevent our grain from going forward across the ocean, unless conditions—if conditions are blamable—do not become very much more favourable than they have been in the past we are not going to be able to get rid of what we have before our next harvest comes on. That is a very unfortunate condition, and again I say that I decline to accept the position of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce on that point.

Mr. REID: I think we all agree that at the ocean ports we should have quite a lot of elevator capacity. Of course, we must have, and will require as soon as we can arrange it, larger storage capacity at St. John and Halifax, but the fact of our having such a large storage capacity in Montreal, which, no doubt will be increased from time to time, assists us so far as the ports of St. John and Halifax in the winter are concerned, because we can store large quantities of grain at Montreal, and then in the winter move it to St. John and Halifax. I shall be in a position at another sitting to give more information with reference to the rate question that we discussed this afternoon. I stated that I did not know what the arrangements were when this rate was made by the minister himself, but I have made some inquiries since the matter was brought up. To-morrow I shall take it up with the general freight agent of the Intercolonial and be able to give more details. As I understand it, the advantage of that arrangement was this:

In the summer, the rate is 6 cents per bushel from Fort William to Montreal. In the winter time, over the Canadian Pacific Railway and, I presume over the Canadian Northern railway too, the rate is 12 cents per bushel from Fort William to Montreal. The rate say from Winnipeg to Fort William is 10 cents per 100 pounds. The advantage was this: any farmer shipping, say, from Fort William to Montreal over the Canadian Pacific railway would pay 12 cents per bushel in the winter time, and 6 cents from Winnipeg, say, to Fort William. That would be 18 cents. Over the Transcontinental he would pay 6 cents per bushel to Armstrong and 6 cents per bushel to Montreal or Quebec, so that the farmer shipping from the West on the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern at their regular winter rates would pay 18 cents per bushel from Winnipeg to Montreal or Quebec while over the Transconti-

nental he would pay 12 cents, thus saving 6 cents per bushel.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the rate from Montreal to St. John by the Intercolonial, compared with the rate from Montreal to St. John by the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. REID: The rates we are talking about are through rates.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it not true that while the Government has lowered the rate on a portion of the line, the total through rate on the Government system of railways from Winnipeg to St. John is not less than the rate on the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. REID: The rate is, as I have said, lower by 6 cents per bushel.

Mr. PUGSLEY: For what distance?

Mr. REID: I have just explained that the through rate on the other roads to St. John would be 6 cents per bushel more.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let us have this matter understood. Does the minister state positively that the rate on the Government system of railways from Winnipeg to St. John is 6 cents per bushel less than the rate on the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. REID: What I said was—

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is what the minister said.

Mr. REID: Let me answer the question in my own way.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We want to have this cleared up. We say that the Government has simply made a pretense of lowering the rate for a short distance. What I ask the minister is—it is a plain question, if he will pardon me—will he state that the rate on grain during the past winter from Winnipeg to St. John over the Government system of railways was 6 cents per bushel less than the rate on the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. REID: If the hon. member will allow me, I will answer that question, in my own way. In the first place, I said that if he would wait until to-morrow, until I could get the information, I would be able to answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is better, but the minister pretended to answer.

Mr. REID: I did not give any definite answer, so far as that was concerned. I said that grain that was shipped on the Transcontinental to Montreal and Quebec for export—some of it is in store in Montreal and Quebec, and some went to Portland, the Grand Trunk having taken it to their terminal—that grain shipped for export to Quebec, Montreal, or Portland over the Transcontinental road was carried at a rate which was 6 cents per bushel less than would have been charged if it had been carried over the Canadian Pacific railway to Montreal or Quebec for export.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Canadian Pacific Railway has no line to Portland.

Mr. REID: We are talking about grain for export, and that is the information I have at the present time, that the rate over the Transcontinental is 6 cents per bushel less than the rate on the other roads. There was not any grain shipped to St. John because we have no way of storing it there. We could not take it over the Transcontinental and deliver it without putting it into the Canadian Pacific Railway elevator there, and the hon. member knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators at St. John were taxed to their utmost capacity this year by the grain which that company hauled over its own railway system.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understood my hon. friend to say that some went to St. John and Halifax. He says now that none went to Halifax or St. John, but that all went to Portland.

Mr. REID: Some 400,000 bushels of the 8,000,000 bushels went to Halifax. There are one and three quarter million bushels stored at Quebec, and there is a large quantity in store for export at Montreal waiting for the opening of navigation. But a large portion went to Portland; I cannot give the quantities.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister must see the importance of it. There must be a through rate on the Government system of railways from Winnipeg to St. John and Halifax, because St. John and Halifax are two large exporting ports. Will the minister say that the through rate on grain for export during the past winter was 6 cents per bushel less on the Government system of railways to Canadian Atlantic ports than on the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. REID: I must admit again that I am not fully seized of the facts this evening, but I will get the hon. member that information. He could not expect me to have that information this evening.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought the minister would have it. He is making a great handle of the reduction of 6 cents on a part of the line between Armstrong and Quebec. In the winter season the great question is, what is the through rate for export to the Atlantic ports, and that is why I should have thought that the minister would have the information.

Mr. TURRIFF: Is it not the fact that the Government decided to fix that 6 cent rate from Armstrong to Montreal after consultation with the other companies, and was it not practically understood that the other roads, the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway, would give practically the same rates?

Mr. REID: My information is that there was no consultation, that the other roads did not give that rate, and that it was in operation only on the Transcontinental. The Minister of Railways took the responsibility of making that rate himself for this reason: we had in Montreal a very large storage capacity, and he thought that if we could fill the elevators there—I do not know the exact capacity, it may be anything from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 or 20,000,000 bushels—that if, also, we could fill the elevator at Quebec, which has a capacity of 1,500,000 bushels, the farmers of the West would get the advantage if they paid the same rate that they would have to pay in the summer by shipping it to Port Arthur, lake and rail. They would not ship their grain in the winter time if they could possibly avoid it, because it would cost them the winter rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern, which would be 6 cents more than if it were carried on the Transcontinental. As I understand it, that was the reason which actuated the Minister of Railways. He said, we have the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur filled, and we have in Montreal a considerable storage capacity. If we can carry the grain over the Transcontinental, and put it in the elevators at Montreal and Quebec, where there is a capacity of one and three-quarter million bushels, and the farmers can get it carried there at the same rate as they would pay in the summer time, it will be of great assistance to the people in the West.

The only reason why we could not handle more was that we had not the equipment. We took the road over on the first of July with the expectation that we would get our proportion of equipment that the Grand Trunk Pacific was supposed to have on hand for the Transcontinental, but, on the contrary, we got none. We took that road over without a particle of rolling stock. We did the best we could by taking rolling stock from the Government railway system. We have ordered rolling stock, but it will be eight or ten months before it is delivered. You cannot get cars for months and months after the order is given on account of the scarcity of raw material. During the last year or two the policy of railway companies has been to build steel, instead of wooden, cars, and it is difficult to get the material. However, the minister did order cars, we are ordering more, and we are doing our best to get sufficient equipment to meet all the necessities of the road. Taking the condition as we found it, it does strike me that it is not bad work that has been done by the Minister of Railways since the road was taken over. We hope we will get the road as well equipped as the Intercolonial was at the time we took the Transcontinental over, and that we will have it in such shape that we can move the grain in larger quantities and avoid the trouble we had with grain being exposed last winter. If we can get the necessary equipment, with the great storage capacity we have at the head of the lakes, at Montreal, in the West, where three elevators were built last year, at Quebec and in Ontario, where the elevator capacity has been increased very materially within the last few years, and with the elevator capacity that we must have at St. John and Halifax, I think we will be able to handle the crop fairly well. This is a big question and one which requires a great deal of consideration, and will call for considerable expenditure. At St. John, where the elevator is supposed to be built out on the point near the sugar refinery, tracks will have to be laid and other work done. I admit that there has been quite a delay in the building of that elevator.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Quite an inexcusable delay.

Mr. REID: I do not agree with the hon. gentleman in so far as that is concerned. I agree that it is necessary to have the elevator there, and as soon as possible. But war conditions have been such that many works of great importance, such as the one mentioned, has had to wait.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Minister of Finance said that all necessary works that could not be called new would be carried through to completion.

Mr. REID: I have had this matter up and I am in hopes that it will only be a short time until we have an elevator in St. John.

Mr. BURNHAM: I should like some one to put in a word for the building up of Canadian industries. I have heard of nothing but wheat. We cannot eat wheat, nobody can eat wheat, but we all eat flour. We could reduce our elevator capacity, and the facilities for moving wheat, by half, by turning the wheat into flour. But, we allow the industry, flour-making, in Great Britain and elsewhere to be built up at our expense while we are trying to get our raw product transported across the ocean and carried elsewhere. Why is it that some method cannot be devised, why is not the impulse to manufacture strong enough in this country, why do we not repress this tendency to freedom of trade, which is so absurd, and why is it that we never think of developing our own country? Let us bend all our energies towards turning our wheat into first-class flour, and then try to send that elsewhere, and not keep calling for enormous storage capacities half of which, as a matter of fact, would not be required, if we had our ideas properly developed in regard to our own industries, and in regard to giving the people of this country something to do, and we would be saved that expense, which in itself is tremendous.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid that my hon. friend is wrong. He often is right, but I think he will have to go a step further. We do not eat flour; we eat bread and biscuits, and he will have to carry his argument down to the manufacture of the flour into bread and biscuits if he is going to carry his idea out to its logical conclusion. I was glad to notice that the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals answered the Minister of Trade and Commerce so effectively. I was almost going to say that he had done it more effectively than it was done on this side of the House. The Minister of Trade and Commerce argued that the proper place for the wheat just now is in the elevators and elsewhere in the West. The Acting Minister of Railways and Canals rather discounted that by arguing that the Government had done a great deal by transferring a lot of it to Montreal and Quebec. I think the Acting Minister of Railways was right in saying that that was a good idea; but I am not so sure that he was quite right in saying that they had carried that idea into practical effect. The minister's figures must surely be wrong. I cannot conceive of a statement that only 400,000 bushels, out of 8,000,000 bushels, went to a Canadian port.

Mr. REID: No, I did not say "went to a Canadian port."

An hon. MEMBER: To Halifax.

Mr. GRAHAM: I should have added in winter. I should have added to a winter port. You said that 400,000 went to Halifax and none to St. John.

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: A great deal of it went to Portland. I cannot see how my hon. friend, having a Government line from the West, did not even fill the elevator at Halifax once. He tells us that we ought to have more storage capacity at Halifax; yet, out of the 8,000,000 bushels, he did not ship 750,000 to Halifax. That rather bears out something that was said in the discussion the other night, and which was that the way the railway has been managed has made it practically imperative that a large portion of our western wheat should be carried to an American port. The road has been operated in a practical way to Cochrane, but east of that as a side line, a local road, and not with any regularity. An excuse was given why proper operation has not taken place. The result has been, just what the minister has said to-night, that a large proportion of the 8,000,000 bushels that came from the West over that road has been handed to the Grand Trunk at Cochrane. The Grand Trunk has brought it out over the Toronto and Northern Ontario to North Bay, from there over its own line to Scotia Junction, then east to Montreal, and from Montreal to Portland. Now, until the Government takes hold of this line east of Cochrane, and gives it a service at least approximating the services west of Cochrane, the result cannot be otherwise than that in winter a large proportion of our western wheat will go to American ports. That is altogether subversive of the policy behind the construction of this line. The Grand Trunk cannot begin to haul as big a load over its line from North Bay to Montreal as can the Transcontinental from Cochrane to Moncton; there is no question about that. I am safe in saying that the Government railway from Cochrane to Moncton, with no more than two short pusher grades, can haul in one train twice as heavy a load as can be hauled over the Grand Trunk from Scotia

Junction east. If the Grand Trunk can afford to take that traffic from Cochrane to North Bay, and from there to Scotia Junction, thence to Montreal, and from Montreal to Portland, over a comparatively inferior line, surely the Government line with its magnificent roadbed ought to be able to haul the grain to our Canadian ports at a cheaper rate. I am suprised that only 400,000 bushels got to Halifax. If there was no tonnage to be had, the Government should at least have filled up the Halifax elevator out of that 8,000,000 bushels.

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows from many discussions we have had in this House that the Intercolonial has been taxed to its utmost capacity from the close of navigation up to the present time, carrying troops and war supplies, and there have been complaints throughout the whole system because we could not furnish cars for local traffic. The Intercolonial could not have done more than it did during the last season. The grain was stored in the elevators at Montreal and Quebec, and how could we take it to St. John or Halifax when we had not the power or the cars?

Mr. GRAHAM: It struck me that as 400,000 bushels had been taken to Halifax, the elevator there might have been filled. It would have taken only about 350,000 bushels more to fill it.

Mr. REID: It was not stored there; it only went through the elevator.

Mr. GRAHAM: There was no tonnage there.

Mr. REID: Yes, there was tonnage, but not a very great deal. I say the Intercolonial was taxed to its utmost capacity, and could not have hauled that 8,000,000 bushels. But give the Government a chance to get equipment for both roads, and then the grain will be moved over the Government railways to the elevators at Montreal and Quebec, and to the ocean ports. Grain has to have some outlet. The
10 p.m. Canadian Pacific railway was taxed to its utmost capacity at St. John, and as the grain had to be shipped to England we could not help it going through American ports.

Mr. OLIVER: Is this item of $1,500,000 for equipment for the Transcontinental?

Mr. REID: No. I have a memorandum here showing that the $1,500,000 is made up as follows:

Filling wooden trestles, $350,000; fencing, etc., etc., $100,000; unsettled grading contracts, $500,000; right of way and Quebec terminals, $500,000; boilers and power house equipment, Leonard shops, $50,000. There are three trestles on the line just west of Superior Junction, (that is, the 10 miles of line constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and subsequently acquired by the Transcontinental Commission) that it may be advisable to fill this coming summer. They were constructed in 1908, and must now be either renewed or filled. There are other wooden trestles between Graham and Winnipeg that were constructed in 1907 and 1908, that it may be advisable to at least partially fill up this coming summer. It costs considerable money to organize equipment for trestle filling, and it is a question, when once organized and at work, whether it is not more profitable to complete the job at once. I am of opinion that $360,000 will be sufficient for this class of work between Superior Junction and Winnipeg for the season of 1916. As all trestles on the line east of Superior Junction are of more recent date than those west of that point, they should not be filled for some years to come.

Considerable fencing will be required between Hervey Junction and La Tuque, a distance of 50 miles, as the country is settleing up. The same applies to the country east and west of Cochrane and the country adjacent to the Wabigoon river west of Graham, but it is possible that the above-mentioned amount will not be expended, as this will depend largely on whether the anticipated amount of settlement takes place or not.

The unsett'ed grading contracts amount to: Grand Trunk Railway Company, $1,500,000; unsettled contractors' claims, $203,000. The above is a matter of adjustment, and it is impossible to state definitely what the final result will be.

Many of these right-of-way questions in Quebec and vicinity are now in the Exchequer Court for adjustment. In other cases, they may be settled without having recourse to the courts. I am of opinion that the sum of $500,000 will be sufficient for the adjustment that will be affected within the fiscal year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely the acting minister can see now what he has done. He has read some detailed items of construction, which show that the filling of trestles, fencing, etc., has not been completed Under the original contract the Grand Trunk Pacific was to be fenced. The minister admits the whole case about the road not being completed. However, we can discuss that on the Transcontinental item. Can the minister say how much of this 8,000,000 bushels went into the Quebec and Montreal elevators respectively?

Mr. REID: I am informed that 6,250,000 bushels went to Montreal, and 1,750,000 bushels to Quebec. A portion of the grain that went to Montreal elevators has been shipped out to Portland, but we shall not know the exact quantity till spring.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have always understood that steamships are very glad to get grain to use in place of ballast, and I know that some years ago vessels going to New York would carry grain just for the sake of having it as ballast. I should think that the ships coming to our Canadian ports in winter would be glad to get grain to store in the hold.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They got all the grain they wanted to carry.

Mr. REID: The quantity of war supplies that had to be shipped was so great that nearly all the vessels had cargoes of that nature.

But they got all the grain that they wanted to make up their cargo, not as ballast but at very high rates. For years the rates for ballast have been very low; but, of course, owing to the scarcity of tonnage, there was such a congestion of freight that they could get nearly all the freight they wanted.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the Government taking steps to secure tonnage?

Mr. REID: The question of securing tonnage does not come under the Railway Department. It comes under the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the next time that the Estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce are before the House, perhaps the minister will be able to reply to that question.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The minister has given us a great deal of information, but there is one point on which he has not thrown very much light. He has admitted that the scarcity of rolling stock on both the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental is a serious matter, and I know that the business people of the country are anxious about it. Would the minister be kind enough to take us into his confidence and tell us what he has done in regard to providing cars and engines?

Mr. REID: There are quite a number of engines and cars under order. I gave instructions some time ago to have the specifications ready, and I expect within a few days that tenders will be called for for a very large quantity of cars and engines and other equipment necessary. In order to help us out, we purchased the equipment of one of the contractors.

Mr. GRAHAM: What contractor was that?

Mr. REID: O'Brien and McDougall. We purchased from them 25 engines, 400 cars, and a quantity of other material—all the plant necessady for construction and keeping the railroad in repair.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was pretty well worn out.

Mr. REID: I am informed that it was in good condition. The 25 engines and 400 cars have come in very useful. We expect, however, to have under order within the next few weeks all the cars and engines that we can get made in this country between now and next fall.

Mr. GRAHAM: Ordinary wooden cars or steel under-frames?

Mr. REID: What we intended making was the steel cars, but we had in view the building of say 500 wooden cars to keep us going, as we can get those much quicker than the steel cars.

Mr. GRAHAM: Steel under-frame?

Mr. REID: Yes. The reason that there was a shortage of rolling stock on the Intercolonial was, as I stated this afternoon, on account of our taking a quantity of equipment to put on the Transcontinental.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the minister mind bringing down a report showing what he purchased from O'Brien & McDougall and what he paid?

Mr. REID: I will send my hon. friend a copy of the detailed account.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I hope the minister will not delay very much longer in getting his specifications out and calling for tenders, because it is slow work building steel cars. Every one knows that a sample car has to be built, that the stock has to be procured ahead, and that it takes months to get started on a contract of that kind, because some of the large car plants in the country are busy on war material. I regret that the minister has let the whole winter pass without having his contracts entered into. If he really intends to get anything done that will serve us for the coming season, he should not be so far behind as at the present time to be only calling for tenders.

Mr. REID: I have been pressing this matter with those who have to get the specifications out, and they tell me that within the next few days we shall be able to call for tenders, and we expect to get the first 500 cars in July.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do you build any cars at Moncton?

Mr. REID: We only do repairing work there.

Mr. GRAHAM: You build some engines there?

Mr. REID: Yes, but we have a contract for nearly all those outside. We do a little of that work at Moncton.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is there not sufficient capacity at Moncton, in those magnificent shops, which are well equipped and where you have the very best machinery? It was understood, when those shops were erected, that cars would be built there.

Mr. REID: As I stated a minute ago, those shops are being run to their fullest capacity with repairs and so on. When the men are not employed on work of that kind they work at the building of cars. My information is that the shops at Moncton, owing to heavy repair work during the last year, are working to their fullest capacity. They are not holding off any work; all the work that can be done there is being done at the present time, but it takes the whole plant to keep the equipment in order.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Is the minister quite certain that it is the scarcity of cars that has placed the Intercolonial in such a position that it is not able to take care of the traffic? It is inconveniencing the people very much.

Mr. REID: That is the reason—because we had to take equipment from the Intercolonial to put on the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and Quebec, as at the start we had no cars at all on the Transcontinental. Had we not had to do that we would have been in a much better position on the Intercolonial.

Mr. HUGHES: It is the opinion of some people in the Maritime Provinces who have some knowledge of the matter that it is not entirely the scarcity of cars that is bringing about this unfavourable condition, but that it is to some extent due to the management. To illustrate this point, in Halifax on Saturday last a wholesale merchant informed me that on the 8th of April a loaded car for him left Montreal and on the 23rd of April he could not find any trace of it.

Mr. REID: That is easily explained. There have been cases on the Intercolonial, as well as on other roads, of local freight having had to be put on a siding or in the yards and kept there for days in order to allow the through traffic for the war to go forward. Ammunition and supplies for war purposes had to have the right of way.

There is another reason that just strikes me as to why there was a little shortage. The hon. member who comes from Prince Edward Island will remember that there was some trouble because goods could not be shipped to Newfoundland. We had 300 cars at Sydney, where they were held for months because the steamers running from Sydney to Newfoundland could not take the freight. We had to place an embargo on freight for Newfoundland because the steamers could not take it across. We had to send a Government steamer, the Durley Chune, to carry two cargoes, in an effort to relieve the situation. We chartered another steamer also. All that time there were cars held up. But there were other places where we had to let cars wait. This has been an exceptional time—we all admit that. We had to use many engines in moving the troops. A troop train, being very heavy, would require two engines, and the hon. gentleman knows how many troops have been moved. That has meant taking power from the moving of freight. Besides all this, we have had to take over the Transcontinental, making it very hard to meet all requirements. I think the management has done everything possible under the circumstances.

Mr. HUGHES: Here was this car leaving Montreal on the 8th of April, routed for Halifax, and loaded with stuff that the people were waiting for, inquiring about, and ready to unload, but they could not even get information as to where it was. My information is that under the management of Mr. Pottinger the local men were able to give a good deal of information with regard to matters of that kind, but under the management of Mr. Gutelius nearly everything is done in Moncton. The statement is made that when you write to Moncton you do not even get an answer in any reasonable time. I know the conditions in Prince Edward Island. Under the former management the local superintendent had a great deal of responsibility and could give the information to the public, but now everything is transferred to Moncton and you might almost as well write to China as to Moncton, so far as getting an answer is concerned. The matter is referred from one official to another. The present management may be better in some respects that we cannot see, but it does not give the

same satisfaction to local patrons. The case to which I have referred is one that the former management would not have permitted to remain unsettled. I quite understand that a car may go astray on the railway, but surely it can be traced; at all events, a letter might be answered. A wholesale merchant in Halifax told me that this case was not an isolated one, but that similar cases often happen. There is a belief that the management is not trying to give the local people the service they have the right to expect.

Mr. REID: Our general freight agent, Mr. Hayes, is a man in whom I have a great deal of confidence, and I am surprised to hear it said that there is such a feeling as the hon. gentleman speaks of. I think it is on account of the trouble we have had this winter. But the Intercolonial is not the only road on which there have been delays. A case was brought to my attention of a complaint made of eight or ten cars that had been en route on a large system for three months and that they had not been able to locate—they had got run on to some siding, no doubt, and other freight had accumulated. Of course, even under normal conditions, cars will go astray. But from what I have known of the working of the Intercolonial during the present winter—and I have had a good deal to do with it because of the minister being away—I believe it has not been any worse in regard to delays than any other system.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: Whatever the reason, one thing is certain, and that is that there is general criticism of the management of the Intercolonial. That criticism is not confined to the officials and the employees. The minister, no doubt, knows the attitude of the employees towards the management at Moncton, he knows that ever since the change a few years ago there has been nothing of the spirit of cooperation and good will that prevailed among the employees. He knows that even newspapers supporting the Government criticise the management. I refer particularly to a newspaper in Truro, in the constituency represented by the chief whip of the Conservative party (Mr. Stanfield), which, in season and out of season, criticises the Intercolonial management. Why it is I am not in a position to say. But we do know that there is a large staff, and the Lord knows they get good salaries, and the cost of running the service is altogether out of proportion to the cost of the service when Mr. Pottinger ran the road. Complaints are not confined to the operations of last winter, but have been general for a number of years past. There seems to be indifference on the part of the officials at Moncton to the requirements of the local trade. They seem to think they are the lords of creation and can do about as they like, and if they reply to a complaint they seem to think it an act of condescension on their part. The people along the line in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces complain bitterly about the lack of sympathy shown by the officials at Moncton. We regret that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) has been prevented by illness from giving the attention to the service that he would have liked to have given.

Whether it is due to the fact that there are too many new men on the job, that the offices go from one man to another, and that the work is done in a perfunctory manner, I cannot say. The feeling prevails that there is very little sympathy on the part of the management, even on the part of the minister, with the railway and the people of the Maritime Provinces. Another matter that I wish to call attention to is the delay that occurs in dealing with small claims against the Intercolonial. When a small claim for a horse injured or sheep killed is sent into the department at Moncton, investigation after investigation is held; the matter goes from one man to another; the operations are even more mysterious than the Militia Department was before the war broke out. You call attention time after time to these little claims; after some time probably you get a reply, but the thing hangs fire. The delay in the Chancery case that Dickens describes—I cannot recollect the name of it—

Mr. BURNHAM: Jarndyce and Jarndyce.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The delay in connection with that case was nothing compared with the tardiness of the Intercolonial Railway in dealing with these little claims. The minister ought to prod them up a little and see that these claims are promptly dealt with. It is all very well to say that the claimants may go to court about it, but the minister knows that in connection with these little claims running from $10 to $100 the claimants do not feel like running a risk of lawsuit with a powerful defendant like the Intercolonial Railway. I submit that in all fairness these claims should be promptly dealt with; that advantage should not be taken of technicalities. More time

and money is wasted in running these things from pillar to post than would be involved in settling the claims promptly.

Mr. REID: I have not heard any complaints such as the hon. member mentions. We have a solicitor at Moncton who looks after these claims, and there is no reason why they should not be disposed of with reasonable promptness. I will draw attention to the statements the hon. member has made, and see that there is as little delay as possible in dealing with claims that may arise in the future.

Mr. HUGHES: There is a pretty general feeling that the officials who came from the Canadian Pacific railway, particularly those who were loaned, are not in sympathy with the Intercolonial. I do not know whether or not that is correct, but if it is correct it is a serious state of affairs.

Mr. REID: I do not think that is a fact.

Mr. HUGHES: There is room for suspicion there. The system has been changed since the new management took hold. Under the management of David Pottinger, who received a small salary, comparatively speaking, there were two tariffs in each year—I think this applied to the Prince Edward Island railway as well as the Intercolonial railway—a summer tariff and a winter tariff. When the tariff went into operation in the spring, every one concerned knew what the tariff would be until the fall. Now the tariff is changed quite frequently, and nobody knows how often it is going to be changed. I have spoken to station agents along the line of the railway and they do not seem to know clearly what the tariff is. Many circulars are sent out in connection with these changes. A circular will go out referring, perhaps, to section 10 of circular 82, subsection g or something like that, and it keeps a man reading pretty nearly all the time in order to be well posted with regard to the changes. The result is that a man frequently charges too much in order to be safe. The idea is that the Intercolonial is tailing along after the Canadian Pacific railway. This session of Parliament a committee has given its attention to the matter of introducing the fish business into west-Canada. Mr. Archibald, superintendent of the dining car service on the Intercolonial railway, who appeared before that committee, was asked upon what principle they charged as much in the dining cars for fish that cost five cents a pound or less as for turkey that cost from 20 to 25 cents a pound. The Government railway system could be made a good advertising agency.

Mr. REID: Did he explain the reason?

Mr. HUGHES: He said he knew of no reason unless it was that they wanted to copy the Canadian Pacific railway. There does not appear to be any originality or any responsibility in connection with this road; the only desire seems to be to copy the Canadian Pacific railway I understand that on the railway systems in the Southern States they make a specialty of putting fruit in the dining car at a very low rate in order to advertise the fruit districts. On the Hill system they make a specialty of certain kinds of potatoes that are grown in Oregon and in some of the Pacific coast states. It would be an excellent advertisement for our fish if the Government railway system should put fish on the menu card at as low a rate as possible. There is no doubt about the fact that the dining car service is good, but few men who are accustomed to eating fish will take fish if they can get turkey at the same price. I was coming up the other day on the Intercolonial and to my surprise I found that turkey could be obtained even at this season of the year as cheap as haddock. I took the haddock, which I found to be excellent. We are spending money in an effort to advertise the fish business and to introduce it into western Canada; why should the Intercolonial Railway not advertise it on their own tables? The only reason that is offered seems to be that they want to follow the lead of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. REID: You have the Prince Edward Island oysters, I believe, on the bill of fare?

Mr. HUGHES: No, it is not the oyster season.

Mr. REID: I mean during the season.

Mr. HUGHES: I suppose they have them.

Mr. REID: They are good, too, the very best in the world.

Mr. HUGHES: I think so. I see an item here for original construction on the Prince Edward Island railway. Surely that must be a misprint. If I understand the words "original construction," this item should surely be $8,000 or $18,000.

Mr. REID: No; that is an item to cover any claims. The explanation of it is this: it is a revote of amount of unexpended bal-

ances from the 1915-16 appropriation. In 1915-16 we had a vote of $800; it remains the same. Each year there are land damages and claims that have not been presented, or that have been overlooked, and, having a small appropriation, a settlement can easily be made at a reduced figure. There was not anything spent last year, and there is nothing in view, but it is just as well to have this small item in the Estimates in case anything should turn up.

Mr. HUGHES: Some years ago the Government built a piece of railway extending from a place called Cardigan to Montague, and the intention was to continue that line and connect with what is known as the Murray Harbour branch. That line has never been completed, and it ought to have been finished. The intention was to finish it, but, for some reason or another, it has not been completed. Now the war is on, and I suppose that will be another reason for not going on with it. The line between Cardigan and Montague was completed by the late Government, and the intention was to extend it so as to connect with the other branch and make it more useful than it is now.

Mr. REID: These Estimates were prepared by the Minister of Railways himself, and he does not appear to have an item for that railway. I do not understand the situation or the conditions, but there is nothing in the Estimates, and, therefore, there would seem to be no intention of going on with that work this year.

Mr. HUGHES: There is an item of $1,000 for surveys and inspection. That has been in the Estimates for a year or two, but it does not seem to have been used.

Mr. REID: During the past year the right of way surveys have been made on the island, under the vote for this purpose, to obtain records of the profile, right of way, bridges and so forth. The records will be completed this year, but it is necessary to revote the balance to complete the plans and records.

Mr. HUGHES: For two years the Minister of Railways told me that he intended to survey a proposed line of railway between Bridgetown and the main line, connecting probably at St. Peter, and passing through or near the settlement called Strathcona, but no survey has been made. Is it the intention to have anything done this year?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. REID: During the war we are not going on with any more new work than we can possibly help. There is no vote for that work.

Mr. HUGHES: There were surveys made last summer, were there not?

Mr. REID: No, those were for the purpose of obtaining the records of profile, right of way, bridges, and so forth, on the island.

Mr. HUGHES: I saw a number of men making surveys there every time I travelled on the railway. They called themselves engineers, and they carried tripods and surveying instruments of various kinds. I think they were having a pretty good holiday. They seemed to be young men from college, and a good many worked bareheaded, with their sleeves rolled up, and with their boots over their trousers, and there was a considerable quantity of mud on their boots. There was a local election coming on.

Mr. GRAHAM: That accounts for it.

Mr. HUGHES: It was reported that the survey was for the purpose of having the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway widened.

Mr. REID: That was probably right.

Mr. HUGHES: If that is correct, is it the intention of the Government to proceed at once with the widening of the gauge?

Mr. REID: There is nothing in the Estimates for that purpose.

Mr. HUGHES: That is why I thought it strange that they should be making surveys last summer, if there was no intention to go on with the work.

Mr. REID: The surveys have to be made ahead.

Mr. HUGHES: That may be so, but the opinion is that the coming election had something to do with it.

Mr. REID: I do not think so.

Mr. HUGHES: It will be hard to get that idea out of the minds of the people down there, particularly when the surveys are not to be followed up by any work. If there had been an item in the Estimates showing that the survey was to be taken advantage of, and that the work was to go on, I might have thought that it was all right, but I must say I am somewhat skeptical. I am afraid that that

survey will have to be done all over again. A local election was held last summer, and there was a possibility of a Dominion election as well, and perhaps it was thought that the survey would do for both. It is one way of spending money, and of giving a holiday to young men who are sons or relatives of men friendly to the Administration. It is not a desirable way of spending money, particularly when we ought to be practising economy. It is adopting the method which was suggested some sessions ago, that the Government should dash away and spend the money.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the minister get some information about this car ferry and give it to the committee, when the Estimates next come up? He might tell us how far we have got on with it, and all about it. I would suggest that we let the Prince Edward Island item through.

Mr. HUGHES: Will the minister say when the car ferry will be ready for operation, or when the piers will be ready?

Mr. REID: I discussed that matter with the officials a few days ago, and I understand that the car ferry will be ready this coming fall.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would it not be better for the minister to give us the information definitely?

Mr. REID: I will get that information. We have had a very interesting and useful discussion to-day, and if the committee is willing to let this item go through I would suggest that we rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Wednesday, April 26, 1916,

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING AND ADVERTISING.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How much was paid by the Government or any department thereof for printing and advertising during the calendar year 1915, to each of the following newspapers and companies: The Halifax Herald, the Evening Mail, the Weekly Homestead, and the Royal Printing and Lithographing Company, all of Halifax, Nova Scotia?

Mr. BLONDIN:

Department of Customs: The Halifax Herald, $14; the Evening Mail, $14; the Weekly Homestead, nothing; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., nothing.

Department of External Affairs: The Halifax Herald, $55.30; the Halifax Mail, $16.10; Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., $134.50.

Department of Indian Affairs: The Halifax Herald, $32.60; the Evening Mail, $14.

Department of Interior: The Halifax Herald, $2,625.65; the Evening Mail, nothing; the Weekly Homestead, nothing; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., nothing.

Post Office Department: The Halifax Herald, $124.80; the Evening Mail, $156.50; the Weekly Homestead, $111.10; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., nothing.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery: The Halifax Herald, $7,582.48; the Evening Mail, nothing; the Weekly Homestead, nothing; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., nothing.

Department of Public Works: The Halifax Herald, $75.40; the Evening Mail, $75.40; the Weekly Homestead, nothing; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., nothing.

Department of Railways and Canals: The Halifax Herald, $7,646.35; the Evening Mail, $1,281.84; the Weekly Homestead, nothing; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., $3,269.06.

Department of Marine: The Halifax Herald, $347.70; the Evening Mail, $335.10; the Weekly Homestead, nothing; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., nothing.

Department of Militia and Defence: The Halifax Herald, $183.78; the Evening Mail, $57.75 the Weekly Homestead, nothing; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., $356.

Department of Naval Service: The Halifax Herald, $569.88; the Evening Mail, $337.45; the Weekly Homestead, nothing; the Royal Printing and Lithographing Co., Limited, $16.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

With reference to an item of $3,705.52, charged in Auditor General's Report, volume 1, page K-61, paid to the Halifax Herald for printing, etc., was this work advertised for tender?

Mr. ROCHE: The above payment was for 102,000 "Nova Scotia" pamphlets, 64 pages and cover, with double page coloured insert map. This pamphlet, without coloured insert map, was originally printed in 1908 at $55.20 per thousand. A reprint of same being required, The Halifax Herald were asked to state their price for this work, and their offer of $3,487.50 for 100,000 being considered a fair price, they were given the order.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. With reference to an item of $1,000, as charged on page K-62, volume 1, of the Auditor General's Report, for ten pages of advertising matter in Evidence of Industrial Ascendency of Nova Scotia, to whom was this money paid?
2. In what paper or other publication did this advertisement appear?
3. Was this advertisement published more than once? If so, how often?
4. (a) If Evidence of Industrial Ascendency of Nova Scotia is the name of the pamphlet, who printed same, (b) how many pages and (c) how many copies were printed, and (d) what was the total cost of the preparation and printing?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Halifax, N.S.

2 and 3. This publication is a pamphlet.

4. (a) Printed by Imperial Publishing Co., Ltd., Halifax, N.S.; (b) 84 pages and cover; (c) 50,000; (d) Department of Interior paid $1,000 for ten pages of advertising in this pamphlet, but has no information as to total cost of publication.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT CLERKS.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many clerks are there in the Public Works Department who belong to and are paid from the outside service vote and who work in the inside service?
2. What are the names of said clerks?
3. What salary is paid to each?
4. How long has each been in the service of the department?
5. Have all or any of these clerks passed any examination? If so, what examination and on what date or dates?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. 7.

2, 3, 4, and 5. S. Fortin; salary, $2,400; from 4th Sept., 1914; no examination.

F. G. Smith; salary, $1,800; from 17th Nov., 1914; no examination.

A. E. Cross; salary, $2,100; from 18th Jan., 1905; no examination.

Jos. Aube; salary, $1,000; from 15th May, 1911; certificate from Civil Service Commission.

J. R. Tobin; salary, $1,200; from 20th June, 1910; no examination.

H. M. Davy; salary, $2,300; from 21st May, 1905; no examination.

W. J. Hickey; salary, $1,060; from Dec., 1909; no examination.

SUPPLIES AND TRANSPORT.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is there a director of supplies and transport for the Canadian service in England? If so, what is his name?
2. Where does he come from?
3. Is he a British subject? If so, by birth or naturalization?
4. If naturalization, when was he naturalized what is his rank, and when was he appointe
5. When was he appointed?
6. Why was he appointed?
7. How many officers has he on his staff?
8. How many clerks, stenographers and civilians are employed under him?
9. How many troops were in Shorncliffe and surrounding camps in July and August, 1915?
10. How many officers and men were required to carry on the work of transport and supplies, etc., for the number of troops then at Shorncliffe and surrounding camps?
11. How many troops are at present in Shorncliffe and surrounding camps?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes, Colonel Alexander Duncan McRae.

2. Vancouver, B.C.

3. He is a British subject, born at Glencoe, Ont., November 17, 1874.

4. Honorary Lieutenant-Colonel, 6th Regiment, 11th September, 1912; Lieutenant-Colonel in the C.A.S.C., 21st November, 1914; Lieutenant-Colonel in the C.E.F., 11th May, 1915; Colonel in C.E.F., 1st November, 1915.

5. 1st November, 1915.

6. Such an officer was considered necessary, and the D.O.C., M.D. 10, recommended Colonel A. D. McRae as most useful in connection with the transport and supply branches of the service, particularly the former, as he is thoroughly conversant with everything connected with that work, especially in regard to horses, automobiles and motor freight trucks.

7. 24 officers.

8. 68 clerks, 12 stenographers, 1 civilian employee. (This includes 27 casualties fit only for light duty.)

9. 43,098 on 31st July, 1915; 44,950 on 31st August, 1915.

10. There was no Army Service Corps training school work done in July and August last, owing to its personnel and that of 2nd Divisional Army Service Corps being engaged in supply and transport work. This aggregated 75 officers and 1,249 other ranks. In addition, hired civilian transport was much employed.

11. 57,494 on 20th April, 1916.

WAR SUPPLIES—GROCERIES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were the persons or firms who tendered for the supply of groceries called for by the Department of Militia in British Columbia?
2. What was the amount of each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member was asked to give some further particulars and promised to write a letter to give such particulars. Up to this time that letter has not been received. If some hon. gentleman on the other side will remind him of it, we will have that question answered. It cannot be answered in its present form.

DR. N. P. FREEMAN.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is Dr. N. P. Freeman, of Lunenburg county, employed as a medical examiner, or in any other capacity, by the Department of Militia?
2. Has he any rank in the militia?
3. Has he received any pay from said department for any services since August, 1914? If so, how much?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes; $525.80 to 31st January, 1916.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—MEN FROM OTHER RAILWAYS.

Mr. COPP:

1. How many men have been taken from other railways and given employment on the Intercolonial railway, between the first of January, 1912, and the thirty-first of December, 1915?
2. What are the names of said employees?
3. What salaries are being paid said employees, respectively?

Mr. REID:

1. Twenty-three.

2. Engineering Department: C. B. Brown, $500 per month; A. T. McDonald, $110; F. S. Wilkins, $100; G. C. Lightner, $165; L. H. Robinson, $150; A. D. W. Cuthbert, $90; James Pullar, $90; H. T. Ruhl, $200; L. Brousseau, $140; T. L. Landers, $125; G. C. Perkins, $85; A. H. Jones, $125; J. E. Long, $225; Thos. Jas. F. King, $100.

Operating Department: J. K. McNeillie, $500 per month; A. C. Barker, $215; William Charles Roberts, $125; Wm. S. Bryne, $50.

Traffic Department: C. A. Hayes, $833.33 per month; Eugene Legasse, $105; Thomas Cree, $95; Harry Russiere, $90.

Mechanical Department: George E. Smart, $300 per month.

3. Answered by No. 2.

ADVANCES FOR SHELL OR FUSE MAKING.

Mr. PARDEE:

Were any advances made by any department of the Government to any persons or firms in Canada to enable them to start manufacturing either shells or fuses? If so, what persons or firms?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

REV. J. A. SPIDDEL.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Is the Rev. J. A. Spiddel a recruiting officer for Kings county?
2. What rank does he hold, and what pay does he receive?
3. When was he appointed?
4. What is the total amount received by him, including his expenses, for services as such recruiting officer?
5. Is the department aware that he is reported as having accepted nomination as Conservative candidate for Kings county, N.S.?
6. Is it the intention of the Government to continue to employ Mr. Spiddel in such service?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes.
2. No Militia rank. $3 per diem from November 9, 1915, to January 4, 1916.
3. November 9, 1915.
4. $164.
5. No information.
6. No.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MILITARY CHAPLAINS.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Is there a Roman Catholic Chaplain with the 25th Regiment at the front?
2. If so, what is his name and home address?
3. If not, why was there no such chaplain sent with said regiment?
4. Were Rev. J. McPherson and Rev. R. McGillivray taken from the battalion to which they were attached? If so, why?
5. (a) Has the 64th Regiment left Halifax, and (b) who is the Roman Catholic chaplain attached to said regiment?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. No. There are no battalion chaplains at the front. All are brigade chaplains and detailed for duty by brigadiers. There is one Roman Catholic chaplain to each brigade.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Rev. J. McPherson was sent to the Mediterranean as the only Canadian Roman Catholic chaplain available at the time. Rev. R. McGillivray was never posted to a battalion, and is now with the 4th Infantry Brigade in France.

5. (a) Yes. (b) Honorary Captain and Chaplain P. McQuillan is Roman Catholic chaplain to the 64th Battalion, C.E.F.

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Was there any trouble among the men of the 64th Regiment at the time of embarking for overseas? If so, what was the cause?
2. Was the 85th Regiment called out to assist the authorities? If so, why?
3. Is there a Roman Catholic chaplain now with the 185th Regiment at Broughton?
4. How many Roman Catholics are there in the 185th Regiment
5. How many Roman Catholic officers are there in the 85th and 185th Regiments, respectively?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1 aud 2. There was trouble between men of the 64th Battalion and Garrison Military Police on night before embarkation, and a piquet was called from 85th Battalion, but all was quiet before the piquet arrived. A few of the men were under the influence of liquor on embarkation, but nothing serious occurred.

3. No, nor any other denomination.

4. No information. Attestation papers have been telegraphed for.

5. No information.

STONE PURCHASED FROM ERNEST DEMPSY.

*Mr. BOYER:

1. What number of tons of stone did the Department of Railways and Canals purchase at different times from one Ernest Dempsy?
2. What price per ton was paid?
3. What use was such stone put to?
4. At what date and in what year was such stone purchased?

Mr. REID:

1. 2,325.86.

2. Five cents per ton, was paid to Mr. Dempsy, and the department did the quarrying, loading and hauling at a cost of $1.72 per ton, making the total cost to the department $1.77 per ton.

3. Building protection walls along the north shore of lake St. Francis, between Coteau Landing and St. Zotique.

4. March 1 to 28, 1913; February 2 to 28, 1914, and March 3 to 25, 1916.

SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL.

Mr. McCREA:

1. Were all or any of the following persons employed as sentries in guarding the drill hall and armouries of the 54th Regiment at Sherbrooke: Alexander Goulet, Joseph Morin, David Lamontagne, Théophile Noël, Alfred Vadeboncœur, Adelard Bouffard, Cleomene Jaffroy, and Joseph Côté?
2. If so, how long did they, respectively, act in such capacity?
3. What rate of pay per day did each receive for such services?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Our records show the following on duty: Joseph Morin, David Lamontagne, Théophile Noël, Alfred Vadeboncœur, Cleomene Jaffroy, Joseph Côté; no record of Alexander Goulet or Adelard Bouffard.

2. Joseph Morin, May 1, 1915 to June 30, 1915, 61 days $112.85; David Lamontagne, November 16, 1914 to July 31, 1915, 258 days, $477.30; Théophile Noël, August 11, 1914 to September 30, 1915, 385 days, $714.10; Alfred Vadeboncœur, November 16, 1914 to December 31, 1914, 46 days, $85.10; Cleomene Jaffroy, August 1, 1915 to September 30, 1915, 61 days ,$112.85; Joseph Côte, August 1 to 31, 1915, 31 days, $57.35.

3. The Militia Department paid $1, field allowance 10 cents, subsistence 75 cents.

UNMARRIED OFFICERS—SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Do the relatives of unmarried military officers serving in Canada in any case draw separation allowance?
2. If so, what degree of relationship is necessary to enable relatives to draw separation allowance?
3. What rate of separation allowance do they draw?
4. What officers as above haye relatives drawing separation allowance?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Only in a few cases.

2. Officer must be sole support of widowed mother.

3. The rate provided for the rank they hold in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

4. Those who are unmarried, have widowed mothers, and are the sole support of same.

FUEL PURCHASED FROM MR. ZEPHIRIN MARCHAND.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. What quantity of firewood did the Minister of Militia purchase from Mr. Zéphirin Marchand, of Three Rivers, during the year 1915, and what price was paid for such wood?
2. What quantity of coal did the Minister of Militia purchase from Mr. Zéphirin Marchand, of Three Rivers, during the year 1915, and what price was paid for such coal?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1 and 2. Public tenders were called for wood and coal at Three Rivers, and contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, Mr. Zephirin Marchand, at following prices:

Montenegrin Camp, Three Rivers: 75 cords softwood at $2.90 per cord, 199 cords hardwood at $3.90 per cord.

86th Regiment, Three Rivers: 21 cords softwood at $4 per cord, 60 tons grate-size coal at $7 per ton.

ALLEGED OMISSION FROM HANSARD.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, some days ago I called your attention to the official report of an address in this House by the Minister of Militia. I understood that the matter was to be referred to the Debates Committee. I call your attention to it again.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders have been given to have a meeting of the Debates Committee to-morrow.

PUNISHMENT OF PRIVATE SOLDIERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): The right hon. Prime Minister yesterday suggested that I should give such particulars as I could about a matter that I then brought to the attention of the House—an allegation that punishment more or less of the nature of torture had been administered to certain soldiers in Moosejaw. I have a telegram giving me further information in regard to it, the names of some of the soldiers alleged to have undergone this punishment, and other minor particulars, as follows:

Anderson, age twenty; offence, off duty about April 1; on 70 minutes of first part punishment, fainted. Graham, age 19; offence, insubordination, about April 8; punishment, arms suspended above like Anderson; invalid mother in Regina dependent for support. O'Brien, young man, neglected to carry out orders about April 8; same punishment. This was supposed to be for two hours a day for several days, but inside discontent and outside rumours stopped it.

I give this information as asked for by the Prime Minister, and it confirms my own conviction that barbarous punishment, really amounting to torture, is administered to soldiers there. I would ask the Prime Minister whether he is yet able to give us any information as to the investigation which he was kind enough to promise.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Within an hour after my attention was brought to the matter by the hon. member for Moosejaw, I gave instructions to the Deputy Minister of Militia to obtain information by telegraph. He has not yet communicated such information to me. At that time I had not the names of the privates alleged to have been punished in this way. If the hon. member will send me the telegram he has just read I will immediately communicate it to the Deputy Minister of Militia as giving additional data which may enable him to pursue the inquiry he has already been directed to make.

Mr. KNOWLES: I shall be glad to send the Prime Minister part of the telegram I have read, or, indeed, all of it. Lest there should be any misunderstanding, I do not wish to be understood as saying that these men were suspended with all their weight on their arms. My contention would be the same if they were transfixed in that position until they fainted. I bring this matter forward and make my protest regardless of whether these soldiers were left hanging there with all their weight on their arms. In either case, if the report be well founded, I protest against it as inhuman and barbarous.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is account of a similar punishment at Trenton in Nova Scotia, published in the Nova Scotia papers. I do not know whether or not that is the usual military punishment, but the indignation is so great there that, according to the newspaper statement, after the officers had started the punishment they refrained from it and allowed the man to be released.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Can the hon. gentleman give me the number of the regiment and the name of the man who was punished?

Mr. SINCLAIR: No, I cannot do that. It was at Trenton, N.S. The statement is in the Eastern Chronicle, which is on file in the reading room.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my hon. friend know the number of the regiment?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I can ascertain that for the right hon. gentleman.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend will direct my attention to the particular number of the Eastern Chronicle in which this article is to be found, so that I can advise the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, I shall have that inquired into also.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I will do that.

PRINTING OF ELECTORAL LISTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I am asked by several candidates in the coming provincial election in Quebec whether it is possible to have printed electoral lists. Some people say they are printed and some say they are not. The other day I inquired about the county of Rouville, and the

Secretary of State was kind enough to send me a typewritten copy of the list, for which I am very thankful. Would the hon. gentleman say whether it is possible to have the printed lists?

Mr. BLONDIN: Most of the lists are ready now.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Printed?

Mr. BLONDIN: Typewritten, for the use of members of the House of Commons. Those that are not ready now will be ready a couple of days hence.

CAMPBELLTON-GASPE SERVICE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Is the Minister of Trade and Commerce in a position now to give an answer to the question I put yesterday about the service between Campbellton and Gaspé?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have been able to secure a vessel which will make weekly trips from Campbellton to Gaspé and from Campbellton to Paspebiac, one service through to Gaspé and one service through to Paspebiac each week.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the name of the vessel?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Elaine.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the tonnage, and what the subsidy paid?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot give the exact figures with reference to the tonnage, but I can say that the tonnage provided is amply sufficient for three or four times the amount of traffic that has developed along that route during the last four or five years.

CANADA'S TRADE AND COMMERCE.

OCEAN TRANSPORTATION AND RATES.

On the motion for Committee of Supply:

Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Before the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply, as intimated previously, I am taking occasion to say a few words with reference to questions involving transportation rates, control of rates and such like, which were discussed while the Estimates of the department were under consideration. In the remarks that I propose making I shall try to look at all sides of these knotty and troublesome questions which have been thrust upon us largely by conditions arising from the war. I am going to make what little contribution I can make to a discussion of these points, with the idea of interesting the House and of provoking suggestions and opinions which will tend to explain if not to solve the conditions under which we are labouring.

In the discussion of these matters by gentlemen on the other side of the House, the Government has been held responsible for several things. Mainly it has been held responsible for the increase of freight rates across the Atlantic, for scarcity of tonnage for Atlantic transport, and for utter neglect or negligence in respect of both these matters. Although most of the members of this House may be thoroughly conversant with what I shall bring out this afternoon, and may, therefore, look upon it as being an iteration of what is already known, I am convinced that such is not the case amongst the people at large. These questions with reference to freight rates, control of freight rates, and transport across the Atlantic are not easily understood by the majority of the people, and consequently, in view of the statements that have been made as to what the Government has not done, there may easily be raised in their minds the presumption that things could have been very different from what they are if the Government had taken an active interest in these matters or had been possessed of capacity to deal with them. A good deal of this will probably be old matter to many of you who sit in the Chamber this afternoon; but I am addressing my remarks not only to the members of the House, but to the public outside, in the hope that a little more light may be thrown upon the matters under consideration.

The scarcity of tonnage is the key to the whole situation. Rates have advanced because of the scarcity of tonnage, and they have advanced in proportion as this scarcity of tonnage has become more pronounced. The lack of transport and the control of rates is connected with the general transport of our products overseas. How has this scarcity of tonnage which, as I say, is the key to the whole position, been brought about? In the first place, the commercial marine of the world has been sadly confused and hardly dealt with. The mercantile marine which belonged to the Teutonic nations has been absolutely swept from the seas. A

large proportion of it has been kept in home ports, mainly in Germany and in Austria; a large proportion of it has been interned in neutral ports where it happened to be when the war broke out or where it happened to find refuge shortly after the outbreak of war in order to avoid capture. When you put these two elements together you account for the disappearance of a very large proportion of the commercial tonnage of the world—tonnage which was absolutely and immediately abstracted from carrying capacity and power. Then, too, there has been the destruction of enemy tonnage through the activities of the war. Ships have been sent to the bottom; ships have been destroyed in different ways. When you take this into account you have one great factor accounting for the scarcity of tonnage which has been felt all over the world; because this commercial tonnage of the Teutonic nations went everywhere and was not confined to any one or two routes. These had been so developed by Germany during the last fifteen or twenty years that German lines of communication extended to every quarter of the world.

The next factor in producing scarcity of tonnage is the weight of work that has to be performed by the commercial marine of the allied powers and of the neutral nations, in supporting the active operations of the war. The transports and naval vessels of the allied powers have been engaged in the transport of troops and munitions from the bases of supply to the fields of action, many of them in taking care of that ceaseless stream of war traffic between Great Britain and France, and a large portion of them in caring for those distant operation which are being carried on in every part of the world by the British and allied nations. These operations have been conducted on an extensive scale in the Mediterranean, in the far East and in South Africa, and they have made a very great demand on commercial tonnage. In proportion as the war has extended and has developed in intensity and in the numbers of men engaged, particularly on the part of the British Empire, the naval transports have proved unequal to the added work and the call upon the British commercial marine has been accentuated and made greater, month by month, and year by year. Supplies and troops have had to be transported to the scene of the war from far distant countries,—New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and the dependencies of Great Britain all over the world. Owing to the great length of the voyages in such cases the demand upon the mercantile marine is very much greater than where the troops and supplies have to be transported only a short distance. No one, without actual investigation, can comprehend the amount of commercial tonnage that has been required to carry out this work. Not only have multiplied munitions of war had to be carried from far distant countries, very largely from the United States, but it has been necessary to provide transportation for immense quantities of supplies, food, provisions of all kinds and great numbers of horses and mules. It must also be remembered that Great Britain has had to look after not only her own wants but she has had to supply commercial tonnage for France, Italy, and other Allies. So, when we sometimes feel almost like finding fault because Great Britain requisitions ships which are engaged in mercantile operations, we must take into account not only the vast needs of Great Britain for her own purposes but also that she has to supply commercial tonnage to a very large extent for the war purposes of her Allies.

It must be remembered, also, that at all times during the war, and particularly of late, there has been a certain destruction of tonnage by the enemy. It would surprise any member of this House if he were to total up the quantity of commercial tonnage which has been destroyed by mines within the two years of the war, and, of late, by enemy submarines. Outside of all accidents and casualties common to the sea there have been these influences which have taxed to the utmost the commercial tonnage, not only of Great Britain, but of the neutral countries as well. Coincident with the destruction and internment of tonnage there has been going on in Great Britain and in the allied countries a certain amount of shipbuilding. It would not be far from the truth to say that the tonnage built for commercial purposes since the war began has been sufficient to offset the destruction by mines and submarines, and by casualties, and even with, perhaps, a slight surplus up to within a very recent period. I think the truth is that just now the new shipbuilding from month to month will hardly replace the actual destruction of tonnage by warlike operations.

Added to that destruction of tonnage there has been a demand for the carrying of products unprecedented, possibly, in the

history of the world. There has been a very abundant harvest in the world; there have been enormous productions of munitions of war; there have, therefore, been tremendous calls, not before equalled in the history of the world, for tonnage to carry these products of peace and necessities of war across the seas. That tremendous call, acting in conjunction with the scarcity of which I have spoken, could only have the one result, namely, that the rates of carriage have been greatly advanced. This increase in rates has been directly in proportion to the call for service, and the inability to secure transports.

We would not measure up the whole position unless we also took into account that not only has there been this scarcity of tonnage and this destruction of tonnage, but that there has been a diminution of the efficiency of tonnage, which it is very important to remember. For instance, the congestion and the confusion arising therefrom in the great ports of the world has reduced the efficiency of tonnage, in some cases by one-half. Havre, during the first months of the war, presented such a congested condition that ships which went there and which, in the ordinary course of traffic, would have entered and unloaded and come out of Havre within two weeks or four weeks at the utmost, have been delayed there month after month before they could even get berthing. That same congestion has taken place in the British ports and in the Italian ports as well as in the French ports, and that congestion, and the consequent idleness of ships which have been prevented thereby from coursing the ocean, have reduced the efficiency of the commercial marine by a factor which looms large in the proper understanding and solution of the question. To-day that inefficiency is not so pronounced as it was, but it is still a very important factor in the matter. A troop ship is loaded with troops, provisions, munitions of war, and is sent to a far-distant base. She is out of control not only of the Naval Department but of the Board of Trade. She is in a far-distant port, she is on army service, she is kept there, and she is used in proportion to the exigencies of the army requirements at that port and at that time. It is not possible for her to be unloaded and she is not unloaded. Or she may unload part of her cargo and may not unload the other part, because quick despatch does not chime in with military and army necessity at that time, which is the prevailing consideration at that port. I just mention these things to show what it is, over and above all the other prominent reasons for scarcity, that has accentuated that condition and does accentuate it to this day. In view of these considerations, to say that any Government, or any corporation, is responsible for the increase in freight rates, is to make an assertion which cannot be proved, and which is unreasonable. The history of the increase in rates, to repeat myself just to that extent, has been pari passu with the scarcity of tonnage, a scarcity brought about by the causes to which I have alluded. Up to the time that war broke out vessels were carrying wheat from Montreal to Liverpool, not as ballast or anything of that kind, but on a commercial basis, for 6, 7 and 8 cents per bushel. To-day the rate on wheat carried from our Atlantic ports to Liverpool runs up to between 40 and 45 cents per bushel. Deals that were carried at profit for 35 shillings per standard now pay three hundred. Looking at the great disparity in these rates, it is natural for a man to say that they are exorbitant rates which ought not to be allowed and ought not to continue. But what remedy do you find for it? There is a world-wide call for tonnage, there is cargo awaiting these ships at any port at which a call can be made, and it is impossible under these conditions to regulate the rates of freight. They are determined only by the call for carriage measured by the capacity of the tonnage to meet that call. Canada has not suffered more than other countries in this respect; in fact, I do not think it has suffered as much. The same great increase in rates has taken place all over the world. If you take the rates and compare them, you find that Canada is in this respect in as favourable a position, if not more so, than any other country in the world.

To speak for a single moment in reference to the control of freight rates, you can control a land-carriage system, the railways, for instance, because that is a fixed system, and it is within your territory and your jurisdiction. But there is no fixed system on the ocean. A vessel finds ports and docks in every quarter of the world. There are no terminals to be arranged for by a tramp vessel or by any other vessel; she finds an open track for herself in any part of the sea she wishes to traverse, she is perfectly free to range the world over, and perfectly competent and able to find loading and dockage facilities in any quar-

ter of the wide world that has goods for transport. Internationally, it is impossible, without an agreement between all nations, to have control over these rates, and no matter what efforts have been put forth—and they have been put forth by the United States, by Great Britain and other countries—up to the present day there have been no systems found by which these ocean rates can be effectively controlled.

But you say that Canada ought to control them—especially on the subsidized services. Canada can say that any vessel going out of her port shall not charge more than a certain amount per bushel to carry wheat to Liverpool or to any other port. Canada can say that if she chooses, but what will happen? The vessel which has it put up to her at Montreal, St. John, or Halifax, that she shall not charge more than a certain rate per bushel on wheat to be carried, simply says: "Very well; then I will not carry the wheat; I will simply go down to Portland, or Boston, or New York, or Baltimore, or to the Argentine, or to Australia, or to New Zealand and I will be subject to no such restrictions there." That is assuming that it is an unsubsidized vessel. It is absolutely impossible to say what the rates shall be for vessels of this kind sailing out of a port in Canada, for the reason that there is no absolute necessity for these vessels to trade with Canadian ports. If Canada were a country which had a commodity calling for transport, which was noted, and which could not be obtained at any of the other ports in the world, then Canada could lay down a condition of that kind and enact laws to enforce it. But that is not the case, and an attempt to impose such a restriction would only have the effect of driving away tonnage which would otherwise come.

But you say that you ought to be able to control the rates of subsidized vessels. In the contract with every vessel that we subsidize in Canada there is a clause requiring the minister to approve of the rates, but with world conditions entirely changed, and when rates have gone up all over the world from, say, 8 cents a bushel for wheat to 45, in Canada, and to 70, to 75, to 80 cents a bushel in other countries, what would happen with even subsidized vessels if we were to undertake to keep them much under, the general world rate? It would be more profitable for them to leave the subsidized service of Canada and go to ports where they would be subject to no conditions, carry freight at current rates, and thereby make more money for themselves. To a certain extent we have even under these conditions kept rates on the subsidized steamers within bounds, and to-day I think on all the subsidized lines the freight rates are lower than on the unsubsidized lines. But the control that you can exercise over even these must be a moderate and sensible control, and must be measured in the main by the general world conditions of carriage, and particularly the conditions arising from scarcity of tonnage.

What I have said lays the matter before the House and the country in a reasonable way, I think, and men must ask themselves whether or not, upon those conditions, the Government in power has been lax or negligent or inefficient, because it has not reduced the rates or prevented them from rising. How could the Government act? The Government, we have been told, should provide vessels. Taking into account the fact that the British commercial marine amounts to about 4,000 steamers, and that the commercial marine of neutrals added would make that 4,000 a much greater tonnage—and it is this vast amount of commercial tonnage combined that is doing the carrying of the world—in view of these conditions, to what appreciable extent would the chartering of a half dozen or a dozen vessels of moderate capacity affect the general carrying conditions of the world, or to what appreciable extent would it relieve even the Canadian situation? Let us bear in mind that if the Government of Canada chartered or purchased vessels we should not thereby be adding one single ton to the carrying capacity of the world. It would be simply a transference from one route of carriage to another and different line of carriage, it would simply be a transference from one owner to another without adding in the slightest possible degree to the total carrying capacity of the world. Let us see what happens when the Government charters, we will say, two, three, or four vessels. The Government must then adopt some method by which the vessels will be operated. If the vessels are operated by those from whom they are chartered, and we pay the charter fee, the vessels come under the control of the Government. Suppose three vessels, with a carrying capacity of 5,000 tons each, we will say, or a total of 15,000 tons are in the hands of the Government. They can carry but an infinitesimal portion of what Canada wants carried. You say that the Government should charter these

vessels and run them at a lower rate of freight, in order to give to Canadian shippers and producers the advantage of that lower rate. Now, when we have these three vessels with a combined carrying capacity of 15,000 tons, we have Canadian shippers and producers with hundreds of thousands of tons of produce to be shipped. To which one of those shippers will you allocate those vessels at a low rate of freight? You cannot discriminate. The wheat man wants the wheat carried; the lobster man wants the lobsters carried; the cheese man wants the cheese carried; the manufacturers want their products carried, and so on with the asbestos man and the paper man: all have equal rights to be considered. How are you going to discriminate between the lines of goods you will carry at a lower rate, and provide no tonnage for other lines at a like rate? How are you to discriminate between the parties who own the line of goods you decide to carry? Take wheat, for instance. You have a carrying capacity of 15,000 tons. To what wheat shippers will you go and say: here is a chance for you to get 5,000 tons of freight carried at a lower rate than you can get it carried by another ship. You would discriminate in favour of one and against others in that way. Your only refuge is to maintain the normal rate, and let your ships carry all that you can possibly pack into them at that rate, so that no one will be discriminated against. I do not see any other way out of it. That faced me immediately I went into the market to attempt to charter vessels. I could not accede to the demand that in chartering a vessel I should bring the rate down, because then I should be faced with this problem who is it that you are going to favour and carry his goods at a lower rate, while hundreds of other men about him cannot get a chance on your ship at that lower rate? That was the difficulty and it was impossible to face it successfully on any other ground than this: that you charge the current normal rate, and let whoever might be able take advantage of that much space on your ship. That is the position that I think some of us fail to take into account when we ask the Government to charter vessels to bring down the rate, and engage, so far as we possibly can, in the carrying of what, after all, would be an infinitesimally small proportion of the freight offering. The very same difficulty is met in the purchase of vessels. There seems to be no escape from the position that, if you are to help out in this emergency by purchasing or chartering vessels, you can do it under present conditions only by charging the current rates; and if you are to submit to that condition, then somebody else might just as well charter those vessels and put them on the route as the Government. Nothing is gained in the matter of carriage capacity, nothing is gained in the matter of rates. The Government did face that difficulty, and did make very serious and general inquiries into the possibility of chartering vessels; but it was met with these conditions, which made it difficult for the Government to act beneficially. And, what was the necessity of incurring responsibility unless some good could accrue?

Leaving that branch of the subject for a moment, one very marked criticism has been made—I have seen it thousands of times, in the papers, in platform speeches, and I think it has been made in this House by members on either one or the other side—and it is this: A man in the West today sells his grain—taking grain as an illustration—in Winnipeg at a dollar, we will say; it can be sold for more than a dollar, but we will take that figure. The statement is made that he has to pay 45 cents for the grain to cross the ocean, plus whatever it takes to get the grain from Winnipeg to the ocean, which we will assume to be 20 cents. There is 20 and 45 cents that the man has to encounter before his bushel of grain can be delivered at Liverpool, and the statement is very commonly made that but for these iniquitous rates the western farmer would get very much more for his wheat at Winnipeg; that is, he would get the difference between the old transporation rate and the present rate, which would be in the neighbourhood of 45 cents per bushel.

The argument is made and the lesson is sought to be taught that on account of those high freight rates the western farmer gets that much less for his wheat, and that if the ocean rate were brought down from 45 cents to 10 cents, the western farmer would have the difference of 35 cents to put in his pocket. My hon. friend (Mr. Turriff), who is looking at me, may be guilty of having used that argument himself; he smiles as though he were; but if he is not guilty of it, many people are, and I could almost vouch, if he heard any one putting forward that argument in the West, he would not sweat very much in an endeavour to get him away from that argument. On the other side, in Liverpool you have the

man who wants the bushel of grain. He says: Grain is so much at normal value in Winnipeg; but I have to pay 65 cents on that bushel to get it to Liverpool; if that rate were reduced 45 cents, I would have the difference to put in my pocket because I would pay that much less for the bushel of grain when it was delivered to me at Liverpool. Now, you cannot have the thing both ways. My own opinion expressed before the House to-day is that it is a case in which the consumer pays, if not every red cent of it, almost every red cent of it. The man who has to have the flour made from the grain and who consequently must have the grain at Liverpool, has to surmount that chasm between the place of production and the wharf at Liverpool where the grain is to be delivered to him, so that he has to pay the expense of having it delivered to him at that point. I do not know whether my remarks will go so far as that deadly criticism, that somewhat partisan criticism which is smiled at by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and which is actively presented by many of those who sit behind him. If only it does go that far, I hope it will have the effect of getting people to look all around the situation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The freight then is of no consequence?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The freight is of consequence in one respect, but the freight, to my mind, makes no difference as regards another and important part of the question which I have just been discussing. There is no doubt that the freight adds to the ultimate cost. If there is a piece of neutral territory with a man on one side with a bushel of wheat in his barrel, and if he says to me: you can have that wheat if you pay me $1.09, and if some intervening factor on that neutral territory puts up a charge of 45 or 65 cents before that bushel of wheat can be delivered into my hands, then I say that if I want that wheat I have to satisfy the claims of the man on the neutral territory and pay the charge that is necessary to have the wheat transferred from the other side of the neutral territory to my side. That, however, is another form of the argument which I have been trying to advance.

My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has been very profuse in his criticisms of the Government. He has said that the business of the Government was to provide transportation; that they have not provided it; that they have been heartless; that they simply smile and laugh at the difficulty. That, of course, as my hon. friend knows, is persiflage. He says that the Government have done nothing and that therefore upon them you must vent your indignation. I think I have said sufficient to make it apparent, to reasonable people at least, that there are two sides to this question, and that there are to-day conditions and difficulties with which we are confronted which create the trouble, and that the trouble will be with us until the cause of it is mitigated by peace and the conditions which follow peace.

4 p.m.

My hon. friend says: If the Government had been alive and awake to the situation they could have procured vessels. I have dealt briefly with the question of chartering and purchasing vessels. Let me come now to the other question. The only way in which real relief can be given in this whole matter of transportation is by bringing new tonnage into operation; that is, by building ships. To charter vessels or to purchase vessels that are already in service is simply a transference, and neither would add to the carrying capacity. The addition to the carrying capacity will and can only be made and relief can only be afforded, other conditions remaining, by building new vessels and putting them into the transport service. In regard to that, says my hon. friend, you have been lax; the Government either has not seen its duty, or, having seen it, has not performed it. There are some difficulties in the way of building. It is all very well for us to be wise after the event; but in the whole course of this war, in the management of the war, in the preparation for the war, in everything in connection with it, all anticipations have gone by the board, and with every party to the war controversy—less with the German power than with any other because for fifty years it was preparing itself for all these things—anticipations have been trundled over time and time and time again. What was at one period of this war thought to be sufficient provision for anything that could come up, has, in the course of one or two or three or four months proved itself to be away below what the actualities of the case, as they have developed, demanded. Therefore it is quite a fair argument to use with the War Office, or the Admiralty, or with any other body, that this war has been of

such a kind that it has upset all reasonable calculation of provision for occurrences that would be likely to take place. If on August 1, 1914, this Government could have put itself in the point of view that it has to-day, it could have bought vessels and chartered vessels at very low prices, and it could have made over and over again its money put into those vessels and done probably a real service to the carrying trade of the Dominion. But the Government had no more knowledge of what would be the condition of things as they developed in the progress of the war than had any human being. Consequently it is not a fair criticism to say: You should have foreseen this and provided for it years ahead. When the exigency and the conditions which make the exigency are upon us, how do we stand with reference to shipbuilding? My hon. friend says: If you have a mind to, you can call for tenders and you can build steel ships and wooden ships now. There are certain conditions that we have to take into account. A Government is asked in the midst of this emergency to build vessels. Let us see what that means. In point of cost of material, you would be building those vessels at the peak price. You would be building vessels which, in the time that it took to finish them, might have found the period of peace to have intervened and a great slump to have taken place in the cost of building. It is somewhat of a responsibility for the Government to take millions of the people's money and put it into either the purchase or the building of vessels at the peak prices of to-day, prices which, so far as competition is concerned, might put them entirely out of the market should prices be reduced by the coming of peace. The Government did not purchase the vessels; they did not build them. Further, my hon. friend seems to think that all you have to do is to give an order at night and the next morning you will find a vessel afloat and ready for a cargo. That is impossible. You cannot go into any shipyard in Canada to-day and make a contract for two steel vessels to be delivered earlier than late in the fall of 1917. This is 1916, and early in the summer. To go into the market and contract for a vessel costing from $750,000 to $1,000,000, which can be delivered to you only late in the fall of 1917, will not afford much relief in the present emergency.

[Sir George Foster.]

We tried also to get wooden vessels built. To parties who might be able to build wooden vessels, we said: "Tell us what amount of tonnage subsidy you will take and construct wooden vessels of a capacity which will be economical, say 2,000 to 2,500 tons." That proposal was considered, and I will give the House the results. We received only one answer, which was to this effect: "We will undertake to build wooden vessels of the capacity you name, if you will pay us a subsidy for construction of $6 a ton a year for fifteen years, or, in all, $90 per ton." That is the offer we got; it is an offer we did not accept. Even had we accepted it we could not have brought these vessels into service before the early or middle part of next year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The offer was $6 a ton spread over fifteen years?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, it was $6 a ton a year for fifteen years.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Gross ton?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, ton dead weight.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the hon. gentleman know that that sum would build a ship of that kind many times over?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Well, where does the hon. getleman get to now?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will get twenty men in St. John to make an offer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Well, why does not the hon. gentleman do it?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. minister has not come down with any proposition

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman has been something of a promoter, and has large moneyed connections. He has seen the difficulties about tonnage; if he thinks there is money in it, why has he not in some way interested himself and his friends in making a proposition for this shipbuilding? But no proposition has come from him; he has satisfied himself with criticising and finding fault, and has not put within the reach of the Government a single proposition that would be reasonably acceptable. Let me tell the House how the man looks at it to whom you talk about a tonnage subsidy. In order to build wooden vessels I have to make certain preparations, and for that purpose put in certain money; and I cannot turn out a vessel until seven, eight, or ten months from to-day. I get my wooden vessels built. But

you do not give me any assurance that the vessel-building business in this country will not by that time be absolutely different from what it is to-day—that peace will not have intervened with all that that involves. That contingency is ahead of me, and I cannot afford to go into the building of wooden vessels except with a very heavy tonnage subsidy to protect me from possible loss. That is the way this man reasons. Capital, under present conditions, is chary about going into the building of vessels with the uncertainties that face it within the next year or year and a half. The position has been so difficult that we have not received one single reasonable offer for the building of wooden vessels.

We have an offer for the building of steel vessels, and the general terms of that offer I will state to the House. Two steel vessels could have been built for this Dominion Government at a rate of $125 to $135 per ton, with delivery in the middle part of the year 1917. That is the best offer we got for steel tonnage. The amount asked for, of course, is very large; but the time of delivery is also a factor in the case which must be considered. What we must do in Canada is to divide this thing into two. There is a period of emergency, and there will be a period to succeed this emergency. Having canvassed, to a certain extent, the emergency period, let me now say a few words with reference to the work of shipbuilding in Canada on the basis of permanency, that is, with reference not to the present emergency but to the conditions and the needs of the future. It goes without saying, to my mind, that a country of such large productive capacity as Canada, and with production constantly increasing, occupies an undesirable position if it does not produce and have at command a very considerable commercial tonnage for its own use. That becomes apparent in times like this when, with no commercial marine, the country is at the mercy of the disturbing conditions of war. Altogether, it is a fair axiom that a country with the producing capacity of Canada ought to have a reasonable and growing mercantile marine; and I believe that Canada can have it. It ought to have it, for these potential reasons; it ought to have it because commercial tonnage taken year in and year out, is a profitable investment for a country. Great Britain's wealth is largely built up on the earnings of her commercial marine. Holland, and formerly Belgium, are notable examples of the wealth that comes to countries from large commercial marine, employed year in and year out, having their periods of prosperity and their corresponding periods of adversity, but bringing on the average a good return to the country in earning power. Canada as well ought to try in some way or other to build up a good commercial marine. How is it possible to do that? One may say: let capital run its own course; if capital sees that it would be profitable to invest in building commercial tonnage for Canada, it will do it; on the other hand, if it cannot see its way clear to do that; if it feels that it should depend upon the carrying capacity of outside vessels, it will take its chance in the open market of the world and charter or procure its tonnage as it has necessity for it. I believe that this argument should go along the line of a country having a good, strong, commercial marine of its own, and I do not think you can bring that about by leaving the matter entirely to corporate and private enterprise without some form of aid. Now, what are the forms of aid which can be given? There is a tonnage construction subsidy, whereby for every ton of capacity of vessels built in Canada under certain conditions the Government—the Treasury, the people generally might pay a certain amount in order to give an impetus, at least in its early stages, to the building of a commercial marine. That is one method that can be employed, and it has its disadvantages. In the first place, a vessel that you subsidize by tonnage construction subsidy may be in your employ a year after the vessel is built or it may be sold and be in some one else's employ thereafter. This is liable to happen unless you hedge the subsidy around with conditions requiring that the vessel shall make itself available for Canadian trade, and that stipulation is difficult to append to a simple tonnage subsidy agreement.

There is a scheme which has been adopted and which has in it, I think, a good deal of merit; I am going to give the outlines of it this afternoon, but I shall first call attention to what the United States Government is now proposing. Last year a Bill was introduced in the United States Congress for the promotion of shipbuilding in the United States. This year the Bill has been modified, and the lines of the present Bill, which has the administration behind it, and is being pressed in the United States, are something of this kind: an appropriation of $50,000,000 is to be made and

secured upon Panama canal bonds; that $50,000,000 so secured is placed in the hands of a committee, or commission, consisting of certain members of the United States Cabinet, a naval architect and other persons chosen by the President, with the assent of the Senate, and these men so selected are to be thoroughly conversant with shipping matters and shipbuilding. This governmental commission is in charge of shipbuilding under this scheme. It says what kind of vessels shall be built, how they shall be built and their tonnage, and it has general direction over such matters. The shipbuilding which is carried on under this scheme—and this includes purchases of vessels—is subject to these conditions. This commission shall have charge of shipping matters so far as they relate to that proposition, and they have also the right to license vessels trading to the United States and to control rates as far as possible. That $50,000,000 being at their disposal, they may enter into contract with parties to build or purchase vessels in the United States, and to purchase vessels outside of the United States, these vessels to be placed upon the United States register of tonnage and to become United States vessels. Entering into contract with these parties for the purchase or building of ships, the commission is empowered to subscribe stock to these ships, in building or in purchase, taking care always to have a majority of the stock so as to enable them to keep the control. On that basis the whole proposition, outside of the financial aid which is given, looks at the acquisition by the United States—by building in and out of the United States and by purchase out of the United States—of vessels on certain standard lines, which vessels shall be built or purchased and operated under the regulations of this commission. They have also in the United States a mail contract law, by which vessels of twenty knots and upwards get $4 per mile on approved routes for carrying the mail, while vessels of sixteen to twenty knots get $2 a mile. These are the propositions which are to-day before the United States Congress looking to the upbuilding of a commercial marine in that country.

The Chamber of Commerce in New York, which is a very influential body, has criticised that scheme, and has put forward another scheme. I purpose giving that scheme in brief to the House this afternoon, and in order to bring it down directly to ourselves I will translate it into the form it would take if it were applied to the Dominion of Canada. Applying to Canada that scheme, which was debated and unanimously approved by the New York Chamber of Commerce, it would work out something like this: You would appoint in the Dominion of Canada a commission consisting, we will say, of three members of the Cabinet whose departments are interested—for instance, Commerce, Navy, and Finance. The Government side of that commission would be the ministers of these three departments. Add to these a naval instructor and three practical and experienced men in shipping matters, selected by the Government, and you have the commission which would operate in Canada. That commission would have general oversight and direction of the classes of vessels to be built under the scheme; how they should be standardized, how they should be manned, everything in connection with them, and, to the extent that it would be possible, the regulation of the rates as well. That committee would then be empowered to enter into contracts with shipbuilding companies, to build according to the plans and regulations laid down in Canadian shipyards, and the builders of the ships would be allowed the difference between the cost of construction in Canada and in European ports, that difference having been carefully ascertained by the commission. The object would be to enable the Canadian shipowner to have his ships built in Canada with exactly the same cost to himself as if he had them built in a European port. If the tonnage could be built in a European port at a certain percentage per ton cheaper than in Canada, then the subsidy for construction would be that difference in cost, whatever it was, so as to put the Canadian shipowner on an equality, in the after competition, with his competitor who had ships built in European snipyards. The time during which this should be carried out would be limited to a period of say 10 years, so that during that 10 years this operation of building would go on. Then the commission would be empowered to enter into contracts with the ship owners, when the ships were built, and to guarantee to the owners the difference in cost of operating the ships under the Canadian flag and under a European flag, that subsidy to continue for the life of the ship. The commission would possess itself of accurate information on the difference both in cost of construction and in cost of operation, and would pay that

difference, and that difference alone. In that connection we should place at the disposal of the Commission the sum of $15,000,000 or $20,000,000, and empower that commission to guarantee the bonds upon the ships built up to 50 per cent of the value of the ships. Such bonds would be 5 per cent bonds, and the Government Commission would get one-half of one per cent on those bonds returned to its treasury for its work and its supervision.

What would that mean? It would mean that for 10 years you would have shipbuilding tried out under the advantage of a bonus equal to the difference in construction cost in Canada and the difference of operation cost; the latter subvention to extend to the life of the ship. Capital would be attracted and induced to invest in steamships owing to the Government guarantee of bonds, which would, of course, be given under a proper amortization scheme by which those bonds would be provided for and paid off during a certain period.

On the Great Lakes you will find a very large and prosperous American mercantile marine, and I am told that almost every vessel in that fleet has been built under a guarantee of bonds, not a guarantee by the Government, either state or federal, but on that same system; and I am informed that those bonds are considered so good a security that banks, including savings banks, are anxious to get them, and that, in the late history, at least, of those transactions, there has not been an instance of failure with reference to the amortization of the bonds or to the security in any way. But we must recollect that lake marine business is a very different thing from ocean tonnage business. However, that is simply an illustration of what has been done along that line.

Let us see what would be the advantage to be obtained if that system were carried out? In the first place, the Government would make its equitable, yearly contributions, not on a supposed or an imaginary or a favoured basis, but on the actual difference of cost of construction and operation. And, in the next place, it would guarantee bonds of the ship to one-half its value, getting back one-half of one per cent, with arrangements for proper amortization. If you take the history of lake shipping, there is fair ground for stating that system that would work out satisfactorily and successfully. It is impossible to say what the subsidy would amount to in actual figures; the only certainty we would have being that it would amount to the actual difference and to no more and no less. In that way, if it worked out successfully, at the end of 10 years you would have a very substantial commercial ocean marine and you would have the certainty of its operation for 20 years from the time that each steamship went into actual service. By such a plan capital would be attracted to that kind of investment, to which our people in Canada are not very much used; and if you could bring it about that capital would become interested, as construction went on capital would more and more come in, so that the private capital of the country, without Government aid, would afterwards be able to look after its commercial marine. You would have a valuable earning power, proportionate to the amount of tonnage, which would accrue to the people of this country. Our people would have the advantage of the expenditure of money for wages and materials in connection with these ships, and I am assured that if such a policy, based on permanent conditions, were inaugurated in this country, Canada would make the steel necessary for the building of those steel ships, and that we would thus have the benefit of a further development of the steel industry. We would derive many other advantages, which I shall not take time to enumerate, but which would come from a more or less steady supply of ocean tonnage, somewhat commensurate with the needs of a great producing country, requiring large ocean transportation facilities.

I am sorry that the short tale I started to tell has developed into a longer tale than I had supposed it would. You turn to me and say: "That is all very good, but what does the Government propose to do?"

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am simply coming to this committee, as I have come without very much encouragement on two previous occasions——

Mr. PUGSLEY: From the Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I came once and put a proposition before the House in an absolutely businesslike and non-partisan way and I asked my hon. friends on the other side to give us, the Government and the House, the benefit of their suggestions and their criticisms? What did I get? The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) went back to Genesis, the first chapter of

it, and he detailed every book in the political bible until he came to the Apocalypse, interspersing his observations with numerous criticisms of the Government for its malfeasances and negligence. Then, I had to endure the excruciating agony of having the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) get up after that—when I was chuck full of what I had got from the hon. member for St. John—and take up the free wheat problem. He dealt with the history and conditions of the free wheat problem, from the time he started until he sat down. It was a fine speech from his point of view, and contained many fine things, but the House had gone over that half a dozen times before and my hon. friend from Assiniboia had debated it on every imaginable opportunity which had arisen. However, I had the single solace of hearing from the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) who did say that when I came down with my Estimates upon that question he might be able to give me some suggestions. I hope he will, because it will relieve the monotony of desert barrenness in helpful suggestion which I have heretofore found on the other side of the House. We are, more or less, business men on each side; we have our views; I have put this discussion of the question before you, and I ask you for your views about it. If you have some further plans, bring them out. Do not be so niggardly as to keep in your back pocket everything that is useful to the country in its time of need, because you feel that you might make something out of it for yourselves ten or twelve years from to-day when you get into power. It is the duty of patriots on both sides of the House to now bring forth their talents, not to keep them hidden in their napkins, and to give us their views as to what ought to be done at this time and under these conditions. May I take my seat with the hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will not again cite Genesis, Exodus, and the Apocalypse, and that we may be spared free wheat just for this solitary occasion, and get the benefit of their experience and opinions on the subject we have been discussing.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I accomplished nothing else, I am very glad to think that I induced the Minister of Trade and Commerce to read his Bible pretty carefully last night. I assume he has been devoting a good deal of attention to it, because he has discovered the particular chapter to which reference was made by myself in a somewhat jocular way. My hon. friend referred to a certain proposition which he said he had received for the building of wooden vessels and when I ventured to suggest across the floor of the House that I thought that proposition was an unreasonable one, in the sense that the bonus asked for the building of wooden vessels was entirely too great, my hon. friend asked me why I did not make a proposition. He said that I was connected with financial men. Well, now, did it not strike him that he was making very light of a most important project such as the furnishing of vessels at the present critical time? I would have been of the opinion that the Government, during the twenty-one months that this war has been in progress, and knowing as they ought to have known from the very beginning that tonnage was growing scarcer month by month, would have given such thought to this question that they would have been prepared to have brought down to this House a suggestion of their own as to what ought to be done, not to create a mercantile marine ten years from now as the minister intimates he is thinking of, but for the present time when the war is on, when we need tonnage, when ships are being destroyed, when they are growing scarcer every day, and when increased tonnage is absolutely essential to enable the products of Canada to be carried to Britain and her Allies. That is what I would have thought my hon. friend would have suggested, but all he tells us now is that there are difficulties in the way. This war, it is true, has brought enormous difficulties to the Mother Country and to the overseas dominions but the statesmen of the Empire have met those difficulties as best they could. No doubt mistakes were made, no doubt loss will occur if the war should end within a year or two, no doubt there will be large sums of money expended which, if anybody knew with certainty that the war would be over within a short time, would not be expended. My hon. friend says there are difficulties in the way of building ships because if the war should cease in a year or two, there might be a slump in the cost of shipbuilding and in the rates of freight, and therefore there would be a loss. We are preparing and equipping, so the Government tell us, and nobody finds fault with them for that, an additional army of 250,000 men to send to the front. That vast number of men cannot be sent forward for a

year from now at the very least. Many millions of dollars will be expended in their equipment and in getting them ready and if the war should be terminated in six or ten months from now I suppose the minister would say that the money would be wasted. But is it an improvident thing to go ahead on the theory that the war may last and that all the energies of the country should be put forward to make all necessary preparations to meet whatever the future may have in store for us? Are our munition workers to stop making shells because the war may be over sooner than expected? There may be hundreds and thousands and millions of dollars expended in the making of shells and other munitions of war which possibly may not be required and which probably would not be required if the war should cease. Is it suggested by the minister that in that case it is quite provident for the Government to go ahead and not be deterred because the war may cease sooner than some people expected it would? But, in regard to the carrying trade of our country, in regard to giving opportunities for getting the products of Canada to European markets at reasonable rates, the minister says: "Let us do nothing for fear that this war may end sooner than we expect and the money might be lost."

To my mind the minister, while attempting to defend himself and his colleagues from the charge of want of foresight and of neglect to provide for the transportation interests of the country, has confessed that they are guilty not only of neglect but of want of foresight. The minister has sought to excuse the Government for their neglect. The minister has admitted that when the war broke out the Government had abundant opportunities to buy and charter vessels at low prices and that they would have been able to put these vessels into the carrying trade of the country very much to the advantage of Canada and of the producers of our country as well as, I suppose, to the advantage of the consumers upon the other side of the water. But he says they did not do it and what is his excuse, Sir? It was because we did not know when the war would end; we did not know how long it was going to last. All calculations, except the calculations of the people of Germany, were set at naught. The Germans prepared for this war but apparently, the minister says, we did not know of it. Do you think that is reasonable, Mr. Speaker? Those of us who have been in this Parliament know that when war broke out this Government at the short session held in August, 1914, made the statement that Germany had been preparing for fifty years for a European war, and that her preparations had been enormous. Then, Sir, would you not have thought that the exercise of a very little amount of judgment would have told the members of this Government that this war was a great struggle that might last for more than a year, and would you not have thought that in view of the great uncertainty as to when the war would terminate, it would have been the part of prudence for this Government to have bought and chartered vessels wherever it could get them, and put on our trade routes as large a number as they thought the transportation interests of the country called for? Would not that have been the prudent thing to do? Would it have been any more than evidence of that reasonable foresight which gentlemen who have charge of the affairs of the country should exercise? But the minister admits that the Government did nothing, and he seeks to argue that if they had bought or chartered vessels they could not have accomplished very much for Canada, because as the tonnage became scarcer and the demand for vessels increased they would have had to charge the same rates that private companies were charging. They would have had to charge the normal rate, the minister says; otherwise they would have been obliged to show favouritism to one shipper over another. That certainly is a most extraordinary argument. According to that argument the Government, having the interests of the people of Canada at heart, could never keep down the cost of transportation when the demand for transportation increased. According to that argument, there being a great demand on the Canadian Pacific railway for carriage of goods, all its trains and all its resources being used for the purpose of transporting traffic, if the Canadian Pacific chose to double, treble and quadruple their rates, the Government would have to double, treble and quadruple the rates on the Government railways to meet the increased rates that the Canadian Pacific railway and other private railway companies were charging. Is not that the logical result of the argument which the minister puts forward? Why, from my slight knowledge of affairs, I would say

that the great object of having Government-operated railways is to keep down the rates to what is reasonable and fair profits. Does not the minister see that the very fact of the Government railway keeping down its freight rates compels the private railway companies to reduce their freight rates, or to keep them within reasonable limits, as otherwise the traffic would be carried by the Government railways? If this Government when war broke out had chartered or bought, at the low rates which the minister says were available to the Government, fifty or a hundred steamers, and put them into the carrying trade at reasonable and fair rates, it would have been an enormous factor in preventing the private shipping companies from increasing their rates. All that the Government ought to look for would be that the rates would give a reasonable and fair return upon the money invested. But what is the result to-day? These great shipping companies are making one thousand per cent more than they were satisfied with before the war broke out—one thousand per cent more than reasonable and fair profits upon the capital they have invested. And the minister tells us to-day that even the great shipping companies that are subsidized by this Government—even the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Allan Steamship Company, which receive a subsidy of $1,000,000 a year from this Government—have been permitted to increase their rates one-thousand fold beyond what is reasonable and fair. And the minister allows them to do it, because he thinks they might take their ships away somewhere else if he did not give them a free hand in increasing their rates just as they pleased. I am unable, I regret to say, to follow my hon. friend. I am unable to recognize that he has been able to give the slightest possible excuse for the failure of this Government to charter or buy the steamers which he says they could have bought at low prices when the war broke out. I am unable to acquit him and his colleagues of want of foresight. I think they should have recognized that the war might continue for a very considerable period. The minister has given a graphic picture to-day of the great difficulties which have arisen in connection with ocean tonnage. He has told you, Sir, of all those difficulties; but they were difficulties which were not unknown to you or the members of this House. They are not difficulties which could not have been foreseen by the members of this Government. Did not the minister know when war broke out that vessels would be required to transport for the use of the armies of the Allies the products of those countries which produced grain and cattle and other natural products. Did he not know that there would be a great demand for vessels to transport these goods? Did he not know that the Allies would naturally look to America for large quantities of ammunition, clothing, boots, shoes, horses and of everything else required by the armies at the front? Did not the minister foresee that? If he did not why didn't he? Did not he and his colleagues look forward to just that state of affairs which has arisen to-day? If they did not, why didn't they? Were they of the men who thought this war was going to end in six weeks? Was the Minister of Trade and Commerce like the Minister of Militia, who thought this war was going to be such a simple affair that Germany could be beaten by the Canadians alone, without any assistance from England or France, as he stated on one occasion when he was interviewed in New York on his return from the old country? Did the minister look on this as a trifling war that would terminate in a few weeks and would not be likely to produce the results which he sees to-day and which are becoming worse and worse as the war goes on? I am obliged to say this because the minister sought to defend himself and his colleagues from the charge of want of foresight and from the charge which I ventured to make against the Government for not doing what they ought to have done in the way of providing for the transportation of the products of Canada to the markets of Europe. I am unable to see that he has made any defence whatever, and I think the confession he has made to-day that the Government could have acquired by charter or purchase at low prices ships which would have been of great advantage to Canada, is a confession that the Government are guilty of the charges which have been brought against them.

The minister says that if the Government had gone into this business it would not have solved the difficulty, because they would have had to follow the example of the private companies and squeeze everything they could exact out of the producers or the consumers of the country. As to that, I think most men who give any thought to the subject will differ entirely from the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Then the minister says that the next thing

to do and the only other thing which might be done in order to increase the tonnage, would be to engage in the business of shipbuilding, and, he says, that is a serious matter also, because we cannot tell when the war will end. The minister has stated that if the Government were either themselves to undertake the building of steel ships, or to encourage others to build, if a steel vessel were laid down to-day she could not be ready until the fall of 1917. I doubt very much whether the minister is correctly informed on that. I believe that vessels of five, six, and seven thousand tons have been built upon the Great Lakes in less time than the minister states. I believe that at the new shipyards at Port Arthur one of the very finest vessels navigating the lakes was built in less time than that, and I would like some evidence that the minister has received his information from reliable sources before I would be ready to accept it without reserve. But, supposing that his statement is true; if the Government had commenced when the war broke out they might have had to-day a large number of steel vessels ready to be placed in commission and to do their work as a factor in the transportation of Canadian produce. With regard to wooden vessels, which, of course, can be built much more quickly than steel vessels, I am told that $60 per ton would be a good price for building them, even at the high prices which prevail to-day. The minister states that a fair size for a wooden vessel is about 2,000 tons. He may be right in that, but I had the impression that it might be desirable to build wooden vessels of larger tonnage.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: 2,000 to 2,500 tons.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Put it if you like at 2,000 tons. The minister said that he had an offer from one person to build a wooden vessel for a bonus of $6 per ton per year spread over a period of fifteen years. The minister did not state from whom he received that offer, nor did he state what inquiries were made of practical shipbuilders in Canada as to the terms upon which they would be willing to build wooden vessels. What would that proposition mean? A bonus of $6 per ton on a wooden vessel of 2,000 tons would be $12,000. If that amount were spread over fifteen years, it would mean a bonus of $180,000 for a vessel which, at the very highest prices prevailing to-day, would not cost over $120,000; in other words, it would be asking $60,000 more than the cost of the vessel. We all know very well that at the present time, and probably for a number of years to come, those vessels will be able to earn very large profits, and that is why I stated that the suggestion which was apparently made to the Minister of Trade and Commerce was a most

5 p.m.

unreasonable one, and that if this Government were bona fide in putting before the people of this country the idea that they were willing to give assistance for the building of wooden ships as well as steel ships, I could not imagine for a single moment that they would not receive much more reasonable offers. Not very long ago a gentleman in the city of St. John with experience in shipbuilding and in the operation of ships told me if reasonable encouragement had been given, including taking off the duties on the machinery necessary for providing auxiliary power, men could be found who would engage in the building of wooden vessels, and that it would not be very long before a large number could be turned out. Two hundred wooden vessels, with a capacity of 2,000 tons each, would mean a very great addition to the mercantile marine of Canada. Even if you had 100 vessels, that would mean a tonnage of 200,000, and in the course of a year those vessels would be able to transport from Canada to the markets of the Old Country and to bring back upwards of 2,000,000 tons of produce, which would be a large quantity and would prove of enormous assistance. The total cost of those vessels, if my information is correct, would not exceed $10,000,000; and, in view of the necessity of increasing the production of Canada, and in view also of the necessity of getting a market for that production, and of getting it to that market at a reasonable rate, would it be unreasonable that the Government, for the purpose of making a start on a mercantile marine in Canada, should appropriate $10,000,000 of the sum of $200,000,000 which Parliament is voting for war purposes, for the purpose of increasing transportation facilities or of carrying out any other object which the Government may think reasonable in view of the conditions which exist? What we want to do, it seems to me, is not to look forward to what may be done in five or ten years from now, after the war is over, but to consider what shall be done now to relieve the present necessities. The minister, if I understood him aright, has argued that after all the Canadian producer is not injured very much by the high freight rates. He argues very eloquently that the

farmer gets, under any circumstances, a reasonable price for his grain. I suppose he would argue that the buyer gets a reasonable price, and that the freight on the railway and across the Atlantic is added to the cost to the consumer. My hon. friend may be right as to that, but I do not think so. One might argue as well that, if the milling companies earn enormous profits so that they are able to pay, not only a dividend upon their preferred stock which represents actual capital, but enormous dividends upon their common stock which represents no capital at all, but only water, that does not come out of the wheat producer but out of the people who consume flour. I would rather think it comes out of both the producer and the consumer. If the miller would be content with a less profit, the consumer would pay a less price for the flour and the former would get a higher price for his wheat. We know that hundreds of the tramp steamers which are upon the Atlantic to-day pay for their cost in two or three voyages, and it seems to me therefore that those extra and unnecessary profits are paid both by the consumer in England or other European countries and by the producer of the grain in Canada. If you reduce the rates of freight you are conferring a benefit not merely upon the consumer but upon the Canadian farmer. It does seem to me that the minister is hardly justified in saying that the Canadian producer does not suffer from the increased rates. Take the case of lumber. When war broke out there was a very good demand for lumber in Europe, but, except in the case of lumber which is specially required, the high rates of freight have checked that demand, and so people in different parts of the province of New Brunswick are not able to send their lumber forward at prices which would enable them to pay the high freight rates.

I do not wish to take up more time than is necessary. Nor do I wish to unduly criticise this Government, for I realize that they have many difficulties to contend with. But I do hold very strongly that they have not given to this question of transportation the care and attention which they ought to have given to it. I do not think the Government is doing credit to itself, nor has it measured up to the responsibility it owes to the people. The minister does not present any policy which his colleagues have approved of and to which he can ask the concurrence of this House, but he comes here as an individual member of the Government and asks us to make suggestions and give him the benefit of our opinions. Let him come down with a scheme for building up a Canadian merchant marine—not, as I have said, for building vessels ten years from now, or five years from now, but at the present day—and he will find support. Mistakes have been made, and, in the end some money may be lost. But the object is so important and the benefits to accrue from increased tonnage operated under the control of the Canadian Government are so great, as, I think, to justify us in running some risk of making mistakes. I say again that if the minister will come down with a matured policy which can be put into operation without unnecessary delay, I for one—I cannot speak for others—will be prepared to give that policy my heartiest support. It affords me no pleasure to criticise my hon. friend under present circumstances and in the trying position in which he is placed. But he comes to us with a statement that he gets no sympathy from the members of this House,—he speaks as if he gets no sympathy from his colleagues, as if he were "ploughing his lonely furrow." He turns his back upon his colleagues and in effect says: "I get no sympathy, no support, no encouragement, from the men by whom I am surrounded;" and he looks over to us with an appealing glance in his eye and asks us to stand by him and not only give him support but tell him what he ought to do under these trying circumstances. Let him come down to-morrow with a policy for engaging at once in the building of ships, both steel and wooden, to the number really necessary to meet present conditions and to take the place of the waning ocean merchant marine as far as Canada is concerned, and he will receive from us, even if he does not receive it from his colleagues, earnest consideration and hearty sympathy such as, I am sure, will warm the cockles of his heart. And from many private members on the other side of the House, I am sure, he will receive support and sympathy.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I wish to compliment the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the broad-gauge speech he has made this afternoon on this important question. It is true, his speech is open to criticism in some respects; but in the few minutes I shall occupy I shall not devote myself to criticism so much as to an expression of my delight with the

way in which the minister has brought this proposition before the House. He has appealed for national consideration of a great national question; he has appealed to the Opposition and to all the members of the House practically to go into Committee of the Whole to deal with the transportation question, especially with the question of ocean transportation. The minister made another notable speech this session. I did not happen to be here on that occasion. He made an appeal to this House to do away with the system of patronage, and asked the Opposition and the whole House to take that matter into serious consideration. I think he is proceeding on the right lines. We have had too much party government in this country, and in view of the present crisis we ought to have more national government and less party government, and we ought to try to deal with these great problems from a national point of view. I cannot but recall what happened in this House when the Naval Aid Bill was before us. I made an appeal then to the House, pointing out that the opportunity was then afforded for the two parties to co-operate in working out a system for the defence of the Empire. We were not successful in that; the proposal was practically abandoned at that time. My contention to-day is that, the great problems which this war has created cannot be solved by a single party, and will not be solved unless the House and the country approach them as a nation from a national point of view and irrespective of party. And if you apply this to part of a question you must apply it to the whole question. If the minister asks for the co-operation of the whole House and the whole country in regard to transportation by sea, the same course must be followed in regard to transportation by land. My contention, therefore, is that the only solution of these problems of transportation is the co-operation of both parties in the adoption of a national policy supported by a national Parliament. We cannot deal properly with the railway question now before the country if we deal with them from the party point of view. We are confronted by the most serious problems in connection with railways that we have ever had before us; for the fact that these problems have arisen, both parties may be responsible. If that is the case, we ought to correct our mistakes by dealing with these matters from a non-partisan standpoint. Unless both parties co-operate in considering these problems, as was pointed out by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to-day, we should not be able to solve them. In the matter of transportation both by land and by sea we must arrive at some kind of united policy; the country expects us to deal with these questions from a non-partisan point of view. The member for St. John city made a rather reasonable suggestion to-day, although the method suggested had a tendency to be somewhat partisan. I understood him to intimate that he and his friends were disposed to co-operate in matters of this kind. While not much has been done in the House in the matter of national co-operation concerning these questions, there is a good deal of feeling in the country in favour of that idea. There has been co-operation of parties in the Mother Country with a view of solving the difficulties that have arisen; if they have not quite succeeded over there, I believe that at least they have improved the condition of affairs. None of these questions can be approached and settled in any other way than by some kind of co-operation. Will the question of Civil Service reform in Canada ever be settled by each party in this House putting up the record of the other and pointing out the mistakes of the other in connection with that matter? No; you will arrive at a new and progressive measure only by some kind of co-operation. The remarkable thing about the speech of the minister to-day is not that he did not quite come forward with a substantive policy for dealing with the transportation problem so far as ocean traffic was concerned, so much as it is that he came forward with an appeal to both parties to co-operate in their efforts to deal satisfactorily with the question of shipbuilding. I simply want to content myself with saying to-day that, having regard to the great problems now before us, we should not be doing our duty to this country or to the Empire if we do not have this co-operation. Further, if there is to be co-operation in connection with shipbuilding and transportation at sea, there must be co-operation in connection with railways and many other things.

Speaking on broad lines, what is the solution of the transportation problem in Canada? It is that we must have a national policy with regard to railways, which means public ownership of our railways; and we must have a national policy with regard to transportation at sea. To my mind the difficulty will have to be approached by

national ownership or national control of ships, very much along the lines outlined by the minister to-day. Great evils have arisen from the manner in which transportation has been carried on in the past, especially through the operations of private monopolies. Private monopolies have taken advantage of the public on every occasion in the past, and they will do it in the future. A proper national policy supported by all the people would build up a transportation system both by land and sea that would seek to serve the public rather than to take advantage of it. The greatest advantage that has ever been taken of the public has been by the shipbuilding and ship owning interests of Great Britain. They have soaked the public right and left in transportation charges. It has been argued that because these ships were privately owned and operated under a different flag they could not be controlled by Canada. I have never subscribed to that doctrine. I do not agree that we should lie down before them; that we should not seek to control them by some kind of legislation. That may be an expensive and roundabout way of doing it, but it is a comparatively easy thing to start a national policy on the line of national ownership, or national control of shipbuilding, and in that way bring immediate relief to the transportation conditions in this country. As I pointed out in this House when discussing the railway question some time ago, what is the use of our appointing a Railway Commission to regulate railway rates if we cannot also regulate the charges at sea by the ship monopolies? All the advantages—if there were advantages—accruing to the people from the subsidies paid in connection with the construction of railways, and from the passing of the Act creating the Railway Commission have been taken away from them by reason of the fact that the shipbuilding interests have been allowed to charge what they liked in connection with transportation at sea. As a consequence rates were increased not a thousand-fold, as the last speaker said, but to an amount from four to eight times as high as the rates that formerly obtained. I do not quite agree with the minister when he says that the consumer paid the larger portion of the increase on these rates. Perhaps what he intimated was that the increase was equally divided between the consumer and the producer. In any case, if we had had national control of the rates at sea as well as by land, especially in connection with ocean transportation systems, we should be able to give the Canadian producer the best advantage that he possibly could get both by land and by sea—by land especially—and we should be able to give the consumer also the best advantage that he could get. After sixty years of railroad building and experience in matters connected with shipping, the public cannot obtain that measure of advantage to which they are entitled otherwise than by national ownership and national control on new and progressive lines. There has been a failure up to date, no matter how much we have spent in getting improved transportation in this country. The United States, judging by the evidence brought forward this afternoon, are coming to the idea that they must have a national system of transportation by sea. If they are to have it by sea they must have it also by land. This all goes to show that the trend of public opinion these days is that relief from high transportation charges, whether by land or by sea, must come by national ownership; it will never be attained as long as private control of monopolies prevails on this continent. Owing to the war, England has taken over her railways, and has practically commandeered all the ships at sea for the service of the public. But the trouble is that the number of ships is rapidly declining owing to attacks and destruction at sea, and we do not know when that is going to end. So it is up to the Government and up to the House, in view of this condition of affairs, to inaugurate forthwith some kind of national policy, or party policy if we must have it, looking to the establishment of a great Canadian merchant marine. One reason why I supported the idea of naval aid four years ago was that it would have started a great shipbuilding industry in this country. While it would have been primarily and in the first instance for the building of war ships, it would have ended in the production and the building of a commercial marine. That did not quite come then. It should have been started four years ago, before the war came on. But the war is on now; it is in its second year, and the best judges say to-day that next year will not end it. Then, I say, the responsibility is on the Government to inaugurate forthwith a policy in the direction of encouraging shipbuilding in this country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN: It must be not only an encouragement to get the ships built,

but to control them when they are built, and to consecrate them to the trade of the country and the development of that trade. What is the use of inviting settlers to come to the great Canadian West, to locate there and to develop the land, if the transportation charges are to be so heavy that they will absorb all of the products of the farm except enough to keep the farmer on the land. We are not going to settle our lands, we are not going to get the right people there and to have them develop our country as it should be developed, no matter how much we spend on an immigration policy, unless the Government and Parliament, representing the people of this country, control the system of transportation both by land and sea, absolutely. We have tried private ownership of railways now for 60 years and what have we got to show in the way of rates? We have a magnificent service which has been of great benefit to the country. But as regards rates our conditions are not at all what they should be. We have three transcontinental lines, it is true, but for the same amount of money a much better service could have been secured if the transportation question had been handled from a national point of view. We would thus have avoided the duplication of construction and, a still worse evil, the duplication of service. Of the three transcontinental lines now existing there are miles and miles that are mere duplication and which are practically a waste of money. We have the other problem before us and must deal with it, perhaps this session, that is the problem of the unnecessary duplication of service. We have failed in regard to railways, and we will fail in regard to ships unless we have a real national policy, which implies co-operation. I do not care how this great reform is effected. You may say that under our system it must be by party Government. But is party Government to exist forever in this country, after the fruits we have had from it in the past? Is there not a need and a call for some kind of co-operation? We are asked now for co-operation in regard to the war, at the most critical point in the world's history. Well, if co-operation is necessary in time of war, are we not to have it in time of peace in regard to trade and transportation, the development and the settlement of the country, and in dealing with financial problems, including banking and currency? I compliment the minister on his speech. I know it has the weakness that it has not presented a constructive policy. But the minister has gone so far as to say: We are prepared to sit down together and consider the question. That is not a bad policy. Judging from what I can read of the past, good results have followed where men have sat down and joined together and decided on a policy that meant progress for the whole nation. I hope there will be some expression of opinion on this problem, although perhaps not here to-day. The leaven is working and it can be seen in the country; you can see from the press what the people are talking about. They know that we have had too much politics and too much partisanship in the past, and they know that partisanship has not produced very favourable results. The Americans, after their experience with party Government and partisanship are getting rather tired of it. All the evidence goes to show that, in the new time after this war, the only thing possible for a nation is national organization of its resources and its transportation, its educational system, and everything of that kind. A nation will not be in it from this day forth unless it is nationally organized and unless it abandons the mistakes that have grown up in the past in dealing with public problems. New times, new methods and nationality must be the governing idea in dealing with these great questions. While I throw these statements out, just off the bat as it were, they are convictions that I have reached after careful study of the conditions that have existed here and in other countries. I believe that, if we are to be a nation fit to play our part under the new conditions that will obtain and are already in sight, we shall be able to do it only by listening to such appeals as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has made to-day and on other occasions. He recently warned us of the danger of the excessive influence of party considerations in the matter of patronage, and a great many other things. We are all to blame for conditions as they exist to-day; both parties are to blame, the public are to blame. But the public expect a change. They expect relief from somebody, or perhaps from some new party that will arise in this country, some new, national party that will have a real national programme and some kind of national leadership, and that will appeal to all the people of Canada for a cessation and abandonment of the present method of working out our problems and will ap-

proach them on the newer and broader lines which have been indicated here to-day. The public expect it, and the public will not be satisfied with this Parliament and with our political institutions unless they are modified and changed to some extent, in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): With much of what my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has just said I have a great deal of sympathy. I think that after this war is over we may have less partisanship than we have at present. I am prepared to give my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) this much credit, that in many cases what he advocates to-day is the policy of the party in power to-morrow. His policy may not be taken up within a few months or even years, but we have seen the adoption by the party in power of more than one of the principles he has advocated.

The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce has taken me to task for bringing up the subject of free wheat, and he has said that I have brought it up very often. I can only say to my hon. friend that I have not brought it up any oftener than he has dodged it, for he has dodged it every time it has been brought up. Hearing the Minister of Trade and Commerce speak this afternoon, you would think it was a crime for one of the representatives of a million and a half, or two millions of people, on the prairie, whose principal business it is to grow wheat, who are looking for a market for their wheat to bring this question up, and to bring it up again, in the effort to secure a solution of it. This is a question that it is up to the Government to deal with and it will always be before the Government until it settled. Therefore, no representative of the West is to blame in the slightest degree if he does bring this question up again and again until we get a settlement and a right settlement. My hon. friend makes a statement that is very far from the fact when he says that the freight rate does not affect the farmers in the West, that it does not matter whether the freight is high or low, he gets the same price anyway and that it is the consumer across the water who pays the extra freight on the wheat that the farmer grows. I have been a grower of, and a dealer in, wheat in my time and I know that if you are on the market buying wheat at any point on the prairies where wheat is grown, and the freight at Fort William suddenly goes up, we will say from three to five cents a bushel, just as quickly as the message can be flashed over the wires, down goes the price of wheat to the farmer two cents a bushel. That happens in every case; you cannot get away from it. How is the merchant going to pay the same price for wheat if it costs him two cents a bushel more to send it across from Port Arthur to Montreal? He has to reduce the price paid to the farmer. The freight has everything to do with the price that the farmer gets. Under the present circumstances, occasioned by the war, the freight on wheat across the ocean has gone up from five cents a bushel to 35, 40 and 45 cents. I am not going to be so extreme, or unreasonable, as to claim that if the freight was suddenly brought down to a normal rate the farmer would get all the advantage of that reduction. I do not think he would under the circumstances, but it certainly would be greatly to his advantage if the rate came down. He would not get it all but he would get part of it. You can lay it down as a principle which cannot be got over that the cost of freight on wheat between the farm which produces it and the city of Liverpool, or Chicago, or New York, or Minneapolis, or any place where the wheat happens to be sold, is and will always be, one of the most important factors. If my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that it makes no difference to the farmer what the rate is, he will find that he has very few followers in the West who will subscribe to his doctrine. During the past ten years there has been a wonderful change in the knowledge of the farmer on those particular questions relating to the marketing of his crop, to freight rates and everything in connection with the sale of his wheat. He is as well posted in a general way as most men in Canada and just as well posted along the lines of his own business as are other men along the lines of their own particular business.

My hon. friend has dealt at considerable length, very moderately, with the question of tonnage, but there were two points that my hon. friend avoided, or overlooked, in his discussion that I thought would have had a bearing on the subject and would have been well worthy of mention by my hon. friend. If we are going to secure the building of ships in Canada, would it not be well to put all the material that goes into the building of these ships on the free list? Would not that be the easiest way to pay a part of the bonus, if a bonus is necessary, to secure the building of ships? Would it not be easier to

simply take the duty off the material that goes into the ships than to pay an extra bonus per ton in connection with the building of ships? There is another factor that would enter very largely into the question of securing tonnage to carry the produce of our farms from this country across the water, and that is the question of securing return freight. If my hon. friend said: We will take off the extra 7½ per cent that we put on British goods last year, that would induce trade between Canada and Great Britain, and therefore there would be more tonnage to carry our wheat and other products to the Old Country. It seems to me that that would be a cheaper way of securing tonnage than offering a bonus. If you pay a bonus on tonnage, what will be the result? Take the case of the farmer, and this applies equally to every man who is a consumer, and we all are consumers. The farmer has to pay the extra duty on goods coming from the Old Country. Then he has, in addition, to pay for the bonus on the building of ships, and in that way he is paying double. In the case of the western farmer, who is refused the right to sell his wheat in the best market, or to have the choice of selling his wheat where the market happens to be best at the time, has to pay three times to secure that extra tonnage. If my hon. friend, instead of just taking off the extra 7½ per cent put on last year, would come down with a definite policy, supported by his colleagues, and say that in order to encourage tonnage to come to Canada, and in order to avoid paying a special bonus to secure that tonnage to carry the products of Canada to the Old Country, we will put British goods on the free list—

Mr. BURNHAM: Would my hon. friend be good enough to say if he would advise anybody to go into the West, settle down and start growing wheat?

Mr. TURRIFF: If the Government would come forward and say: We will put British goods on the free list—

Mr. BURNHAM: That is not the point.

Mr. TURRIFF: Well, then, I misunderstood my hon. friend.

Mr. BURNHAM: I want to know, with the state of things as it is now, if he would advise people to go into the West and start farming, or chuck the whole thing up?

Mr. TURRIFF: That is, if goods were put on the free list?

Mr. BURNHAM: Now, at the present time.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend is very pessimistic. The West is all right.

Mr. BURNHAM: Answer the question.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would advise my hon. friend to settle in the West.

Mr. BURNHAM: What's the trouble?

Mr. TURRIFF: The trouble is that the Government will not give us the best market for our wheat. My hon. friend would have to work if he came out West, but he is a husky looking man.

Mr. BURNHAM: You have knocked your own case on the head.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not wish to be diverted from my argument. I was saying that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce would put British goods on the free list, there would not be nearly so much difficulty in getting tonnage to carry our products to the Old Country, because that would be an inducement to shipping to come to Canada. If the Government would do that, my hon. friend would not have to ask questions about people going to the West. If people could get their goods right and sell their products in the best market, you could not keep them out of the West with a club. Free wheat does not mean that all our wheat would go to the United States. If the argument of hon. gentlemen is sound, that the Canadian price is better, our wheat would never go to the United States, not one bushel of it. But if we had that extra market, we could take advantage of it exactly as our cattle raisers in the West do. Cattle enter the United States free now, and practically all our cattle are going there, simply because they fetch a higher price than in eastern Canada or across the ocean. Money counts with the farmer when he is selling his cattle, and it would count when he was selling his wheat. If he could get a better price at home he would not sell outside.

I entirely agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce that a country should have a mercantile marine of its own, to carry products to and from the country. The question is, how best to bring that about. I have never been much of an advocate of bonusing industries, but a bonus has this advantage: you know exactly what you are paying. And when it is a question of giving a bonus or putting a duty on an article that is produced in Canada I prefer the bonus, simply because it is more easy

to regulate, and everybody knows exactly what is being paid. But I do not know that a bonus is the best way to secure a mercantile marine. It may be; I do not profess to know very much about this subject; but I think it rather unreasonable for the minister to come here without any proposition whatever to offer to the committee, and then ask my hon. friend from St. John to outline his proposal. Let the minister work out a proposition that will receive the assent of his colleagues first of all, and then submit it to the House, and if it is reasonable I am sure it will receive considerable support from this side of the House. But I do not think it is up to the Opposition to work out a plan for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not say that we should not be able to satisfy him, because I have a pretty good opinion of his reasonableness—a much better opinion than I have of the Government as a whole. But while the minister might agree with a proposition coming from this side of the House, his colleagues might not, and it is for that reason that a proposal of this kind should be put forward by the Government in power, and have behind it the weight of the Cabinet's approval.

I have said what little I wanted to say, and I do not apologize to anybody for bringing up the question of free wheat. I shall bring it up just as often as I think necessary, and shall keep on doing so until we secure that boon for the western farmers; it would be a boon not only to the West but to the whole of Canada and would hurt nobody. I should like to see the minister take a tour through the West, not meeting out-and-out supporters of the Government in the large cities, but attending a few of the farmers' big conventions, the Grain Growers' and the United Farmers' conventions for instance. Let the minister get their view on the free wheat question, and he will soon find that his colleague the Solicitor General was very far from the mark when he said in the House that he was satisfied that ninety per cent of the agitation for free wheat was political, and the other ten per cent mistaken economics.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

[Mr. Turriff.]

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—ocean and mail service between Canada and Great Britain, $1,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Before six o'clock there was a general discussion in regard to ocean rates and freights, and I presume the minister does not object to that discussion being continued on this item.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not at all.

Mr. OLIVER: Can the minister tell us what amount of grain has gone across the ocean during the period between the close of navigation on the lakes and, say, the middle of this month?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That question is pertinent to this item, but the whole question of grain carriage, transference, routes, everything like that, will come up when we take up the item covering the grain system in the West. I intend to take that item up to-morrow, when I will have my notes here and will give full information. The hon. member is perfectly in order in asking a question on this item, because a good deal of grain does go by this route.

Mr. OLIVER: The Minister of Railways and Canals was not altogether clear in his explanation yesterday as to the disposition that had been made of the grain carried forward on the Transcontinental during the past winter.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That will come under railway transportation.

Mr. OLIVER: If it were convenient for the minister to get that information from his colleague it would be of great advantage to have it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to get that information myself, so that we shall have it when the item comes up.

Mr. OLIVER: I had it in mind to give some consideration to those questions that were discussed this afternoon on the basis of the information for which I was asking just now. That information, however, will be quite acceptable to-morrow, when the matter is up for discussion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will be up to-morrow or the next day.

Mr. OLIVER: Following the argument of the minister when he set out the reasons for the present lack of shipping facilities, I remember that he laid considerable stress on the fact that on the outbreak of war the mercantile marine of Germany and Austria was automatically eliminated from the

carrying traffic of the world, that is, all except such portion as was under seizure in British ports which, I presume, was turned to use in due course. Since then, some of that shipping which was interned in the ports of Portugal has been dealt with in the same way, and I think Italy has done the same with enemy shipping interned in her ports. I do not know what proportion of the total mercantile marine of the two central empires was comprised in that which was interned in the ports of Great Britain and her Allies, but it must have been a considerable percentage of the total, so that that part is not now out of commission by reason of the war. That part of the mercantile marine of the two central empires that remained in their own ports or is interned in neutral ports, of course, is out of commission; but on the other hand the traffic business of the two central empires, of the Turkish empire and, in large measure, of the Russian empire is also out of commission. Therefore, the loss in shipping facilities to the Allied and neutral nations is not nearly as great by reason of the war as the case as presented by the minister would indicate, because, whilst we have lost the shipping, the business is not there to be done by that shipping owing to the blockade. I emphasize this phase of the case for the purpose of establishing what appears to me to be the most serious and deplorable feature of the present condition of trans-Atlantic traffic, and that is that, having given full credit for all the legitimate reasons arising out of the war as an influence in increasing ocean freight rates, I am compelled to the conclusion that the great reason is the fact that the owners of shipping on the Atlantic ocean have taken advantage of the necessities of the world as it stands to-day and are so using the power that is in their hands as to create and constitute a menace to the Allied powers and to civilization at large. In my opinion, the owners of shipping on the Atlantic, to say nothing about any other part of the world, are to-day in the strongest and the most conscienceless combine that the world has ever seen, especially when all the circumstances are taken into consideration. When we are discussing this question, it is worth while to realize that the conditions that we face are not altogether natural, but artificial, and, being artificial, permit of drastic treatment that would not be in order were the conditions as to ocean rates the natural result of the general world conditions arising out of the war. I will admit that there is a certain percentage of reason for the increase in freight rates; but, taking everything that the minister has said at its full value, I still cannot admit that that constitutes a sufficient reason for the increase in ocean freight rates on the short haul between Canada and Great Britain of three, four, five, six, eight or ten hundred per cent that has taken place since the war began. The increase is out of all proportion to the change of conditions. A great part of the cost of ocean transport is the wages of men employed and the cost of the support of those men. Sailors' wages have increased, and the cost of living has increased. But the wages have not increased more than one hundred per cent—I doubt that they have increased fifty per cent—and the cost of living has not increased more than one hundred per cent; yet we are face to face with an increase of from eight hundred to a thousand per cent, and for this, for my part, I can find no justification.

That brings me to this point: that while I am not favourably disposed towards the minister's suggestion of a future policy of subsidized shipbuilding in Canada, I am of the belief that present conditions are such that if Canada, as a part of the great alliance, and the Mother Country are not to be absolutely strangled in this war by reason of the rapacity of owners of shipping on the Atlantic, some drastic and immediate measures will have to be taken to supply the mutual needs of Canada and Great Britain. Up to the beginning of the war, there had never been a complete shipping combine; there had been partial combines, limited combines; but in the period since the beginning of the war, in effect the whole shipping business of the Atlantic has become a combine, and it is merely a question of how much these people can get without regard to the service that they render, knowing that the absolute necessities of the case, life or death for the whole country on either side of the Atlantic, depends upon their say-so. They have their hands on the throat of civilization and they are strangling it to death. The minister was at some pains to explain that the producer did not pay the freight; he was strongly of the opinion that the consumer pays the freight. But whichever pays the freight, the allied world is carrying that additional load. The shipping people are taking it out of the allied world beyond what would be fair and just under all the circumstances, and are stupendously increasing the burden which has to be carried, without proper

justification. I do not wish to argue at any great length the point of who pays the freight, because it is not material to the argument I am making; but my impression is that, the circumstances being as they are, it is the Canadian producer who pays that freight. One reason why I believe that is this. When the freight was lower and when the price of grain at Liverpool was not so high as at present, the Canadian producer received a higher price for his wheat; but since that time in 1914, the price in Liverpool has increased but the price in Canada has gone down, while the cost of transport across the ocean has gone up. It seems to me there is no question that, had the cost of transport across the ocean remained the same, we in Canada would have received the benefit of that increase in the price of wheat in Great Britain. But whether we lose or whether the consumer loses, we know that we are stupendously handicapped in this terrible struggle by reason of the fact that freight rates across the ocean have been so greatly increased.

The minister asked the House, and asked the Opposition, to give their best opinion as to what should be done under these circumstances. I do not know that that, under our system of government, is exactly the business of the party of the Opposition. Having become seized of the existence of a certain condition, it is the business of the Government to find means to meet that condition. If our discussion were to run along that line, I should be compelled to follow in some degree the argument of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and to say that, had the responsibility rested on this side of the House, notice would have been taken at an earlier day of the conditions as they then existed, and due preparation would have been made to meet these conditions as they now exist. My hon. friend will see that we do not get anywhere when we begin to argue in that way, because that is not a matter that is capable of proof, either one way or the other. But we can, I think, reach this agreement, that the condition that exists could have been measurably met, or, at any rate, it would have been right and proper to take steps to meet it when it began to arise or when it became evident that it would arise. That, however, is not what I want to say.

What I want to say is this, that we in Canada, as well as the people of the United Kingdom, are faced by a terrible crisis, as I am given to understand the situation to be, in regard to the cost of transport and the facilities for transport from this side of the Atlantic to the other.

We are faced with a crisis which will have to be met without delay. While I would not wish to be considered for a moment as agreeing to a permanent policy of subsidized shipbuilding such as my hon. friend suggested to-day, I would say that in view of the crisis which we are facing I would be prepared to support the Government in almost any measure they saw fit to take, if it was feasible, in order to meet that condition of affairs and to give transportation across the ocean with assurance as to accommodation being available at reasonable rates. War conditions being as they are, I do not think that we are well advised in making calculations as to what may take place after the war. My impression is that the conditions to-day are such that the best thought of the allied nations, this Dominion included, should be brought to bear upon the single object of winning the war. If and when we win the war, we shall be in a position to lay our plans and take consideration of the future, but until the war is won the first essential is that it shall be won, and won under circumstances that will leave no question as to the result or as to the winning. I know that many great minds in Canada have given much thought to what we will do after the war. I repeat that in so far as these ideas draw us away from the concentration of our best minds upon the winning of the war, to that extent they are not really to our benefit. We had better put these things aside for the present and concentrate our thought and attention on winning the war.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I had intended before the Speaker left the Chair to say a few words on this question, but I was called out of the House, and perhaps this would be as good a time as any to express briefly my views on the subject. I was pleased to hear that the minister had decided to take some action on this very important question. It is not a new question in this House. I have had the honour of sitting in this House for twelve years and I do not think that a single session has passed without a discussion on shipbuilding. Although the subject has been looked at from all angles it is apparent that up to the present time no decision has been reached.

It is not a party question, and I trust that it will not become a party question.

It is purely a business question, and I see no reason why both sides of the House should not deal with it as such and endeavour to reach some conclusion. Coming from the province of Nova Scotia, I take a special interest in this matter. We look back upon the time when our province was a great shipbuilding province. It is not a great while ago since we were able to boast that no country in the world, not even Great Britain, had as many tons of shipping to its credit per head of population as the little province of Nova Scotia. We lost that proud position, and we began to lose it very shortly after 1867. You will remember that soon after Confederation a high tariff was introduced into Canada in place of the old 10 per cent tariff that we used to have in Nova Scotia. One of the reasons, according to my view, why we were driven out of the business of shipbuilding was because this high tariff increased the price of production. It cost more to build the ship, and when she was launched she had to compete with the whole world; she had to compete with the ships built on the Clyde, and on the Humber, and elsewhere in Great Britain where everything is cheap and where they have made such great progress in this industry. Another reason was the change from wooden to iron ships. In those days we built wooden ships successfully, but when the change took place from wood to iron and then from iron to steel, we had our own difficulties to meet. Our people who had money in the shipbuilding business took their money out and invested in the industries which promised large returns under the national policy, but many of them were disappointed and lost their money. The question now arises: can we get back to a workable system; can we get again the old supremacy on the sea that we have lost? Every Nova Scotian is ambitious in that direction. We like to look upon ourselves as a maritime people, sweeping the seas and carrying cargoes from far-off countries. That has been the tradition of the province in the past, and it has not yet died out. I am sure that in the province from which I come any steps that can be taken to waken the shipbuilding industry will be welcomed. I am sorry that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has not seen fit to come to us with some kind of a clean cut proposal from the Government, which if we thought was genuine, we could look upon seriously and give our views on. But if it is only talk, if it is only a discussion which is not intended to end in anything, there is little use in our taking very much interest in it. We have had so many of these illusory suggestions in the past that we would like to feel that this time the minister is leading us to a bona fide movement with regard to this matter. We are not able to forget that in 1909 the Minister of Trade and Commerce made a great speech in this House in which he drew a delightful picture of what was to happen in the years to come when we should embark on naval construction in this country and when the construction of mercantile ships would follow. We believed him at that time; we thought that his forecast was correct, and he was able to win the assent of both sides of the House, but for the last six or seven years the minister has been busy trying to explain away the position that he took on that particular occasion. If there is one man in Canada who is responsible for our failure in that matter it is the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself. I am sorry to have to say that, but we must speak the truth on matters of this kind.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Speak the truth as we see it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am glad, however, if he is going to turn over a new leaf; if he is going to make a sincere and honest effort to blaze the trail for the country in regard to this important matter. We would all be very pleased if the picture drawn for us by the Minister of Trade and Commerce could be realized, and I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) that the question has become so urgent that it demands immediate attention from the Government. I do not agree that it is on the Atlantic alone that this trouble exists. The high rates prevail not only in the North Atlantic, but in the Pacific, in the South Atlantic, and all over the world. The ship owners can secure just as profitable trade in carrying cargoes from the Argentine to the Mediterranean as from Halifax to Liverpool. The peculiarity about the ocean shipping business is that the ship owner has the whole world for his market; he is asking only for the market price. When there is a cargo to be carried it is put up in the exchanges in the big cities like London and New York, and the ship owner who undertakes to carry that cargo for the lowest figure will get it, and bidders are there from all over the world.

Wherever the cargoes are owners of vessels in that part of the world are represented at the exchanges in London, or wherever the business is done, and the cargoes are carried at the market price. I do not think that any one can substantiate the theory put forward by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that there is a combine.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not think there is any combine. The world's shipping trade is too large a business for a combine to be formed. The whole world is interested.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Is there not a North Atlantic combine?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not think so.

Mr. MACLEAN: I think there is.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At least I do not know of any. I never heard of any.

Mr. MACLEAN: The Canadian Pacific Railway is in it for one.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not see what advantage it would be to have a combine in the north Atlantic. There was, a few years ago, a shipping company in New York that was said to be endeavouring to combine all the shipping of the country; but that fell down, and at the present time I do not think there is any large company that controls the rates in any way. If there is I am not aware of it; but perhaps my hon. friend has better information. If he could enlighten us on that matter, I should be interested. There is in the whole world about 50,000,000 tons of shipping and the British Empire owns about 20,000,000 tons of that shipping. I am now talking of gross tonnage. The next largest owner is Germany. Germany has over 5,000,000 tons, and the United States also has over 5,000,000 tons, a very large part of which is coasting tonnage. Of course, the whole German tonnage is now tied up. The United States has very little deep sea tonnage. In Canada we have quite a respectable tonnage, but in Canada, under our system, we count everything in the tonnage, the little boats that ply on the lakes, the scows, and all these small craft.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have big boats on the lakes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, but they are all put in the one list, and they form the tonnage of Canada, which is about 700,000 tons or perhaps a little more. Very little of that is ocean tonnage. We have some ocean tonnage, and while the minister was speaking on that point I thought of interrupting him to make a suggestion. He said there was nothing the Government could do to affect the rates. I felt like suggesting that they could have done what the Government of Great Britain did which commandeered the tonnage that they required for war purposes and for commercial purposes, and forced the owners of that tonnage to turn in and work for them, and the owners are now carrying cargoes for the British Government at about one-third what they could get in the market if they were free to go and work for the ordinary merchant. That is to say, the British Government give on tramp vessels about 12 shillings per ton per month, whereas an owner can earn from 35 shillings to perhaps 40 shillings a month in the market if he was free from the requisition of the British Government. The British Government in that way have controlled the rate of a certain amount of the tonnage of Great Britain, I think about 33 per cent, according to the last statement I saw. The Canadian Government could have done the same thing. They could have commandeered all the boats that are registered in Canada and turned them into the Canadian service, to do the work of Canada at a reasonable rate. The way the British Government arrived at their rate was by taking an average of the profits of three years prior to the war and making a certain allowance for the increased cost of manning the ship and the increased insurance. They fixed a rate on that basis, and the traffic on all commandeered vessels is controlled by that rate.

Mr. BRODER: Do not the English Government run all risk of the vessel being lost?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, in a sense. The ships are all insured under a system which the English Government have organized with certain companies in London, and they pay the insurance so that if a ship is sunk by a submarine or lost in any way the owner gets the value of his ship. They also make some provision for the increased cost of the running of the ship, so that it works out fairly well for the owner, while the British Government have the advantage of getting their work done at a fair and reasonable rate. My hon. friend could have done that,

but he failed to do so. He also, as I understand, allowed the British Government to commandeer Canadian ships, which I do not think should have been permitted by the Canadian Government. Ships registered in Canada should be under the control of the Canadian Government, and if any commandeering or requisitioning is to be done it should be done by our own Government. We are loyal to Great Britain; we are willing to help in this great struggle, and we are helping; we are sending our best to the other side, regardless of money, regardless of life; we are willing to do our full share in winning the war. At the same time, we do not expect the British Government to come here and order us to send our men overseas; we want to send them voluntarily. We have free government in this country, and I should expect our Government to take the stand in regard to this matter of commandeering ships that an independent, free Government should take, and to say: No, if any requisitioning or commandeering of Canadian ships is to be done we will do it ourselves, and if it is necessary to turn our ships over to the British authorities in order to help in the war we will do it, but we will control every ship that is under Canadian register. That is the position the Canadian Government should have taken.

I said a moment ago that we had not been able, during a great many years, to make any progress worth while in the building of ships, and I attributed that to two reasons. One of those reasons has disappeared. We have now in this country a great steel industry. We are able to produce steel in large quantities. We have rolling mills in which we can roll steel to produce the ships. We have a large number of skilled men who are able to do the work. We have all those things in Canada now that we did not have twenty years ago. But we still have high protection; that stays with us, and in my view we shall not be able to compete with free trade Great Britain in ship building unless something is done to assist the Canadians who embark in this business. Take France, for example. The people of France have an extensive coast line, and they have always been very anxious to be the owners of a mercantile marine. No Government has done more than the French Government in that direction. They have paid large bounties, they even paid so much a mile for the voyage that the ship makes on the ocean, in order to induce the French people to embark in shipbuilding. They have spent vast sums of money, but they have had no special success in France. They do not own to-day much more than about 2,000,000 tons of shipping out of 50,000,000 tons that are owned by the maritime nations throughout the world. Two million tons is all they have been able to put on the water with all the protection that they have given in France. What is the reason? The reason is that France is a highly protective country, and everything is so expensive that they cannot build a ship, launch her and compete with the rest of the world in that business. Hon. gentlemen must not think that it is all easy sailing in the shipping business. Before the war ship owners were having a very hard time of it, and many of them had to go under. In many cases they did not make more than 5 per cent on their money, and their property was disappearing or becoming less valuable year by year. That is what happened during all the years of hard times before this spurt came on. If you are going to embark in the shipping business you must be prepared for a dull spell as well as for a profitable time, and in order to do that you have to build your ships with as little capital as possible, because you have to pay dividends on every dollar that you put into it. If it is going to cost the Canadian more to build the ships than the Englishman, or the Scotchman, he must get that money from some source, and that is the question the Government have to settle.

The scheme they have in the United States, and which was put forward by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to-day, does not seem to be a practical one. No capitalist will want to embark in partnership with the Government. I understood him to say that under that scheme, which is proposed before the United States Congress to-day, the Government would provide the largest part of the capital, that the Government would require to own the controlling interest in the capital that would be put into the ships, and that they would invite private enterprise to go in with them. I venture to say that capitalists, or those engaged in private enterprise, will not embark in business with the Government. The experience of the United States is like our own. The Government have not been successful in managing commercial matters. I fear they will not be successful in this

and I do not think that the scheme will be found workable.

The last proposition made by the minister strikes me, without having had much time to consider it, as more likely to be of some use. I hope he will follow it up and work it out if he can. There is great activity in the United States at the present time in the matter of shipbuilding. The United States own about 5,000,000 tons of shipping already. They have, within a year, reduced their tariff. They have made it easier to embark in the shipbuilding business. They have never paid any bounty, but they have opened the registry in the United States to foreign shipping, which is of great value.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: For seven years.

Mr. SINCLAIR: For seven years. Any man who chooses can go abroad, buy a ship, bring her to the United States, register her under the American flag and sail her as an American ship. He could not do that until recently. That has increased the tonnage of the United States largely during the last year or two. From the last statistics I have seen, and which are contained in the Report of the Department of Commerce for the present month of April, it appears that there are 360 vessels on the stocks of the United States of an aggregate tonnage of 1,067,856. You can see that there is great activity in the United States in reference to the question of shipbuilding, and I am inclined to think that if the United States reduce their tariff and become practically a free trade country she would very soon become a rival of Great Britain on the seas. She was a rival of Great Britain away back about the middle of the last century, before she adopted high protection as her policy.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This new tonnage is almost entirely coastal.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I believe it is very largely coastal and, of course, in the coasting trade of the United States they have a certain amount of advantage. They confine the coasting trade of the United States to American bottoms. A foreigner is not allowed to take any part in the coasting trade. There is also another matter that has an important bearing on the question. They allow great freedom in the selection of officers. A ship up to 700 tons is not required to have certificated officers in the United States. That gives a good deal of freedom to the smaller class of coasting vessels and it enables them to carry on a business that they would not be able to do if they were subject to our laws. If you look over the Canada Shipping Act you will find that it is a most complicated statute, containing about one thousand clauses, many of which are grandmotherly clauses that should be struck out as they only hamper the business. That is a matter I wish again to draw to the attention of the minister. Notwithstanding all the discussions we have had here, the Government have not taken any action towards revising the shipping laws of this country and making them a little more in accord with modern business conditions. I have pointed out to the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Hazen) that our ships are hampered by being prevented from going on southern voyages further than 5 degrees north latitude. I have brought that question to the attention of the Government on various occasions but they have taken no action. This is not a matter connected with the deep sea trade but it is a matter of great interest in connection with the coasting trade. It is a matter that should be dealt with, but up to the present the Government are adverse to making that change. It has been placed before them on various occasions. There is a Bill before the House at the present time which has passed its second reading but which can get no further unless it is made a Government measure. It simply asks that coasting vessels shall be allowed to engage in the southern business, and perhaps the most profitable business is to be found on the coasts of the Argentine Republic and Brazil. Under the present regulations a coasting vessel is allowed to go no farther south than 5 degrees north latititude and the consequence is that owners are withdrawing their ships from Canadian registry and are registering them in Barbados and other British possessions in order that they may be able to carry on their business. This should not be the case but unfortunately it is. Some sixty or seventy large sailing vessels, belonging to the Maritime Provinces, during the past few years have been withdrawn from Canadian registry altogether and have been registered in Barbados. They have been taken away from the Canadian flag because the Canadian Government refused to allow them to engage in the southern business. There is no reason in the world why they should not be allowed to do so.

It is much easier navigating in southern waters than in northern waters where they are allowed to go, but for some reason that has not been explained to the House or the country, the Government still adhere to the old policy of preventing Canadian coasting vessels going farther south than 5 degrees north latitude. This is a matter that the minister should deal with if he is desirous of keeping ships under the Canadian flag and building up our coasting trade.

I do not want to weary the House, but this question of tonnage is of great importance. Our trade is growing enormously but tonnage is not growing. Ten years ago our total trade—that is our exports and imports, leaving out gold and bullion—was $458,000,000, approximately, while to-day it is $959,000,000, so that our trade has doubled within ten years, while during that period our shipping has not increased at all. The consequence is bound to be stagnation, as far as Canada is concerned. We have stagnation to-day with regard to our wheat and our lumber, and instead of doing something for ourselves we are like a lot of children crying to the Old Country to give us tonnage to carry our wheat across the ocean. It is high time the Government woke up and dealt with this question, and I feel certain that any practicable scheme put forward by the minister would meet with the support of hon. members of this House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe): I wish to make a few remarks on the question now under consideration, namely, assistance by the Government in some manner or other towards shipbuilding in Canada. I assume that any assistance given would be equally applicable to ships on the Great Lakes as on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. It is to be regrettaed that a large quantity of our Northwest grain has gone through to Buffalo in the past. I saw it stated in to-day's papers that the hon. member for St. John had alleged that some 80 per cent of our grain for export had gone through Buffalo while the Minister of Public Works stated that it was somewhere around 50 per cent. Speaking for myself, I heard the statement frequently made last fall that about 75 per cent of our Northwest grain for export went through Buffalo; indeed so great was the quantity that went through that port that at the close of the year there was no less a quantity than 30,000,000 bushels of export grain lying at Buffalo in vessels which were waiting to take their turn at the elevators.

At the outset I want to point out the great disadvantage under which Canadian registered vessels labour on the Great Lakes. Contrast the position of two vessels, one owned by an American and registered in the United States, and the other owned by a Canadian and registered in Canada. With the New Year the large American freighter, or any American freighter as far as that is concerned, lying at some point near Buffalo is loaded with coal for either Duluth or Port Arthur. The Canadian vessel has the same privilege of taking coal up, but after the first run of coal is through, and after the grain at the head of the lakes either at Duluth, Port Arthur or Fort William has been carried east, a lull comes in the trade for the Canadian vessel. The American vessel is pressed into the ore carrying trade, and any man who ever stood at Detroit or Windsor and saw that wonderful procession of huge freighters passing by, all bearing the American flag, must have been impressed with the enormous ore carrying trade these American boats do. The Canadian vessel is debarred from that trade because all the ore that is carried from the North is taken from the Missanabie range or from some point on Lake Michigan, and it would be a contravention of the coasting laws for a Canadian vessel to engage in that trade. There are, it is true, some iron industries on the lakes, the one at Hamilton, for instance, requires a certain amount of iron ore, and the iron ore it uses is in the main carried by Canadian vessels, but while the Hamilton concern is relatively a large one, yet the quantity of ore it uses during the whole season can be supplied by two or three vessels. The result is—and I have frequently seen this—that at Midland, Goderich, and other lake towns, Canadian vessels are tied up during the summer months while American vessels are carrying ore. That of course is a great handicap on the Canadian lake shipping.

Another point to be remembered is that the growth of the Canadian vessel in carrying capacity has been comparatively small. While I do not profess to give the exact figures, I think I am well within the mark when I say that to every vessel of Canadian registry on the Great Lakes there are in all probability forty or fifty American vessels, and the American vessels are also of much greater tonnage. The experience has been such that no man will invest his

money to-day in a vessel of two or three thousand tons, and for the reason that the average 100,000 bushel boat, commonly known as a canaler, which passes through the Welland canal and on to Montreal, travelling night and day, has of necessity to employ a night and day crew. Contrast a vessel of that class with a vessel like the Grant Morden, owned by the Canada Steamship line. These two vessels leave Port Arthur or Fort William side by side. The Grant Morden's crew is very little larger than the crew on the 100,000 bushel boat, and at the prevailing rate of about five cents a bushel the Grant Morden picks up a freight of about $25,000, while the 100,000 bushel boat picks up only about $5,000; that is to say, except for the extra expense the larger boat has on account of coal and a few more deck-hands, the Grant Morden makes five times as much money as the smaller boat. The inevitable result is that the small Canadian boat is going off the Great Lakes, as has long since happened under the policy followed by the American vessel owners. Any person conversant with the subject knows that there must be dozens of vessels under American register that can carry from 400,000 to 500,000 bushels of wheat. If we are to have a Canadian lake trade it can be done in only one way, and that is by supplying the vessels. This would mean not only the giving of employment to Canadians on Canadian vessels, but this major and far greater fact, that the grain would be carried on Canadian railways. The Canadian Pacific have established at Port McNicoll, in the riding I have the honour to represent, elevator accommodation for about 5,000,000 bushels, and they contemplate still greater accommodation in that respect. They have built to a point near Peterborough what may be considered to be one of the best railways in the whole of Canada, a railway with an almost perfect grade. When I tell the House that one locomotive can haul 70 cars, each carrying 1,500 bushels, or a load of 100,000 bushels, I think hon. gentlemen will agree that there is not another railway in Canada that can do that at the present time. It is indeed a wonderful road. By the establishment of what is known as their Lake Shore line, the Canadian

9 p.m.

Pacific railway are able to carry the bulk of their grain on the Peterborough line to Glen Tay. The whole business of the Canadian Pacific railway to-day is directed to the end of carrying grain in Canadian bottoms, and all grain carried from Port Arthur and Fort William to Port McNicoll or to a Canadian port must be carried in Canadian bottoms, as it would be a contravention of the coasting laws for American vessels to engage in that trade. The Grand Trunk have apparently taken Midland as their chief point on the Georgian bay, by reason of the fact that it has a good harbour and is their closest port to Montreal. They have there elevator accommodation for about 5,000,000 bushels. If we are to have Canadian trade on Canadian vessels and on Canadian railways, there is only one way in which it can be brought about, and that is by the introduction of more Canadian vessels. As an instance of the prejudice against the owning of Canadian vessels, I may say that the Canada Steamship Company has their largest vessel, the name of which I have forgotten for the moment, registered, along with many others of their ships, in the United States. They have done this so that the boat can engage in the ore trade during the summer months, which she would not be allowed to do if she were of Canadian register.

At Montreal we are handicapped owing to natural conditions. It is only late in the fall that there is a great rush of grain, and after about the 15th of November there is no navigation down the St. Lawrence river, not because it is not possible, but because of the excessive insurance rates which then make transportation by that route almost prohibitory. The result is that the trade is diverted to Buffalo, and it is rather startling to learn that between 60 and 80 per cent of the wheat of the Canadian West shipped out for export went by way of Buffalo instead of over Canadian railways. How can this handicap be gotten over? I heard a gentleman who is very prominently connected with one of the transcontinental railways state that it would have been much more in the interest of his railway company if they had had at the southern end of the Georgian Bay canal some of the elevator accommodation which they have at Fort William and Port Arthur, because the Canadian Pacific railway in that case would have the trade through to St. John, and the Grand Trunk would have the trade through to Portland, in which case the bulk of the transit would lie between two Canadian points, namely, the point on the border and Midland, or any other point at which they might have

their elevator accommodation on the shores of the Georgian Bay.

The construction of ships in Canada has had its trial, and what has experience proven? A large company erected a magnificent plant at Port Arthur, but I do not think there has been a vessel built at Port Arthur in the last four or five years, although I have been pleased to note from recent reports in the press that they have now under contract the building of two canallers. Although one or two million dollars was invested in that plant, I do not think any large steamer has been built since the Noronic was built some years ago. At Owen Sound, at Sault Ste. Marie and also in my own town, Midland, the construction of drydocks has been projected for a number of years, by bonuses and otherwise. Those projects, however, have all gone to the wall owing to the fact that capitalists did not see the possibility of thos ventures proving financially successful. There are at Collingwood two drydocks, five or six hundred feet in length, which I believe are capable of accommodating the largest boats on the lakes. I am not speaking disparagingly of the owners of these docks; I believe the conditions were adverse to them. There is, however, the fact that the docks are there and that they are first-class docks, fully and thoroughly equipped with the most up-to-date machinery; and had they the business of constructing ships afforded them I have no doubt they would be a financial success. Hon. gentlemen may think that once an iron vessel is constructed, that is all the work that has to be done upon it and that it has no further use for a drydock, but the fact is that there is a great deal of money earned by drydock companies repairing vessels. Were it not for the repairs made in drydocks, and were the drydocks solely dependent upon new construction, there would not b many drydocks in the country.

As I understand the suggestion of the minister which he has placed before the House in order to get an expression of opinion, the first point is, that if a vessel is constructed in Canada and if it costs more than a similar vessel built in Great Britain, the difference in the cost will be given to the Canadian investor. The Canadian vessel at present suffers a great handicap not only on account of American competition, but on account of British competition. After the South African war I remember that there appeared on the Great Lakes a fleet of ten vessels called Turret ships because of their peculiar construction. After that war arrangements were made between the British Government and the Government of South Africa for a better steamship service, a combination of freight and passenger boats, and as a result those Turret ships were brought to Canada and sold. While those vessels would carry from 100,000 to 120,000 bushels of grain and a vessel built in Canada would carry about 100,000 bushels, I believe that some of them were laid down in Canada for under $40,000, whereas the Canadian vessel carrying that quantity of grain would cost $100,000. Those vessels, being of iron, were perfectly dry and served the purpose of carrying grain, although, of course, repairs had to be made on them from time to time. In this way the Canadian ship-owner not only had to compete with the American ship-owner, but he knows not the moment when, with trade dull in the old country, competing British vessels may be brought on to the lakes, on the assumption that they are of such a length that they can go through the Welland canal, and at the close of navigation be taken out again to trade along the Atlantic coast. The large vessel that will carry from 300,000 to 500,000 bushels of grain is the only vessel that can be built in Canada to make money on the lakes. Hon. members will have noticed in the last few days that what was known as the St. Lawrence Navigation Company, of Toronto, sold four vessels to the Canada Steamship Company on an agreement that the stock was paid for at $180 a share, although a few years ago that stock could have been picked up at $120 a share. Had those vessels been small vessels carrying 90,000 to 100,000 bushels, the Canada Steamship Company would not have been anxious for them, but one of them had a capacity of 400,000 bushels and two others were not far behind that. That goes to prove that the class of vessels that must be built on the Great Lakes to be successful financially must have a capacity of from 400,000 to 500,000 bushels. Such vessels must be built with an almost flat bottom, and until the St. Lawrence canal locks are lengthened to say 500 feet, those vessels will never be able to leave the waters of the upper lakes, although they would be able to go into lake Ontario after the Welland canal is improved. The cost entailed in that enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals will be so great that, I fear, this country will not be willing

to contemplate it within the next fifty years. What does that bring us to? In the first place, you must have a large vessel to carry grain on the Upper Lakes if you are going to make money—and unless that vessel can make money no man will invest in it. And in the next place that vessel cannot be taken out of the Upper Lakes in winter, it must lie lifeless, and, instead of a money-maker, it will be a money-loser. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to let the Americans carry the balance of the grain and make it an even one hundred per cent to Buffalo? They have the advantage of taking it out in the winter months by way of Philadelphia, New York, or other points along the coast, while we are driven to bring it to some point on Georgian bay and carry it out by way of the Grand Trunk to Portland or by the other line to Halifax or St. John—and we all know how we are handicapped on account of the great mileage to Halifax, St. John, or Portland. We must have vessels on the lakes if we want to control the trade; and so I was pleased to hear the minister say that he hopes to see that done. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) spoke of the question of steel production in relation to shipbuilding in Canada. I assume that in Sydney, with their enormous production, and probably also in Hamilton, if vessel building on a large scale were guaranteed in this country, they might go into the manufacture of shipping plates. But the manufacture for the few vessels building to-day in Canada would be the height of absurdity; no people with capital would invest in it. I understand that this business of rolling plates is a very variable business, so variable indeed that I have known Harland & Wolff, the great British shipbuilders, to carry over through Midland shipping plates rolled in Chicago and then take them to England for use in building ships. That, I assume, was when shipbuilding in Britain was very brisk, so that they could make a profit even paying freight for that long distance. So far there has not been a large amount of ship construction in Canada. I venture the statement that only one kind of vessel will be built in Canada for the future, and that will be the large vessel that cannot possibly pass through the Canadian canals and go out to sea, and, as it will be tied up during the winter months, it will be greatly handicapped. The Canadian vessel is handicapped in every way you look at her. Take, for instance, the question of coal. It is true large quantities of coal are taken up to the head of the lakes at Port Arthur and Fort William, for I assume that all the coal going as war west as Winnipeg is carried to the head of the lakes by vessel. The Canadian vessel has no monopoly of that trade, for it is no contravention of the coasting law to carry that freight from Cleveland or some other point on Lake Erie to a Canadian port. Then, at a point called Byng Inlet, a little north of Parry Sound, on Georgian bay, the Canadian Pacific handle an enormous quantity of coal. They have splendid appliances for handling it, and they carry it from Byng Inlet to Fort William and from Fort William back towards Toronto. That is American coal and consequently the carriage of it is not restricted to Canadian vessels. These are handicaps that will always be faced by Canadian vessels. With the hope that shipbuilding in Canada may be promoted, I trust that at an early day the Government may be pleased to enact legislation along the lines suggested by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I will not refer to the other phases of it and to the advantage to the country that they would bring. But I do believe that the payment of the difference between what the vessel would cost if constructed in Great Britain and what it would cost if constructed in Canada would have a good effect, and for that reason I would welcome with the greatest possible pleasure such a proposal as has been indicated.

Mr. LOGGIE: I just wish to refer to one phase of the suggestion made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce regarding this country paying the difference in cost between a vessel constructed here and constructed, say, in Europe. It would be necessary to provide for the case of wooden vessels as well as steel vessels. In the case of steel vessels, I think, the minister should find out the cost per ton of a vessel built on a certain specification on the Clyde and the cost of the same vessel in the United States—because I assume that a vessel could be built in Canada as cheaply as in the United States. Having arrived at this difference, I think it would be better to give a bounty per ton yielding the same amount instead of agreeing to pay the difference in cost. In effect it would be the same, but, to my mind, the carrying out of the proposal would be

easier. In regard to wooden ships I should say the reasonable thing would be to find out the cost per ton of a vessel of a certain specification, say in Riga, and also the cost in say Bath, Maine, for I assume that we can construct a wooden ship as cheaply as it can be constructed in the United States. Or, no doubt, the minister could find out what would be the actual cost of construction in Canada. Then, I think it would encourage wooden shipbuilding all over the Maritime Provinces if the plan I suggest were followed and a bounty per ton were paid. I am not sure that the minister will think that practicable, but I am confident that if you give a shipbuilder in the Maritime Provinces a bounty per ton equal to what the minister has suggested, the work will be more easily overtaken and the plan more effective in encouraging the industry. When the minister addressed the House in 1909 on the subject of the navy he declared strongly that he wanted something tangible. I regret that he did not insist that the contracts entered into for the starting of a great shipbuilding plant in the city of St. John were not carried out. I have no doubt whatever that if that had been done we should have the ships afloat to-day and the same plant engaged in mercantile shipbuilding. But we must forget the past and lay hold of the opportunities before us to-day, when an increased mercantile tonnage is absolutely necessary in the interests of this great dominion that sends so much of its products across the ocean.

The minister ought to take this matter up seriously and get down to something tangible, so that a man who wants to build a 500-ton vessel will know how much aid to expect from the Government. Hundreds of Riga vessels, built in Russia, have been plying in the river in my county since the war started. They are vessels of 400 to 600 tons register, not as large as the ordinary vessels of British register, and they are very useful in the timber trade. Before the war these vessels did not ply very much across the ocean, because they were engaged in the Baltic trade. Perhaps they are rather small to make the ocean trade profitable, but the principle remains the same; you must put the Canadian builder in as good a position as the man in Riga who puts capital in a vessel and sends it here to compete for our trade.

Mr. TURRIFF: In the early part of the session the Minister of Marine stated that the Government had secured from the British Government for the Atlantic trade between Canada and Great Britain three enemy vessels that had been captured and taken to Great Britain. I would judge from what the minister said this afternoon that if those vessels are still carrying freight between Canada and Great Britain, they are charging the ordinary freight rates.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Three sailing vessels were got hold of. One sank, another foundered, the other one got to this side and her charter was revoked.

Mr. TURRIFF: By whom was her charter revoked?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: By the British Government, from whom we chartered it. She was a very small vessel and the amount that she could have carried would not be very great. The British Government required her for their own use, and we let her go.

Mr. OLIVER: Last fall a very strong campaign was carried on in a number of Government papers in the West on behalf of action by the British Government in the commandeering of vessels for the carrying of Canadian grain to Great Britain. Demand to this effect was made upon the British Government, who were held responsible by these newspapers supporting this Government for just the same condition that my hon. friend to-day objects to his Government being held responsible for by the Opposition. The campaign was carried on for some considerable length of time, until it developed into a measurable degree of hostility to the British Government for its inaction in the matter. Am I to assume that the British Government will not take such action as was spoken of and urged at that time, am I to assume that the Canadian Government will not take action to commander vessels as was suggested by the hon. member for Guysborough? In fact, has the Government any project or proposal having in view the object of actually facilitating and cheapening the transport of grain across the ocean during the present season?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Whatever may have been stated as matter of discussion or of controversy in the papers looking towards bringing influence to bear on the British Government to commandeer vessels and send them out here to carry Canadian

wheat, I do not think there ever was any very strong ground for the hope that that could have been done. If the British Government had bought grain in Canada for their own purposes, they would have had fair reason for obtaining vessels to carry it over. But the proposition to commandeer vessels and send them to carry grain from Canada to Great Britain for commercial purposes would be followed by a similar demand from Australia and New Zealand or any other country that might have a surplus. I think anyone who would consider this proposal would hardly expect the British Government to carry it out. Similarly, as to the statement made by one of the hon. gentlemen opposite that the Canadian Government could have commandeered Canadian vessels and set them at certain kinds of work, I do not consider that a feasible proposition. Canadian vessels have been carrying everything that they could possibly carry, taking Canadian products from Canadian ports. They could not have stowed any more into their holds if they had belonged to the Government than they did in the possession of the companies themselves.

Mr. OLIVER: The answer is, then, that there was never any probability of the British Government taking the action that was suggested in these newspapers, and there is now no possibility of the Canadian Government taking such action?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No one can tell what may happen, but as things are at present there is no intention of doing that.

Mr. OLIVER: Aside from the somewhat tentative suggestions made by the minister, has the Government any other proposal to deal with the present situation, which, I am bound to say, from what the hon. minister told the House to-day and yesterday, is certainly a critical situation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government is very seriously considering the whole question, and before the session ends it may be able to lay some proposals before the House. I have nothing to speak of about that now. The hon. member for Edmonton carried on a discussion with reference to this matter, and traversed ground which was interesting. I listened to his remarks very carefully. We have been a long time in debate on this matter and I do not care to traverse the ground again, but I do not want my hon. friend to think that I was not interested in the remarks he made. With some of them I agree. I think that more careful examination into some of the others would scarcely lead me along the same line as my hon. friend.

Mr. TURRIFF: The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) pointed out that the British Government in commandeering vessels pay a certain price, which he says is a very good price, so that the vessel owners are doing fairly well. If our Canadian vessels are charging ten times the normal price, which is an unreasonable profit for them to be taking from the people of this country, it seems to me that this Government would be absolutely justified in commandeering those vessels and fixing a price at which they would make double or treble the profit they would make in ordinary times. That is a phase of the question well worthy the attention of the Government. If things become worse and worse, as appears likely, we have no guarantee that, if it is left absolutely to the consciences of the owners of vessels, they will not next year charge double what they are charging now for the carriage of wheat or other products across the water. Would it not be feasible for the Government to commandeer these vessels in order to bring some relief to the producers?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is to be borne in mind that when the British Government commandeers vessels it is not commandeering them for commercial purposes. It commandeers for purposes of war alone. It commandeers them to do what is necessary, in order to carry munitions, provisions, troops and so on. The British Government has not commandeered a single punt in order to carry on commercial business. In fact it is not a parallel case. I am not able to say what compensation is given by Great Britain on vessels commandeered for war purposes. I know that Great Britain pays generously for every vessel commandeered. But I should be surprised if, when Great Britain commandeers vessels and uses them, she is not paying very close up to the rate of freight prevailing at the time the commandeering is done. I agree absolutely with the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that there is not at the present time a combination of shipowners which causes this condition of high rates. Whatever there

may have been amongst shipping companies before the war, the war has cut in like a sledge hammer and knocked them hither and yon and there is no possibility, to my mind, and I think there is no indication of anything like a shipping combine which forces the hand of the Government. Let us take the cases of two of the largest companies. Of the vessels owned by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, nearly 80 per cent have gone out from the possession of that company and have been commandeered by and are used by the British Government. Of the vessels owned by the Elder Dempster Company, another widely established owning company, 75 per cent or more have been requisitioned by the British Government. Then no British vessel to-day can trade without license from the Board of Trade, so that the British Government has its hands upon—but for war purposes—the British commercial marine. My hon. friend from Guysborough spoke of Canada not allowing the British Government to commandeer Canadian ships. Well, when war is on and Great Britain wants a ship, so far as I am concerned, she shall have it. I am not going to stand up for one single half minute when the British Government say necessity calls, when the troops need food and fodder, and cavil as to rights or anything of that kind. I may say first, that when vessels from our merchant mercantile marine have been commandeered by the British Government, it has always been after negotiations and communications between the two Governments. But I hope the day will be distant when we shall, any of us, want to prevent the taking of a vessel. When the vessel is necessary the commandeering has got to be done.

Another thing: a man gets up in this House and raises a hullabaloo because somebody has cut his letter open when he should not have done it, under a censorship which has been asked from us for Imperial war purposes by the British Government; another man raises another hullabaloo because there is not a vessel at a certain point to carry what he wants carried. I should like to put the words of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) right before every one who raises that kind of a row, namely that the first thing to do is to carry this war to successful conclusion. And if it is necessary, in order to do that, that lobsters, and wheat, asbestos, and pulp paper have got to stay and wait for carriage, let them wait. I think we make a mistake, sometimes, when we criticise the British Government so much in connection with matters of this kind.

Mr. OLIVER: I am always glad to see evidences of Christian charity in this House, and I am glad to know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is thoroughly satisfied that there is not any combine amongst the ship owners of the Atlantic at the present time, a combination which, if it exists, certainly is a combine the effect of which is to operate against our winning the war. I say I am glad that he is of that opinion; but I regret that it appears to me that the weight of evidence is entirely against him.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Where is the evidence?

Mr. OLIVER: The evidence is an increase of 1,000 per cent in freight rates, which, I think, is all the evidence any of us want that this has come to a point when the shipping interests in the Atlantic are making potential war upon our country. When according to the statements made by the minister yesterday, our wheat needed in England just as we need the money, has been tied up in our country, when it is impossible to get it across the Atlantic, even at the stupendous rates that are being paid. This is a condition that is of tremendous danger to the Empire and to the winning of the war, and we must not ignore it; at least we are not doing justice to ourselves or to the cause in which we are engaged if we do not realize that, just as the submarines of Germany expect to win the war for their Empires by cutting off the access of wheat to the British Islands, so that agency which, during this past winter, by reason of its high rates and its handling of this business, has kept our wheat from going over, has been aiding the German submarines in their project of starving the British Empire. We must realize the situation as it is, as we have to face it, as we know that our enemies realize it. Their whole hope, ever since they started their submarine campaign in the early part of 1915, has been to starve Great Britain. And I say that that alleged peaceful agency which increases freight rates 1,000 per cent, which fails to meet the needs of transportation, is in effective alliance, whether directly intentionally or not, but in effect it is in alliance with and giving assistance to the German submarines in their effort to starve the United Kingdom.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There may be an effect which is a very strong one and a

very striking one, but that does not carry out the argument or tend to prove the assertion of my hon. friend, that this effect is brought about by a combine. The simple, solitary Norwegian, who boasts his one vessel and has no more idea of what a combine means than a child of five years of age, owning that vessel, and having it, can get the highest rate on the market. He does not have to combine with the monopolist or with the great capitalist. Every man, every small company, every private owner who has a ship—all he has to do is to go on the market and ask where he will go for his load. He will find his load there and he will find his price for it. Everybody knows that he is getting a mighty high rate and making more than normal profits. Nobody is going to say he is not, but there are two things to think of. In the first place, a vast amount of the tonnage that is ploughing the seas and getting these big rates is chartered tonnage. Any one can test the market by going to the market to-morrow and trying to charter a vessel for any particular route and he will find out what he will have to pay. I venture to say that the man who charters that vessel will find that by the time he pays the cost of the charter and the expenses as they are at the present time he is not making any more profit out of the chartered vessel than he would have made in normal times three or four years ago and probably not as much. I expected to have had two or three statements bearing actually on the ship chartering business and I will have them before we get through with the discussion. If there is a man who owns a vessel to-day and keeps it running, that man is making money hand over fist but he makes it because there is a need, a call and because there is a man standing in Australia, in New Zealand, and in every quarter of the world, with his hand open and the money in it holding it out and saying in the face of that freight rate: Come and get this load, here is your money the moment you come. You do not need to have a combine to bring about that condition when you are dealing with the necessities of the world to-day.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1916, between Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie or Campbellton, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the minister give me more particulars of that item?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I want to drop $5,000.

Mr. MARCIL: How much is to be paid?

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: $15,000.

Mr. MARCIL: For a fortnightly trip?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: For two trips a week between Campbellton and Gaspé and return, or between Campbellton and Paspebiac and return.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the name of the steamer?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Elaine.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that a St. John boat?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: St. John or Halifax—Halifax, I think. I beg to move that item No. 79 be reduced by $5,000.

Item as amended agreed to.

Steam service between Sydney, N.S., around the east coast of Cape Breton to Hastings and return to Sydney, via the Bras d'Or lakes, $5,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose you will not object to the member making a few remarks somewhere about this?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We will have one or two supplementary items and there will be an opportunity.

Supervision lake and ocean freight rates, $6,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: With that item passed I reserve one item, which takes in the grain business. I will take that up either to-morrow or next day, and the commandeering business will be discussed on that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Was an attempt made to secure supervision of ocean freights some time ago? I think the Chairman of the Railway Commission visited Europe and had some negotiations. Could the minister tell us what the result of these negotiations was?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The matter was very ably presented by the Chairman of the Railway Commission, and it was discussed between himself, the Board of Trade, and some of the British ministers. The whole subject was, at the request of the British Government, left to the Dominions Royal Commission and the Dominions Royal Commission made that one of the subjects of their inquiry in each country as they passed through. Unfortunately, their labours were interrupted when the war broke out.

Mr. GRAHAM: You were on that?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I was on that. A portion of the work in reference to Can-

ada remains to be done. In the meantime the matter stands there. Under the present war conditions there is no possibility of it being taken up.

Salaries, rent, wages and contingencies under the Canada Grain Act—further amount required, $35,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As the main item on the grain business is retained, there will probably be no objection to passing this. I will explain the whole thing when we come to the main vote. On Thursday I will take up the one remaining item under the Grain Act.

Mr. OLIVER: This item is a supplementary vote for last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: It is a very considerable supplementary. A word from the minister might show us what the reason of the extra expenditure was.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There was a considerably larger amount of grain that had to be inspected, weighed and cared for.

Mr. OLIVER: It was simply increased traffic?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board —contingencies—clerical and other assistance—further amount required, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this supplementary, something that was not anticipated?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes. On account of the war loan we have had to engage a large amount of extra temporary help.

Departments Generally — contingencies—care and cleaning of departmental buildings—further amount required, $10 000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This requires some explanation. The war cannot account for this.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The war is responsible for it in a large measure, because there has been an increased number of buildings occupied by the Government. The total number now occupied is 64. Since last year's Estimates 11 additional buildings have been occupied by the Government. My hon. friend understands that this item largely represents the wages of charmen and charwomen who take care of the additional buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I really think that during the war, when so many civil servants are leaving the departments and going to the front, it ought to have been possible to get along without any additional buildings. With the exercise of reasonable economy I think that would have been possible. I can understand that in times of peace, when the country is prosperous, the Government might like to give the civil servants as much room as possible, perhaps to save the necessity of two clerks occuping one room giving each a separate apartment. But why it should be necessary, during this period of stress, to rent 11 additional buildings I am at a loss to understand. I think on reflection the minister must see that the desire to rent buildings from friends who may have had them to rent has been more potent with the Government than the necessity for increased accommodation.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend. As I pointed out the other night, the war has cast additional burdens upon almost all departments of the Government, and it has been necessary to provide additional space. The staffs of many departments have necessarily been greatly increased.

Mr. GRAHAM: What wages do you pay these poor women?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: One of my first official acts was to raise their pay from 75 cents to $1 for a portion of a day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A good idea.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend would be surprised at the number we have on the waiting list. There are many people interested in securing work for these poor women for a portion of a day. It is rather lowly service, but it is worthy—

Mr. GRAHAM: And clean.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Clean in the moral sense, and in the physical sense, too. They are very worthy women. It seems an anomaly this item should be
10 p.m. under the Finance Department, but I am told it was placed there to avoid the possibility of patronage.

Mr. GRAHAM: The information given you could not have been well founded.

Miscellaneous—to provide for the expenses of commission to prepare plans relating to the cities of Ottawa and Hull—further amount required, $2,800.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has any definite action been taken following the commission's report on the making of Ottawa and Hull into

a federal district, somewhat on the line of Washington?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is aware that an honorary commission was constituted for the purpose of preparing plans for the beautification and improvement of the cities of Ottawa and Hull. The members of the commission were Sir Herbert Holt, Sir Alexander Lacoste, Mr. Frank Darling, Mr. Home Smith, and the mayors of Ottawa and Hull. They did a great deal of work themselves, especially Mr. Darling, and engaged architects and engineers, and consulted town planners in the United States. After giving the work a great deal of care and attention they presented their report, which I am happy to say has, so far as I can learn, met with the general approval of the cities of Ottawa and Hull. The report is very comprehensive, and its object is to devise a scheme by which the two municipalities and the Dominion Government, the railways and the public utility companies, may all work together looking to a greater Ottawa and Hull in the future, as the federal capital of Canada. My hon. friend asks what action has been taken. The report has only been recently received. The drawings are on exhibition, and if my hon. friend has not already seen them I would suggest that he take the opportunity, because I am sure he will find them very interesting indeed. After the session is over it is my intention to look into this report very carefully, and go over the ground. My hon. friend is no doubt aware that a committee has been appointed by the city of Ottawa for the purpose of interviewing the Government with a view to giving consideration to the plans. Some large questions were raised in the report, notably the federal administration of the Ottawa district. That is a matter which would have to receive very careful consideration, not only by the Government, but by the other bodies interested. I am unable to say anything further except that I am gratified at the way in which the report has been received, and I am satisfied that if all parties will work together we shall, in the years to come, have a capital which will be a credit, in an artistic sense, to the Dominion. A great deal has been done in the planning of various cities throughout the world, Washington being a conspicuous example of what can be done by working to a plan. In Abraham Lincoln's time Washington was a very insignificant city indeed, but to-day it is one of the most striking cities in the world.

Mr. GRAHAM: And one of the cleanest.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Washington, of course, has a better administration and Washington also had the advantage many years ago of a town planner or architect, and the result is the Washington of to-day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And he was a good Frenchman, too.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I spoke of the artistic nature of the plans, and I do not know from whom we would be more likely to obtain artistic plans than from a distinguished representative of the race to which my hon. friend belongs. However, this is a start which has been made by the Government getting a plan to which all parties can work, and I think the result will be good. Personally, I desire to give the matter a great deal of attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As a resident of Ottawa, I am pleased to hear that my hon. friend will take some interest in this town planning movement. I have glanced at the report published a few weeks ago and I had occasion to discuss this exhaustive report and plan with one of the leading authorities in the United States who was in Chicago a few weeks ago as one of the guests of the Railway Engineering Association, Mr. Brunner, an architect of the city of New York, and one of the leaders in the movement for town planning in the United States. At present he is engaged in the town planning movement at Cleveland. Mr. Brunner, who by the way delivered on that evening a very able address on the relative position of engineers and architects, told me that in his judgment that report was a most remarkable one and that the Government had been very fortunate in securing the services of the gentleman who made the plans.

The allusion I made a moment ago to the engineer who made the plan for the city of Washington came to my mind because we have had lately in Montreal a very distinguished French bishop, Monseigneur L'Enfant, who has preached for several Sundays at Notre Dame church. He is a descendant of Colonel L'Enfant, who at the time of the Revolutionary period settled in the United States. He had come with Rochambeau and Lafayette, and he was selected by the authorities of the new republic to lay out a plan for Washington.

He made the plan; it was accepted, but unfortunately he died very poor. He never received a cent for the work that he did for the Republic, although he might have benefited by the expropriations.

Coming back to Ottawa, I may say to my hon. friend that although the plan of the commission is not yet accepted as decisive and final, it is to be expected that it will be finally accepted. My hon. friend and the Government should insist that the municipal authorities at Ottawa should respect the suggestions which are made in that report. I brought to the attention of the House the other day the question of the height of the new buildings in Ottawa. In the report it is recommended that the buildings should not exceed 110 feet in height, and to please a very enterprising gentleman of this city, the city council or the board of control a few weeks ago altered a resolution which had been adopted a few months before following on the lines of the report that the height of the buildings should not exceed 110 feet, and gave permission to that enterprising citizen to build to a height of 130 feet. Since then I notice that the building license has been withdrawn and that the city council will not allow any permit to be given for buildings exceeding the height suggested in the report. The Government, however, should have an understanding with the city of Ottawa that the general features of the plan be accepted as final by the city although the Government is not ready to take action on the report. On the whole, I think the Government are to be congratulated on having obtained such an excellent report on what is destined to be the model capital of a great Dominion.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose then the Government is not considering the suggestion made to them some months ago that the capital might be removed to Winnipeg?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have not had the matter under serious consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister pardon me if I propose here to ask a question which perhaps would not be raised if this were the only amount in the Supplementary Estimates? I find that the Supplementary Estimates amount to the very considerable sum of $4,485,537. The minister will remember that in his Budget speech he stated that while the Main Estimates showed a proposed expenditure of $189,000,000, yet in making provision for the coming year he thought that the expenditure would not be over about $160,000,000. I may say to my hon. friend, who was not in the House when I was speaking on the matter, that I took occasion to call the attention of different ministers whose Estimates were under consideration to the assurance which had been given by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and I was not able to ascertain from any minister except the Minister of Public Works that there would be any substantial reduction in the Estimates of the various departments, and the reduction which the Minister of Public Works stated he would be able to make amounted to only $10,000,000. There is a great difference between $10,000,000 and $29,000,000. The Minister of Finance might now, as we are getting near the end of the session, desire to put himself right with the country by telling us how the other $19,000,000 was accounted for.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not admit the necessity of putting myself right with the country, because I think I am usually in that happy position. I may say to my hon. friend that upon three separate occasions when he was absent from the House, I took up the matter to which he has drawn attention, namely, the difference between the estimated expenditure for the coming year and the Estimates, and I pointed out that there were always lapses in connection with Estimates varying from 5 to 20 per cent, and I gave instances to show that during the years of the late Administration it was a usual occurrence to have five, ten, or fifteen million dollars of Estimates unexpended at the end of the fiscal year. For example, when the present Government took office in 1911, the Estimates amounted to about $158,000,000, but the expenditure for the year was only $135,000,000, a difference of $23,000,000. My hon. friend might say: Why were the Estimates so large if your expenditures were only $135,000,000? One reason was that the Supplementary Estimates were very large. At that time they were looking for an election.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does that occount for these?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will not say that. If my hon. friend will look at the Estimates and expenditures for the previous year, and the year before that, he will find a similar condition of affairs, but

not quite such a disparity. My hon. friend, in dealing with the question, said that the Estimates amounted to $189,000,000 and that I estimated the expenditure at $160,000,000, and he asked: Where does the $29,000,000 come in? He assumed, of course inaccurately, that the $29,000,000 represents items that will not be gone on with at all. My hon. friend knows very well that lapses occur. There will be in the Estimates many items that will not be gone on with, but in many cases the work will be gone on with, but the amounts that stand opposite those items in the Estimates will not be completely expended. The result will be that $160,000,000 will be approximately the expenditure for the coming year I desire to put this before my hon. friend because I hold strong views as to what the Government will do in the way of retrenchment in time of war. When this war broke out, I was very glad that we were handling a large programme of public works, because there was a very serious dislocation of business, and when there is a serious dislocation of business it is a great advantage in preventing unemployment that there should be a fair programme of public works under way. That was the condition and therefore we refrained at the outbreak of the war from discontinuing expenditure upon public works. I think that was a proper policy at the time; but during this year and so far as I can see for the year that is to come, because the end of this war is certainly not yet in sight, there will be practically no unemployment in Canada. On the other hand there is a demand for labour skilled and unskilled and that demand is likely to increase. The public expenditures in connection with the war are large, and therefore there is not the necessity for public expenditures in the interest of employment. When I say public expenditures, I mean, of course, useful public expenditures. Therefore the policy which has been laid down by the Government and to which I have referred in the last two Budget speeches is, that while we should go on with works that are under contract, we should not proceed with new works unless such new works are indispensable in the public interest. In a country such as this there are always works which are necessary in the public interest. For example, take the elevators to which my hon. friend sometimes refers. In connection with the grain business, the movement and the storage of the grain, expenditures have to be made for elevator accommodation. Expenditures have to be made on the Intercolonial for rolling stock and expenditures have to be made at various points in Canada for purposes more or less immediately connected with the war. Those expenditures we are making, but a number of expenditures which will be made for public works in times of peace are not being made during the war. There are many items in the Estimates which have been voted—some of them for two years—that will stand in abeyance in the meantime. If the war should come to an end, and if the financial situation and the economic conditions were such that we should feel justified and warranted in proceeding with those expenditures, why, of course, I think it would be proper for us to do so, but as I have stated they will stand in abeyance in the meantime.

Just to show in a word the position for the coming year, because it is a matter which daily engages my attention, I being more intimately connected with the question of providing money than any other, I may say that whereas two years ago, that is to say for the fiscal year, 1914-15, our expenditures were about $187,000,000, for the coming year our expenditures will be $160,000,000, as my hon. friend has stated. There is a difference there of some $27,000,000. But included in the expenditures for the coming year is a very large item representing interest on our increased debt. Two years ago the interest charges upon the debt of Canada were about $14,000,000 or $15,000,000, but this year's Estimates include an item for interest of $37,000,000, a difference of some $23,000,000. Then there will be the outlay for pensions. When my hon. friend takes into consideration the fact that the $160,000,000 includes some $25,000,000 of expenditure necessitated by increase in the public debt and by expenditures on pension account, he will see that the comparison is really between $135,000,000 of expenditure for the coming year and $187,000,000 for two years ago. I may say that that $135,000,000 is about the same as the expenditure for 1911, notwithstanding that our trade this year is the greatest by far in the history of Canada, amounting to some $1,400,000,000. So, I think it goes without saying that the Government is exercising every possible economy. We realize the burden of the war and that that burden will increase—that it will be heavier six months hence than it is to-day, and probably heavier next year than this year. Therefore we are

on common ground in desiring to keep down our expenditures. But it has seemed to me unwise for us (as I stated, my hon. friend not being in the House at the time) to discontinue work upon, let us say, the Quebec bridge. There would, of course, be great loss in connection with such a structure partially completed, and the plant is on the spot. Then, the Welland canal work is under contract. The general estimates are less this year than last, and we are doing all we can to keep down expenditures. But I do not think it would command public approval if we were to discontinue expenditure on such works as I have mentioned. In the same way the National Transcontinental railway had to be completed, otherwise there would have been great loss. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) frequently brings to attention the necessities of St. John, in which he is interested. I have always observed that he is a great advocate of economy in the abstract, but when it comes to the concrete he will always bring before the House expenditures which he thinks ought to be made. Now, with regard to the Supplementary Estimates for 1915-16 to which we have called attention, they are very moderate, $4,485,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Can the minister give us any idea how much the Supplementary Estimates for next year will be?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot say offhand, but I think they are comparatively small because we are pursuing the policy I have indicated. In connection with the Supplementary Estimates for 1915-16, now before us, my hon. friend will observe that there are several large items. For instance, there is the relief for seed grain, $1,550,000. That has already been provided for by Governor General's warrants, and this Estimate is not strictly or legally necessary, because a Governor General's warrant is a perfectly legitimate means of providing funds. But I thought it well—and it is an innovation—to include in the Estimates amounts raised by Governor General's warrants in order that the House may have before it the total expenditures made. Then we have a further item for working expenses of the Intercolonial amounting to $1,500,000. The scope of the operations of the Intercolonial has been largely increased by the war. On the other side of the Intercolonial account will be found a very gratifying increase in earnings, in fact I have been surprised and much gratified that the earnings have been so large within the last year or so. So, this amount is by no means wasted but is a necessary expenditure in connection with the Government road. Having regard to all the considerations I have mentioned, I am sure that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), with his usual fair-mindedness, will agree that he has been entirely mistaken as to the Government pursuing a policy that even savours of extravagance, and that we have exercised the most rigid economy since the outbreak of the war. The hon. gentleman himself has been a Minister of Public Works, and looking over the Estimates that he presented to the House in the past, as I have done, I have never found any evidence of that economical spirit which he now exhibits from time to time. But I do not charge that against him, for this is war time and I quite agree with what I conceive to be his view, that in war time, so far as the ordinary expenditures of the country are concerned, it is the duty of the Government to exercise all possible economy consistently with carrying on the business of the country. But there is a point beyond which if you carry economy you become parsimonious and the public interest undoubtedly suffers. There is another feature which I touched upon on one or two occasions in the House, and it is this:

It must not be assumed that while the war is on, the expenditures of departments of Government other than the Militia Department, which, of course, is immediately concerned with the war, will if an economical policy is observed, be necessarily less than they would be in times of peace. My experience has been that in nearly all departments since the war broke out there is an added burden by reason of the war. Take the Customs Department, for example. In connection with the collection of revenue and with the embargo upon various classes of goods and commodities much additional work is entailed. A great deal of additional work has been thrown upon the Commissioner of Customs; I was talking to him about it yesterday. In other departments, my own, for example, the work has increased very greatly and the expenditure has increased correspondingly. Men are working day and night at the same salary that they received before—working uncomplainingly and zealously in the interests of the department, of the Government and of the country at this time. Nearly all the

staffs are increased. We have endeavoured, so far as we have been able to do so consistently with proper administration of the public business, to cut down our ordinary and capital expenditures since the outbreak of the war.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The reference which the Minister of Finance has made to the necessity for building elevators to give accommodation for grain even during war times is an unfortunate one. It happens that in connection with the whole system of Government railways there is only one small elevator with a capacity of 750,000 bushels, and this Government apparently has given no thought to the matter of providing increased storage accommodation in connection with the Intercolonial railway or the Transcontinental railway, which the Government is operating. At the port of St. John, one of the two chief winter ports of Canada, where the grain elevator formerly operated in connection with the Intercolonial railway was burned down some two years ago, no step has been taken to build a new elevator. I say that this reference of my hon. friend was unfortunate, because his colleague the Acting Minister of Railways rather sought to make the excuse that while the war is on he did not think it desirable to rebuild the elevator, though he said that as soon as possible after the war is over steps would be taken to that end. My hon. friend says that in the year 1911, during part of which the Liberal Government was in power, the actual expenditure was $135,000,000. That included, he says very truly, all the expenditures in connection with the items that were contained in the Supplementary Estimates of that year, which were, as he says, pretty large, as well as those in the main Estimates.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think my hon. friend misunderstood me. I did not say that the $135,000,000 included the items in the Estimates. I said that the Estimates, including the Supplementaries, were $158,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And the expenditure was $135,000,000. My hon. friend said that the total Estimates, main and supplementary, amounted to $158,000,000, while the actual expenditure was $135,000,000. These were times of peace, plenty and prosperity. This Government came into power towards the middle of that fiscal year, when prosperity was abounding in the country. The reflex action had not taken place. There was every reason why the Government should go on with all necessary public works. For the coming year, notwithstanding the dreadful condition of distress which prevails throughout this country, affecting practically all classes of people except those engaged in the manufacture of munitions of war, this Government comes down with main Estimates to the amount of $189,000,000, or $53,000,000 more than was expended out of main and supplementary Estimates in 1911. That is an enormous increase; it is double the total revenues of Canada at the time of Confederation. The minister has not come down with his supplementaries; he says they will be comparatively small. If he means that relatively to the Estimates of this year, they will be comparatively small, certainly they will run up to quite a number of millions of dollars, and to the $189,000,000 would have to be added the total amount contained in the supplementary Estimates. I am a little suspicious, if the minister will pardon my saying so, when the minister cannot tell us what his Supplementary Estimates for the current year will be. He must have given them very careful consideration by this time, because if it had not been for certain unexpected disclosures and for certain demands by various railway companies, prorogation would probably have taken place before Easter. When the minister at this late date in the session cannot tell what the Supplementary Estimates will amount to, it gives rise to the suspicion that they will be considerably larger than he would like to let the committee know at this time. The hon. gentleman spoke of myself when I was Minister of Public Works; he is not able to see, in looking back over the Estimates, that I was very economical. At that time my hon. friend belonged to a party that was economical; therefore he would view my Estimates through the glasses of economy. But if he would look at them to-day he would find them very economical as compared with the expenditures of his colleague, the present Minister of Public Works. The total expenditures of the Department of Public Works during the last three years of the late Government were only about $37,000,000 as against a little over $80,000,000 during the first three years that the present Minister of Public Works had full charge of that department. What does the minister think of that? He says that I was very extravagant. What does he think of the action of the present Government in expending in the Department of Public Works during a certain period two

and a half times as much as was expended during a similar period when I had the honour of having charge of the department? My hon. friend says that this Government has not gone on and made any great increases in expenditures, notwithstanding the fact that the trade of Canada amounted to $1,400,000,000. Does the minister put the enormous amount of that trade forward as a reason why the Government would have been justified in going on with great expenditures, just as if these were glorious times of peace and as if that trade was the result of peaceful development of the country? Surely not. Does not the minister know that the enormous trade of $1,400,000,000 is the result of war conditions? Does he not know that it is the result of the enormous demand for clothing, provisions, and all kinds of supplies needed at the front? Does he not know that included in that are the supplies sent forward by this Government to supply our own men? That they all go in and fill up the total amount of the trade of this country? Does he not know that all the money that comes in in payment for the manufacture of many of these war supplies and so on, not only for our own men but for the Allies, goes to swell up the imports, and that these altogether make up this $1,400,000,000 ? Much of that trade results from unfortunate circumstances of which no Government ought to be proud, and by which no Government ought to be made happy. Yet the minister at times cannot help boasting of this enormous increase of trade, and he takes it as an evidence of proper and legitimate and desirable prosperity on the part of the people of this country. That very condition, the fact that we are sending away, for the use of our men at the front, these vast quantities of goods, ought to be an incentive to greater economy. The fact that we have before us the evidence of the ravages which this war is making, not only upon the Allies but upon Canada, the way in which it is sapping the energies and taking away the prosperity of the people, ought to make us more economical than if there was no war. I hope the minister will not talk any more about the economy of this Government. Think, with 8,000,000 of people this Government is coming down with a proposed expenditure of $189,000,000! I have asked the minister how he accounted for the $29,000,000 difference. We have asked every minister whose Estimates have been before us, even the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, and with one accord, with one voice, they all, in effect, said that the Minister of Finance did not know what he was talking about, that they were going to expend practically every dollar contained in the Estimates of their different departments. That is why I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that he is $19,000,000 out of the way, according to the evidence which we have before us from the various ministers whose Estimates have been discussed. The only minister who gave us the slightest aid, who sought to bolster up the credit or reliability of the Minister of Finance, was the Minister of Public Works, and to the extent of $10,000,000 he acted like a man, he stood right at the back of the Minister of Finance. But every other minister went back on him with the exception of the Minister of Marine, who threw off about $5,000.

Royal Mint—further amount required, $13,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Royal Mint has had a great deal of additional work thrown on it this year for the Imperial Government. I am not at liberty to give details, but of course any expenditure which we make will be returned in the charges which are made by the Mint for their services.

Unforeseen expenses, expenditure thereof to be under Order in Council, and a detailed statement to be laid before Parliament within fifteen days of next session, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do we get that statement always?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, within fifteen days after the opening of each session a statement of the unforeseen expenditure item is laid on the table.

Grant to the National Battlefields Commission—

(a) For expenses of administration, $7,200.
(b) For maintenance of the National Battlefields Park, $26,560.
(c) For maintenance of Martello tower No. 4, $400.

Mr. GRAHAM: Could the minister tell us anything about that Battlefields Commission? My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition takes a great deal of interest in it and usually asks a series of questions about it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This year I asked them to confine their expenditure practically to maintenance. There is really no new work being carried on. They have cut down their Estimate.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is an increase of $11,560 over last year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There was another item in last year. Their Estimate is undoubtedly cut down. It ran as high as $100,000. The total amount for this year is about $37,000. There must be some item left out, or not embraced in a, b and c, because, as I have said, they are keeping their expenditure down to a maintenance basis. When the war broke out I asked them to go slow on that work.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But you have an increase of $11,560.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is some item that is not mentioned in the Estimates for this year. But if my hon. friend is interested especially in the matter I will be glad to allow the item to stand and get a full explanation. It is much less than last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to have it stand that the leader of the Opposition may have a chance to say something in regard to it. He may not want to make any comments on it, but he takes a deep interest in it, and it is one of the items that he probably will have something to say upon. I will call his attention to it in the morning, and if he does not wish to have any discussion upon it I will tell my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) and he can bring it up and put it through.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Very good.

Grant to the Medical Council of Canada, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How is that expended?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is paid over to, and expended for the purposes of, the Council. This grant dates back two or three years. At that time they were considering the matter of a uniform qualification for physicians throughout Canada. I made inquiry and I found that it is entirely required for the purposes of the Council. There may come a time when it will not be required, or when so much will not be required, but it seems to be necessary now.

Contribution to aid in carrying on the work of the Astronomical Society of Canada, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think that might very well be dropped this year. It is not large, but what is the urgency of it during war time?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend has nothing of the Philistine in him, and, after all, we must continue to assist some of these societies. It is a very small grant and for a very worthy object.

Royal Academy of Arts, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How is this expended?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: By the Academy for the promotion of its objects. It is the annual grant which has been made for years past.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where are the headquarters of the Academy?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think in Montreal, but if my hon. friend is interested I will allow the matter to stand and get full information.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I might tell my hon. friend why I am interested. I find here a great many items of a miscellaneous character which could all stand over, or all be omitted, without the slightest injury to the public service. I do think that in these war times they ought to be allowed to stand. Take the grant to the Medical Council as an illustration and which amounts to $15,000; the minister cannot tell the committee what is done with that. Surely if that grant is made just to pay the expenses of a meeting they might defer their meeting for one year or until the war is over.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is for examinations.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The medical councils of the different provinces carry on the examinations.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: But this is for the whole Dominion and for all the provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It would not take anything like $15,000 to pay the expenses. Then take these other societies—the Astronomical Society, and the Royal Academy of Arts; these items could stand over without the slightest injury to the public service. They all run up to a large sum. We have to take some action in reference to these items. We may offend somebody by doing so but it is our duty. It is not a matter of $2,000, or $5,000 or $15,000, but it runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars and if the minister would look these items over carefully he can see where a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars can be made. These amounts have nothing to do with public works, they have nothing

to do with ordinary labouring people who need employment but they are largely for scientific and social purposes. They are on a par with the $100,000 which was voted for the Geodetic surveys and which are no more needed to be kept there than a horse requires to have five legs.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Carried.

Mr. PUGSLEY: "Carried," says the minister. No effect on the Minister of Finance at all. Can he not find his way to moving to strike some of these items out?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot believe my hon. friend is serious, because he is an intellectual man and should have sympathy with these scientific objects. It is not only the tangible and material that we should be interested in, but we should not lose interest in science, literature and art even though war is on.

Contribution to McGill University towards the maintenance of a Regional Bureau for Canada, for the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the object of this?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This grant has been in the Estimates for some years. My hon. friend can understand the importance of having these scientific publications properly catalogued.

Grant towards the erection of a monument to Samuel de Champlain at Orillia, Ont., revote $7,500.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This monument has been in the hands of the statuaries for some time, and the $7,500 will be required almost immediately to pay for the work. The item might have stood over had the work not been commenced.

Towards meeting any deficiency arising in connection with the erection of the Champlain monument, Ottawa, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the obligation with respect to this?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This is in connection with the monument at Nepean Point. The Dominion Government made a grant towards that monument, and there were also a number of private subscriptions, but on account of the war a certain number of these subscriptions could not be collected. They were all made in good faith, and would have been paid but for the war. A year ago it looked as if we should have to put in a much larger item than this $3,000, but since then some contributions that were not expected have come in, making the deficit now about $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suppose it goes to the sculptor?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not quite sure, but if it does, it is serving a very worthy purpose, for the sculptor must be paid.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think for the peace, harmony and good-will of the Minister of Finance and his successor, the different bodies that get these grants, small though they be, should send information with respect to them to the Minister of Finance. He is compelled to handle these Estimates in the House, but is afforded little or no information with respect to them. Doubtless when the grants were originally made there were good reasons for them, and the reasons were given. I think the different associations should be asked to send in a memorandum of what they do with the money.

11 p.m.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think there is a good deal in what my hon. friend says. These applications for grants are looked into very carefully by my deputy, and we receive, I suppose, about twice as many applications as appear here. The one that appear in the Estimates are those about which no question arises, the different bodies doing good work and being altogether worthy. I am inclined to think that the information my hon. friend has in mind is in the department, but of course neither I nor any other minister would carry these details in his head, knowing that if any serious question arose about them in committee the information could be obtained from the department.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11.08 p.m.

Thursday, April 27, 1916.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

THE DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. SCHAFFNER moved:

That the first report of the Select Standing Committee on the official report of the Debates, recommending that it be granted leave to sit while the House is in session, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

Mr. SCHAFFNER moved:

That, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the eighth report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, the charge of $200 levied on Bill No. 88, letter X of the Senate, intituled, an Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Bible Society, be refunded.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

VICTORIA TRANSFER COMPANY.

Mr. TURRIFF:

How much was paid to the Victoria Transfer Company, of Victoria, B.C., for services rendered to the various federal departments at that city for the years 1912-13, 1913-14, 1914-15, 1915-16?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

Customs Department:

Year.	Amount.
1912-13	nil.
1913-14	nil.
1914-15	$136
1915-16	91

Marine Department:

Year.	Amount.
1912-13	$ 76 20
1913-14	72 01
1914-15	199 32
1915-16	96 95

Militia and Defence Department:

Year.	Amount.
1912-13	nil.
1913-14	$ 82 80
1914-15	1,183 82
1915-16	1,988 76

Naval Service Department:

Year.	Amount.
1912-13	$331 05
1913-14	473 30
1914-15	330 40
1915-16	112 15

Public Works Department:

Year.	Amount.
1912-13	$ 8 70
1913-14	85 30
1914-15	179 05
1915-16	13 33

Post Office Department:

	Under permanent contract.	Under temporary arrangement.	Total.
1912-13	$903 84	$1,513 50	$2,417 34
1913-14	903 84	2,253 00	3,156 84
1914-15	903 84	1,648 95	2,552 79
1915-16	884 14	1,537 10	2,421 24

The service to the railway stations is performed under permanent contract, service to the different wharves under temporary arrangement. Owing to the frequent changes in the running of the steamers and the consequent irregularity of the service, it is not possible to make permanent contracts for the services between the post office and the wharves.

These services at Victoria have been operated in this manner for over fifteen years.

R. ROBSON BLACK.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Has R. Robson Black been appointed inspector of Cadets in Nova Scotia? If so, at what date?
2. What has been his military experience, his personal or technical qualifications for such position, his rank, and his rate of pay?
3. How much has he been paid for such services since his appointment?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. He has been detailed to perform the duties, temporarily, of Organizer and Inspector of Cadet Corps, Military District No. 6, from the 18th January, 1916.

2. Prov. Lieut. (Supy) 14th Hrs, 24-8-11, G. O. 111-15. (Detailed temp. as O.I.C.C., 6th Div., 28-1-16, M. O. 66-16). Qualifications: Lieutenant, Infantry, M. O. 485-15. Captain, Infantry, M. O. 542-15. Field Officer, Infantry, M. O. 21-16. Pay $5 per diem; allowances, $1 per diem. Total, $6 per diem. This is the ordinary pay of an Inspector of Cadets (see Article 470, P. & A. Regulations, 1914.)

3. To 31st March, $444.

OKANAGAN INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Has a right of way through the Okanagan Indian reserve been purchased by the Canadian Northern Railway Company?
2. If so, what was the price?
3. When was the money paid?
4. To whom was it paid?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes, by the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company.

2. $4,695.15.

3. 28th September, 1914.

4. To the Department of Indian Affairs; $4,219.19 was paid out by the department to individual Indians for improvements on

right of way, and $475.96 was placed to the credit of band funds.

ALLEGED ENLISTMENT OF FOREIGN LABOURERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): I would like to draw the attention of the Government, particularly of the Minister of the Interior, to a rather serious matter in connection with a statement alleged to have been made by the American Consul in Vancouver. I shall read a despatch from Portland, Oregon, that appears in a Vancouver paper, which will explain the situation pretty fully:

Portland, Ore., April 18.—The charge that American labourers are being induced to migrate to Canada on the promise of lucrative employment and then are forced by the pressure of the authorities and of the circumstances by which they find themselves surrounded to enlist in Great Britain's overseas army, is made by the United States Department of Labour Bureau of Immigration in a bulletin which was issued here to-day by the local immigration commissioner.

Quoting from the report of the American consul-general at Vancouver, B.C., the bulletin says:

"Special efforts are being made to induce every foreigner of military age to enlist for the overseas service and it is practically impossible for an American to secure employment in any capacity. Several thousands of Americans have gone from British Columbia to the United States during the past year, a majority of whom went for the reason they were unable to do business or secure employment and some because of the endeavour on the part of the authorities to enlist them for military service."

Then the grossly false and misleading statement is made that thousands of men are idle in Vancouver, and that a propaganda is being carried on in the United States to induce Americans to emigrate to Canada for the ostensible purpose of securing employment, etc. The statement made by this American Consul-General at Vancouver that the Canadian military authorities are using undue pressure to force foreigners to serve in what he calls Britain's overseas army I characterize as absolutely false. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to this statement, and to the indignation of the people, particularly of my own city of Vancouver, in regard to the matter. An editorial appearing in the Vancouver World of April 19, referring to this despatch, is in part as follows:

There is only one course for the citizens of British Columbia to pursue in the case of Mr. Robert E. Mansfield, the American consul here —that is demand his immediate recall.

In asserting that American labourers are being induced to come to Canada on the promise of lucrative employment and are then forced by "pressure of the authorities" to enlist in what he erroneously styles "Great Britain's Overseas Army," the American consul states what is absolutely false, what he must know to be false and what is an insult to every true Canadian. The World yesterday invited Mr. Mansfield to explain his assertion, but he declared he had "nothing to say."

So far from labourers being invited to enter British Columbia, they have been specifically barred out.

The American Consul knows this fact as well as any one. That he should make such a statement as "a propaganda is being carried on through the press and other channels in the United States to induce Americans to migrate to Canada for the ostensible purpose of securing employment", but really in order to be pressed into "Great Britain's Overseas' Army", is so preposterous that it carries its own refutation with it.

The people of Canada—and of British Columbia in particular—are always glad to welcome the official representatives of our great neighbour to the South. Almost without exception they have upheld the traditions of their office and conducted their affairs with fairness and courtesy. It has been left for Mr. Mansfield to asperse this country and to misrepresent conditions here in the most glaring fashion. His recall will be the best solution of the very painful situation in which he has placed himself.

I wish to bring this matter to the attention of the Government and to ask if any steps have been taken, or any representations made to the Government at Washington with a view to securing a correction of these statements, which are grossly misleading and libellous, so far as the province of British Columbia is concerned, and, I believe, are wilfully and maliciously false.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, this matter was brought to my personal attention for the first time yesterday, owing to an article that, I believe, appeared first in the Chicago Tribune as the result of an interview with the United States Immigration Commissioner in that city, based upon a circular which he states he received from Washington to the effect indicated by the hon. member for Vancouver. Immediately on hearing of this article the Superintendent of Immigration communicated with our immigration agent at Vancouver, and asked him to interview the United States Consul General in Vancouver as to the accuracy of the statements attributed to him. He did so, and the United States Consul General in Vancouver refused to either confirm or deny the statements until he saw the particular specified articles based on the statements attributed to him. Since that time our agent has been more than once communicated with, and asked to again interview the Consul General in Van-

couver, and to obtain his confirmation or denial. The statements contained in the article are certainly not warranted by the facts, or by the conditions in the province of British Columbia. We have communicated, also, with the United States Immigration Commissioner in Montreal, who does not at all agree with such articles, and has communicated his views on the matter to his Government at Washington. I understand that a circular was sent out from Washington, said to be based upon reports made by the Consul General located at Vancouver, but as far as unemployment is concerned in British Columbia and Vancouver, our reports are to the effect that comparatively little unemployment existed there. During January and February, which would be the most likely months, in the midst of winter, for unemployment to prevail, only 285 individuals had applied to the city for relief. This is not more than a normal number during any winter in normal times, in a city the size of Vancouver. I should be very sorry, indeed, to think that the consul representing the United States in Vancouver would be the author of these misrepresentations, and it is only right to afford him a final opportunity of denying or confirming the statements, which, no doubt, by this time have been placed before him. We have had a great demand in western Canada, as well as in eastern Canada, for farm labourers, and the propaganda we have been carrying on in the United States in order to secure these men has been twisted and distorted by interested parties in the United States, to prevent their people from migrating to Canada, warning them that if they came to this country they would most likely be subject to conscription, and might be pressed into the army for war purposes. Such are the representations we have had to contend against in the United States for some time past. However, in a day or so, probably to-morrow, we shall have fuller information on the subject. In the meantime we are endeavouring to correct this erroneous impression.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. GRAHAM: During the debate on the Quebec and Saguenay railway the other evening, in an aside remark which I made, and which evidently did not escape the sharp ears of the press gallery, I referred to the road as the Forget-Choquette railway. To this Senator Choquette takes strong exception, and he assures me that he has no financial interest in the Quebec and Saguenay Railway Company. I make this explanation in justice to him.

BANK LOANS TO FARMERS.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White for the first reading of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 33, to amend the Bank Act:

Mr. GRAHAM: What are these amendments?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Senate has made three amendments of a very minor character. The most important amendment provides that in addition to advertising the sale of the pledged live stock in the newspapers, a notice should also be posted at the post office nearest the place where the sale is to be made. The other amendments are of minor consequence, one of them being to meet the analogy of procedure under the Civil Code. The other is merely a verbal change.

Mr. GRAHAM: I presume that the first amendment, which is to increase the efficiency of the advertising of sale, is of chief importance.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The amendment reads:

> Notice of the time and place of such sale shall appear in a newspaper published in or nearest the place where the sale is to be made, and a notice shall be posted in writing or in print of the time and place of such sale in or at the post office nearest the place where the sale is to be made.

Amendment concurred in

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Subsection 19 of section 2 of the Act provides that the bank shall have authority, in the event of default, to take possession of, seize, and sell the live stock. The words "seize and sell" have been struck out, and the following substituted:

> or seize such live-stock and before or after such taking possession of or seizure, to sell.

I think the change was made at the instance of Senator Beique, who, I understand, is a gentleman of high standing at the Bar, and it is evidently to meet the analogy of procedure under the Civil Code. I see no objection to it.

Amendments concurred in.

BOUNTIES ON ZINC.

Bill No. 94, to provide for the payment of bounties on zinc produced from zinc ores mined in Canada—Sir Thomas White—read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

On section 2—bounty on zinc produced in Canada when price is less than £36 19s. 3d. per ton:

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have an amendment to propose. I move that in line 7, after the word "spelter," the following words be inserted: "in cakes, blocks, or pigs."

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the object of this amendment?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The section under consideration provides that when the standard price of zinc or spelter is less than £36 19s. 3d. per ton of 2,240 pounds, that is to say when the price of zinc is below 8 cents per pound, the bounty shall be payable. There is a difference in the price of zinc or spelter in cakes, blocks, and pigs, and that of zinc in the sheet. It is the intention of this legislation that the price in question should be that of zinc in cakes, blocks, and pigs, and not of zinc in sheet. Sheet zinc is much cheaper than zinc in cakes, blocks, or pigs.

Mr. NESBITT: That is so far as the bounty applies to the minimum price.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes:

Mr. OLIVER: If it is sheet zinc, and the bounty is on zinc, unless it is specifically excluded, it would come under the provision for the bounty.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not quite understand the point my hon. friend is making. The bounty will apply when the price of zinc in cakes, blocks, or pigs falls below 8 cents per pound. Then there is a provision that the zinc or spelter shall contain not more than two per cent of impurities. It must be produced in Canada and the zinc ores must be mined in Canada. The price of zinc in cakes, blocks, or pigs is higher than the price of zinc in sheets, and it is only when the higher price falls below 8 cents per pound that the bounty will apply, and then it is to be paid upon zinc or spelter containing not more than 2 per cent of impurities, and produced in Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: Under this amendment, we do not apply any minimum price to sheet zinc.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We are not dealing with sheet zinc. As I have said, the price of sheet zinc is lower than that of zinc in cakes, blocks, or pigs, and it is when the latter price falls below 8 cents per pound that the bounty is payable. I think the Bill is all right.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not have the Bill before me, but I thought the point should be called to the attention of the minister. If he is satisfied that the words are apt for the purpose, I am perfectly satisfied.

Section, amended as proposed, agreed to.

Bill reported and amendment concurred in.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

To cover unprovided items, 1914-15, as per Auditor General's Report, part B, page 3, 1914-15, $228,664.18.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: When this item was under consideration last evening, the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) asked me to place upon Hansard an explanation of it. My deputy minister has given me this memorandum on the subject:

In the Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ended 31st March, 1916, recently brought down in the House, there is an item: "To cover unprovided items 1914-15 as per Auditor General's Report, Part B, page 3, 1914-15, $228,664.18."

At the end of each fiscal year, when the expenditures under the innumerable appropriations are finally adjusted, it has always been found that here and there throughout the service there have been small over-expenditures. These are all reported in the Auditor General's Report as indicated in the item above, and a sum inserted in the supplementary estimates at the next session to legalize the total amount of these over-expenditures. While in the total appropriations of a department there may be large amounts unexpended, if there is any over-expenditure in a sub-head of the total vote, such over-expenditure is reported by the Auditor General.

The total amount of $228,664.18 is made up of amounts from 43 cents upward. In large and varied services these over-expenditures are discovered too late to enable a supplementary estimate to be taken for the year's accounts in which the outlay has been made. For example, in the accounts of 1914-15, which were not closed until long after the session of 1915, it was impossible to get a supplementary estimate at the time the over-expenditure was discovered. Frequently, too, the circumstances change between the taking of an estimate, and the expenditures occur in such a way as to effect the sub-votes to which an outlay is

charged. The unprovided items are all set forth in detail in the Auditor General's Report, as indicated in the vote in the Supplementary Estimates.

With this explanation the item might be allowed to pass.

Grant to the National Battlefields Commission, $34,160.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member for South Renfrew asked that this item be allowed to stand until to-day. I pointed out last night that provision had been made for maintenance only. A question was asked, I think by the hon. member for St. John, as to why there was an increase in this item. I might point out that the Estimates for 1915-16 included an item of $100,000 to be expended in laying out and constructing a park on the battlefields of Quebec, and other items covering expenses of administration, and maintenance of the Battlefields park and of the Martello tower. This year, on account of the burden of the war and the desire to keep expenses within bounds, we have asked the Battlefields Commission to curtail their expenses as much as is reasonably possible, and as a result we have the estimate contained in this item. It is not the intention of the commission, I understand, to acquire new property during the coming year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This commission has done excellent work so far, and work of extreme importance towards preserving the history of the Plains of Abraham. Every stranger coming to Quebec inquires where Wolfe's army landed, and where the battle took place. At present it is impossible to get access to the spot where Wolfe's army landed, because you have to go through private property belonging now to Les Dames de la Congregation. I know that the commission has it in mind to acquire a piece of property on which to construct a road along the cliff up to Wolfe's Cove, where the troops landed and climbed up to the Plains. Of course this will cost money, but not very much, and although we must economize in those times, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the longer we postpone acquiring this property, the more we may have to pay for it. I hope my hon. friend will place in his next Estimates the small sum necessary to acquire that land.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am very glad indeed to have the benefit of the views of my right hon. friend, and I shall be very glad to give the matter my attention. After all, a few thousand dollars is neither here nor there in Dominion finance, and I am entirely in sympathy with having the work completed. As my right hon. friend says, the place to which he has referred is historic, and there is no desire on my part to curtail the work of the commission. On the contrary I have supported them ever since I have been minister, and our relations have been entirely satisfactory. I had the opportunity some time ago of going over the work, and I was very much impressed with what had been done. I shall be very glad to see whether we cannot act upon my right hon. friend's representations.

Public Works—Cow bay (Port Morien)—repairs to breakwater, $2,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would just like to say this, for fear that the minister may take our silence as a consent to the passing of all these Estimates, that I and others upon this side of the House have stated our objection, and I do not think it is necessary further to press the objection to these items, but I will give notice that when the resolutions come up for concurrence, there will be a motion moved that the total amount of the Estimates be reduced by $10,000,000. It will save a great deal of time to make that statement.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend has already made a motion for the reduction of the Estimates.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not for the total amount.

Mr. ROGERS: I hope he is not going to press a second one.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My intention is to move one on concurrence.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister contemplate spending all these various amounts or are they put in the Estimates merely for effect?

Mr. ROGERS: Probably my hon. friend was not here the other night when we discussed that particular point.

Mr. MARCIL: I do not want the minister to go over it again; I just want a brief statement.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend will observe that in a number of cases the same amount appears in the three columns and in such cases there is no intention of spending anything. The appropriations were put in before the war broke out and they are allowed to remain.

Mr. MARCIL: I made this remark because I was not here the other night. I regret that as regards my own constituency with a coastline of over 200 miles not a single dollar has been put in the Estimates for repairs or anything else.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not remember my hon. friend asking for anything on behalf of his constituency or suggesting the need of anything.

Mr. MARCIL: Repairs are needed all along the coast.

Mr. ROGERS: I have not heard of them.

East river improvements, $231,000.

Mr. NESBITT: That is a large amount. Is it supposed to complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Porter's lake—boat channel to Three Fathom harbour, $10,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister be good enough to explain the expenditure at Porter's lake?

Mr. ROGERS: This revote of $10,000 is to be employed in the excavation of a boat channel between Three Fathom harbour and Porter's lake, to prevent the overflow of the lake during the freshet season. The work will be 3,300 feet long by 30 feet wide at the bottom, which will be at the elevation of low water, giving a depth of six feet at high water.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the level of the lake the same as the level of the sea? Is the minister certain that all the water will not run off the lake after the channel is cut?

Mr. ROGERS: Porter's lake is a long and narrow sheet of water lying nearly north and south, and situated about the middle of Halifax county, or about fifteen miles east of the provincial capital. It is about seventeen miles in length, from one-quarter to one-half a mile in width, and the water is a good depth for almost its entire extent. The lake discharges directly into the Atlantic through a beach of gravel and sand from a hundred to two hundred feet wide, and up to about thirty years ago this outlet was navigable for schooners drawing about six feet of water, but has become impracticable owing to its gradual filling up by the sand and gravel of the beach under the action of heavy seas. The normal elevation of the lake, while it was discharged freely by the original outlet, was about one foot below high water ordinary spring tide, or five feet above low water ordinary spring tide. Spring tides rise six feet.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does that mean that the minister will have one foot of water after he dredges the channel?

Mr. ROGERS: No, six feet.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does it mean six feet of water at high tide? If five feet runs out after the channel is cut, there will be one foot left.

Mr. ROGERS: We shall have five feet at low tide and eleven feet at high tide.

Mr. TURRIFF: Can the minister state what amount of trade is carried on in that harbour?

Mr. ROGERS: Considerable traffic was done from Porter's lake when the outlet was navigable, and there was an export of timber, cordwood, general farm produce and fish. This has ceased and fine farming lands are lying practically fallow owing to the lack of access to the market.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: Is it intended to go on with this work this season?

Mr. ROGERS: No, not this year.

Mr. CHISHOLM: If I am in order, I desire information with regard to several votes for public works in Nova Scotia. There is a vote of $12,300 for harbour improvements at Tracadie. What is proposed to be done there?

Mr. ROGERS: This is a revote. The money is required for the construction of the following improvements: A block and span wharf with creosoted substructure, 222 feet in length and 16 feet in width, and having a block twenty feet square at the outer end, estimated cost, $4,000; also a breakwater 804 feet in length, in three sections, estimated cost $7,000; also reconstructing the superstructure of the cribwork wharf for a distance of 136 feet, estimated cost $2,600; total, $13,600.

Mr. CHISHOLM: When did this item first appear in the Estimates?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid that I have not that information here. It has been there for some time.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is it the intention of the department to go on with the work during the coming season?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is it intended to go on with the work at Cribbin's Point this season?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Were tenders called for for the work at Breen's Pond last year or in any other year?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Were tenders called for for the work at Delorey's Beach?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That item is not in these Estimates. I observe that the Auditor General's Report shows an expenditure of $1.58 at Breen's Pond and $1.58 at Delorey's Beach, and $31.37 at Tracadie. Of the appropriation for Tracadie $14,268.63 was left unused. As to Delorey's Beach, which the minister will remember, is ancient history, there was $1.58 spent. The minister may recall that there was a by-election in Antigonish some years ago, and before the Estimates were prepared it was announced to the public that an appropriation would be available and the money would be spent.

Mr. SINCLAIR: On whose authority?

Mr. CHISHOLM: On the authority of the secretary, I suppose. The minister was in Winnipeg at the time. One Buskard wrote a letter stating that an appropriation for this work would appear in the Supplementary Estimates. As a matter of fact, the Main Estimates, to say nothing of the Supplementary Estimates, had not even been considered at that time. But the letter was written and was used in the constituency. Why is it that the appropriations for these several works were not used? Why were not the works gone on with?

Mr. ROGERS: These are like a good many other items in the Estimates. Since the outbreak of the war we have been economizing as much as possible. That is the explanation with regard to the last two years at all events. I should have to look up records not at present before me as to the period before the war.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What is the meaning of the expenditure of $31.37 for improvements at Tracadie, also $1.58 for Breen's pond, and $1.58 for Delorey's beach?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the explanation of these small items here, but I shall be glad to have it sent to my hon. friend.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. CHISHOLM: Perhaps I may give the minister the explanation. Tenders were called for before the war broke out, and these amounts, I think, were paid for printing. I asked a question in the House at the beginning of the session, if tenders had been called for, and received an answer in the negative. I think the department is mistaken, as tenders were called for before the war broke out, but, for certain reasons, a contract was not awarded. I think the minister will find that that is the explanation.

Mr. ROGERS: That is not in accordance with the information I have from my deputy. I shall be glad to have the matter looked up. The deputy minister believes he is correct in the statement that no tenders were called for, and that seems to be borne out by the records before me.

Mr. CHISHOLM: These items have been in the Estimates since four years ago. I understand that it is not proposed to go on with any of these works during the coming season?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Nova Scotia—Yarmouth harbour—improvements, $64,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the item for Cole harbour wharf, $8,300. That item has been in the Estimates for five or six years. A wharf at that point, which is intended as a shipping place for vessels carrying cargoes to and from Charlo's cove and Larry's river, as well as Cole harbour, is very much needed by the people of that locality. I have drawn the attention of the minister, and also of his predecessor, to the necessity of building this wharf. Every year since my hon. friend's party has been in power I have inquired about this matter, and I was told on various occasions that the work would be attended to later. They say that the Sultan of Turkey is not very easily moved in the matter of granting reforms. When the young Turks ask for changes in the Government and improvements in the administration they usually get the answer: "Please God, to-morrow." That is the kind of answer I have been getting from the minister, and his predecessor, in connection with this important work. I hope that this item will not remain in the Estimates forever without being spent. It is the only item in my constituency that has appeared in the Estimates for a number of years. I represent

one of the largest fishing counties in the province of Nova Scotia, where improvements on the coast are very much needed. Any improvements that have been carried out, though not great in number, have been of great service. Some works were built by the late Government that have been of considerable advantage to the fishermen on that stormy coast, giving them protection from the sea for their boats and a steamer service to take their products to market. My hon. friend can hardly realize the importance of a small wharf to this district; I am afraid he does not realise what harm he is doing to the progress of that country by not going on with important works of this kind. This is the only item for that county that the minister has been generous enough to retain in the estimates. Most of them were put in before his party came into power, and afterwards were ruthlessly struck out without any explanation and without any promise of doing anything in the future. For some reason this item has remained in the estimates, but the money has never been spent. I know that the minister's department is scarce of money, but small expenditures are made in most of the counties and I would suggest to him that this amount would not be too much to spend to afford facilities to this long line of coast which are so much needed by the fishermen of that locality.

Mr. ROGERS: I understand and appreciate the interest that my hon. friend has in this particular work. From what I know of this district, undoubtedly it is important, according to its size. As an evidence of my appreciation of that, I may say that very shortly. before the outbreak of war we attempted to start this work; we had purchased land with the view of going on immediately. As my hon. friend understands, however, since the outbreak of war we have been very slow in proceeding with any of these works. Perhaps this work is in a little better position than some items in the estimates to the extent that the land has been purchased. We will go on with the work at the earliest possible date.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: Have any steps been taken to acquire land near the wharf at Malignant Cove, in Antigonish county. A petition was sent by the fishermen of that locality to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Department of Marine and Fisheries quite properly said that this matter did not come within the scope of their duties; that it was a matter for the Public Works Department to deal with. A copy of the petition was sent to the Minister of Public Works, and about the 30th of March last I received an acknowledgement of it. What is required is the securing of land along the wharf and breakwater down there so that the fishermen may have a place upon which to haul their boats and dry their nets. The cost would be small, and if the minister could make terms there would be no difficulty in expropriating the land.

Mr. ROGERS: There is no amount in the estimates to provide for the carrying out of such a suggestion as my hon. friend has made, and I have no record of the matter here. If the amount involved is as small as the hon. gentleman states, and if the purchase is as necessary as he thinks it is, I should be glad to see what I can do. My deputy is taking a note of the matter; we will take it up to-morrow.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I think a mistake was made when the wharf or breakwater was built there that sufficient land was not secured at the time. The fishermen are handicapped by reason of the fact that they cannot haul their boats up there; the owner of the land is somewhat disagreeable with them. The acquiring of land for this purpose would not cost more than $100; probably the cost would be less than that.

Mr. ROGERS: We will look into it to-morrow.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In the absence of the hon. member for Pictou I would like to know what progress is being made with the East River dredging. This work, which is of great importance in that locality, seems to be getting along pretty slowly. It started five or six years ago, I think, and is still in progress. Most people think that the time has come when it ought to be completed. I see that there is a vote here for that work; I would like to know whether the work is being carried on and whether it is intended that it should be completed during the present season.

Mr. ROGERS: I feel that we have made very great progress indeed with the East river work. We have come down to the point now that we have called for tenders for the lock gates. This amount which we are asking for will be sufficient to complete the work, and it is going on as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This will complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: This is supposed to complete the work.

Brudenell—wharf reconstruction, $2,000.

Mr. ROGERS: I move that this item be reduced to $500. The work progressed more favourably than was expected, and $500 is all we shall require. This will complete the work.

Mr. HUGHES: This is a re-vote. Was anything spent last year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, we spent $1,500 last year.

Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $14,000.

Mr. HUGHES: A considerable extension was made to the Souris breakwater over a year ago. In what condition is that work at the present time?

Mr. ROGERS: We have no item in the Estimates in connection with it, and therefore I have no detailed information before me. If my hon. friend wishes any information we can supply it to him from the department.

Mr. HUGHES: Is this $14,000 intended to make repairs there?

Mr. ROGERS: This $14,000 would cover all necessary repairs in the harbours and rivers in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HUGHES: Does the minister intend to put anything in the Supplementaries for Souris breakwater?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think so. I do not recollect anything.

Mr. HUGHES: The extension to the breakwater cost about $144,000 and a very short time after its completion a considerable portion of it was carried away by a storm of no unusual violence, which would indicate that there was something wrong. The work is now in such a condition that if it is not attended to serious injury may result and all of the money that has been expended may be lost.

Mr. ROGERS: I recollect that there was a certain amount of difficulty there, but I was under the impression it had been corrected. I shall have it looked up and let my hon. friend know what the facts are.

Mr. HUGHES: I wish to bring to the minister's attention the general condition of affairs in his department in Prince Edward Island. The fact I have pointed out in connection with Souris breakwater is an indication that there is something wrong. When a work of that kind, costing that much, would not stand more than a few weeks or months after completion, there is at least ground for suspicion. We have this condition of affairs, that under the former management there were three men in the minister's department in Charlottetown doing the work, and there are now seven—and there are eight men on the pay roll.

An hon. MEMBER: What does the eighth man do?

Mr. HUGHES: The eighth man is superannuated. He was chief resident engineer at the time of the change of Administration. He was a very capable man and his assistant was also a good man. Why Mr. Hegan, the resident engineer, was removed has always been to some extent a mystery. Mr. Hegan had been in the service for many years; I think he was appointed away back in the '90's, and I presume he had given satisfaction. He had conducted the business of the department in a businesslike way. But his method of doing business was not satisfactory to some people when the change took place, and it was publicly stated by a man who had considerable interest in politics that he would be removed, and he was removed. He was superannuated while still able to do his work. Several appointments were made. The assistant, Mr. Hyndman, who, I think, is a good man, was made chief. Mr. Hegan was removed from office and several additional appointments have since been made, yet the work is not as well done now as in former years, and it is costing a great deal more. For instance, when Mr. Hegan was there he looked after all the dredging done in the province. But the change of Government took place and a superintendent of dredging was appointed.

Mr. ROGERS: We are probably doing a great deal more work there.

Mr. HUGHES: No, you have the same number of dredges and you are not doing the work as well.

Mr. ROGERS: I doubt that.

Mr. HUGHES: There are too many men employed. Mr. McDonald was appointed superintendent of dredging, but there was really no work for him to do. When he came to the office there was no room for

him. Yet to my surprise Mr. McDonald now has an assistant; Mr. O'Brien has been appointed his clerk. Mr. Hegan was doing all the work himself. As a matter of fact, one gentleman in the office, who went to lay off the work for dredge No. 9, at Grand river, laid off the work for the captain of the dredge and staked the ground and put up the beacons; but he put them in the wrong place, and the captain of the dredge was working in the wrong place for some weeks until Mr. Hyndman came down and discovered the mistake. But in the meantime all the work of the dredge had gone for nothing. That is an instance of the work not being as well done as formerly. If the captain, who is an experienced sea captain and who had brought vessels into that harbour on more than one occasion, had been left alone, he, as a practical man, would likely have dredged in the right place, but, of course, having an engineer over him, he had to follow instructions.

Mr. ROGERS: What is the engineer's name?

Mr. HUGHES: There are so many in the office that I don't remember; I think there are seven, all told.

Mr. ROGERS: I think there are only three in the office.

Mr. HUGHES: With regard to the breakwater at Souris, of which I have spoken, it is a serious matter that a work of that kind should break away shortly after completion. There was surely some fault connected with the construction. My impression is that there are so many men employed, and so few who are efficient that the work is not properly done.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I wish to correct my hon. friend. He has stated that there are seven men in the office, seven or eight, I think he said. I know for a fact that there are only three men in the office. When he exaggerates to that extent with respect to one small item I am afraid we cannot give very much weight to his other statements.

Mr. HUGHES: I must put my hon. friend right. On the 12th April I asked this question:

> How many men are employed by the Public Works Department in Charlottetown, P.E.I.
> What are the names of the men so employed, what positions do they fill, and what salary does each receive?
> What is date of each man's appointment?

And this was the answer:

> W. E. Hyndman, district engineer; R. H. Nicholson, sr., assistant engineer; H. E. Miller, clerk; J. C. Milford, draughtsman; John White, general foreman; John N. McDonald, inspector of dredges; and William O'Brien, clerk.

That makes seven, so that my hon. friend who is right beside the office is not well informed. Either he has given incorrect information to the committee, or the minister gave me an incorrect answer.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: The statement my hon. friend made was that there were eight men in the office. There are only three in the office. There are several outside men. The foreman has always been there, and he is not in the office; he travels through the country. The inspector of dredges, who was appointed about two years ago, has done excellent work. Captain McDonald is as good a man as there is in the Maritime Provinces, or outside of them, and his work has been very satisfactory.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not make any reflection upon Mr. McDonald. I made the statement, which is true, that Mr. Heagan was doing all that work himself under the former Administration, and he did it well. My hon. friend will not say that Mr. Heagan did not attend properly to the work, and he attended to his other work at the same time. Therefore there was no necessity for Mr. McDonald's appointment. Now, Mr. McDonald has an assistant or clerk, a Mr. O'Brien, but I question very much whether the work is as well done as it was formerly, and I have stated my reason for so thinking.

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend much information as to details. I will be glad to take up the question of the breakwater, and to supply the information which he asks for. I do not have it here. In respect to the number of men employed, the list from which my hon. friend read, as presented to the House, is probably a correct list, but my hon. friend behind me (Mr. McLean) is also probably correct in his statement by reason of the fact that the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) included the foreman of the work and some one else who were undoubtedly outside the office. That would account for the difference between them with regard to the number employed.

Mr. HUGHES: The minister is drawing upon his imagination. As a matter of fact, under the former Administration, three men

did the work, and, as a matter of fact, there are seven men doing the work now, while there are eight men on the pay roll.

Mr. ROGERS: They are doing three times the work though.

Mr. KYTE: I did not happen to be present when the Estimates for Nova Scotia harbours were under consideration, and I would ask the Minister of Public Works if he has had any request for improvements on the harbour at Glace Bay?

Mr. ROGERS: We did some dredging there not long ago, but I have no recollection of any request recently, and the deputy has no recollection of any.

Mr. KYTE: I have a letter from a citizen of Glace Bay which, as the minister knows, is a very important centre for shipping coal. It has a large population and has therefore to import large quantities of necessaries throughout the year. At the present time the people there are very much handicapped by the fact that the depth of the water in the harbour does not permit the entrance of vessels even of a very light draught. This gentleman writes me as follows:

I think some eight years ago, the Dominion Government spent about $25,000 on the harbour at Glace Bay. Small as this amount was, it was perhaps sufficient at the time to enable light craft to make their way in and out of the harbour. Since that time, the harbour has been allowed to look after itself, until, at the present time, there is barely eleven feet of water at the entrance. The piers are in the last state of dilapidation, the wood-work in a rotten state, and the ballast between the crib-work has been allowed to wash into the harbour itself. This, mind you, is the condition of a harbour that, within my own recollection, was able to boast of 28 feet of water; and where steamers of 4,000 tons could load coal, I, myself, have seen five steamers at one time in this harbour. To-day, I was speaking to a captain who has a schooner of 150 tons. He says that next year he will be unable to make this harbour. The channel will be so filled up. And what this captain says, all other captains maintain. Not being able to get our produce by water, you can realize how vital the matter becomes.

This should not be a thing of politics. Has the attention of the Government ever been called to it? Has the engineer of the Marine and Fisheries Department ever reported it? Have the Public Works Department engineers inspected the harbour in the past three years? Is it the Government's intention to absolutely abandon the harbour?

I quite understand that the Minister of Public Works has not been able to expend as much money in the Maritime Provinces as heretofore, but I point this out for the purpose of urging him at the earliest possible moment to have a report made by the engineer of his department; and out of the general vote for dredging in the Maritime Provinces I hope the minister will find it convenient to apply a portion towards deepening the harbour so that the people in that community will have the advantage of water communication which will facilitate the transportation of the necessaries they require. As I have said, it is an important port for the shipment of coal, and whereas a few years ago, steamers of 4,000 tons were able to load there, now small schooners are able to enter the harbour only with very great difficulty. I am sure that there is no port in the Maritime Provinces that is more deserving of consideration than the port of Glace bay.

Mr. ROGERS: I am reminded by my hon. friend's reading that letter that this question was up some time ago. The difficulty is that the piers belong to the coal company, and not to the Government, and, of course, the coal company will look after any repairs that may be necessary. I am inclined to think that we have already made some arrangement with regard to dredging. I will let my hon. friend know later on what the facts are.

Mr. KYTE: The fact of the Dominion Coal Company having some interest in the piers did not prevent the late Government from assisting in harbour improvements there. I think the Minister of Public Works might very easily arrive at a similar arrangement with the Dominion Coal Company to improve the harbour facilities.

Mr. ROGERS: We are improving the dredging.

Mr. HUGHES: Did the minister get any letter or petition from any parties asking for dredging in Bay Fortune harbour, P.E.I.?

Mr. ROGERS: I have no recollection of any such request.

Mr. HUGHES: I should like to call the minister's attention to the situation at Little Sands. A year or two ago a wharf was built there, and shortly afterwards a storm carried away the inner portion connecting with the shore. The Government left it in that condition for quite a while, and the fishermen using the wharf put planks on it so that they could get their fish ashore, as it was impossible to take a team out until the wharf was repaired. Just a few days before the provincial election word came that the wharf was to be

repaired, and a number of men were engaged and a large quantity of lumber was purchased. The election was held, but all the men engaged were not employed; that was a breach of contract. The effort to repair the wharf synchronized with the holding of the election. When finally the repairs were made the work was not done properly, as it was late in the season, and the money expended was practically lost. The wharf is almost useless now. The foreman is understood to have received word from the department that substantial repairs will be made this spring, but I do not see anything in the Estimates for it.

Mr. ROGERS: If there is such an item it would be in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. HUGHES: The repairs will be made, I suppose?

Mr. ROGERS: I cannot say until I look at the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. HUGHES: You would not leave the wharf unfinished.

Mr. ROGERS: I would not think so.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think the minister has given only a very vague explanation of why more men were put on in the case cited by my hon. friend. The minister did not say how much more work was being done. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island says that they are doing no more work, and that the work is not so good. Be that as it may, the minister engages seven men to do the work that was done by four men four or five years ago, and I presume their total pay will be just about double. And this is done at the very time when we are told to practice economy. It is just this sort of thing that is increasing the expenditure of every department fifty or seventy-five per cent more than it was a few years ago; and there is no more work being done, and less revenue coming in. If some attempt is not made to establish an equilibrium between revenue and expenditure, where are we going to land? This is just one instance of how the Government is increasing the number of its employees. To-day we have some 12,000 more than we had four years ago, and we can see now where they are, scattered all over the country, where they are absolutely unnecessary. Does not my hon. friend think that in these times only four men should be employed to do four men's work. We shall never economize so long as we engage seven men to do four men's work. Unless the Government realize the position the country is going to be in on account of this war, and cut down their expenditures as much as possible, the finances of the country are going to be in worse shape year after year. Here is a concrete case of an increase of seventy-five per cent in the number of employees, and I am sure not a member of this House believes that increase necessary. I urge my hon. friend to see whether he cannot cut down the number of employees to a reasonable figure.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: That statement has been made by the hon. gentleman several times in my hearing. Let me say with regard to my own province that Prince Edward Island exported in 1915 fifty per cent more than it exported in 1905. I have those figures from the transportation company that does most of the business in my province. Do you expect, Mr. Chairman, that the amount of business we are doing to-day can be done by just the same number of men that were employed ten or twenty years ago? Ten or fifteen years ago we had three dredges in Prince Edward Island; they were controlled by men living in St. John, who probably visited Prince Edward Island only once in the season, and the whole business was left to the captains, who did practically as they pleased; they neglected their duties and practically no dredging was done. When this Government came into power I asked the minister to appoint a local inspector of dredges. He appointed Captain John A. McDonald, an expert dredgeman, and now the dredge captains are compelled to do the work; they are not allowed to loaf as they did previously to 1911. The people of Prince Edward Island are better satisfied with the dredging than they have ever been before, and I think the appointment of this inspector was the best move the Government ever made, as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. In fact, it should have been done years ago, because the business was increasing and our harbours and rivers required to be dredged.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This abuse exists not only in Prince Edward Island, but throughout the whole of Canada. The proof was laid before the House in a return that was brought down last year, but the return did not cover the whole period of the present Administration. The Department of Public Works is one of the worst departments in this respect. I am glad that my hon. friend

from Kings P.E.I. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) referred to that case, but it is well to remember that the record is very bad throughout the whole of Canada. From the return I find that, since the present Government came into power up to the date of the return, which I think is dated about eighteen months ago, in the inside service, the number dismissed is four, the number resigned, 24, and the number of new appointments, 124, making an increase of 96; in the outside service, the number dismissed is 507, the number resigned, 701, and the number of new appointments, 1,877, making an increase of 669, a total increase of 765 officers in the department during the present Administration. If you allow these officers a salary of $1,000 a piece, that means a total expenditure of $765,000. It is no wonder, therefore, that the expenditure in the Department of Public Works has increased so enormously during the present Administration. If my hon. friend will refer to the Public Accounts, he will see that during the last year for which the late Administration was responsible, that is the year 1910-11, the total expenditure in the Department of Public Works chargeable to Consolidated Revenue Fund was $8,621,431.25, whereas, during the year 1914-15, the total expenditure was $19,343,532.35, an increase of over $10,000,000, so that the expenditure has been more than doubled. The enormous increase in the number of officials, of course, accounts for a part, but only a part of the increase. When we consider that about three-quarters of a million dollars additional is paid out for the wages of new employees in this department which is not doing nearly so much work as was done formerly, it is certainly an abuse that the minister can scarcely justify.

Mr. ROGERS: I am rather surprised at the statements of my hon. friend in respect to the increase in the number of officials in the Public Works Department. It is true there has been a certain increase, but my hon. friend must bear in mind that during the past four years there has been a great development which has necessitated such increases as have taken place. My hon. friend quotes some figures—I do not know where he gets them.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I get them from the official blue-book published by my hon. friend.

Mr. ROGERS: He quotes the figures probably of the expenditure of the department, which, he says, in 1910-11 amounted to $8,000,000. I have before me only the figures covering the total expenditure in 1911 under the former Government amounting to $14,338,000, and, of course, the expenditure has increased rapidly from that time on until the outbreak of the war since when we have undertaken to reduce the expenditure very largely from year to year. It is true that there is a necessity for an increase in the service. In the inside service at Ottawa we have an additional number of buildings to look after, necessitating the employment of elevator men, etc. As far as the outside service is concerned, the number of public buildings that have been erected in various parts of the country has necessitated the employment of caretakers and others. The additional amount of dredging, etc., that is being carried on has necessitated the employment of extra help. I do not think, however, there is any ground for the statement that there has been any extravagance so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned.

With regard to Prince Edward Island, I may say that we have been doing a great deal of work down there. My hon. friend will agree with me that the building of the Souris breakwater is probably the biggest public work that has been done in Prince Edward Island for a long period of time, and that work has been going on recently necessitating the employment of additional help. We have been doing a good deal of dredging in Prince Edward Island, and, I am sure, a good deal more work than was done under the former Administration, and properly so, because there was a demand for it and a general development such as was common to the rest of Canada, and Prince Edward Island was getting its full share. I am sorry my hon. friend has found reason to complain, because I would not wish to have in my employ any man who was not earning his wages. I will make a close examination of the statement of my hon. friend, and if it is found that we have on the Prince Edward Island pay-list any person who is not earning his wages, I will see that that is corrected. For the moment, however, I have no reason to believe that such is the case, because we are very careful in that regard.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If my hon. friend wishes to know where I got my figures, I may say that I have here a Blue Book called "Consolidated Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1915," printed by J. de L. Taché, Printer to the King's Most Excel-

lent Majesty, 1916. On page 71 he will find a comparative statement of the expenditures on account of Consolidated Revenue Fund for the various years beginning at Confederation and ending at the last fiscal year. In column 6 he will find the figures that I have given.

Mr. ROGERS: I am not disputing the figures given by my hon. friend. I pointed out to him that I had before me only the totals of Consolidated and Capital Fund Expenditures, and that my hon. friend was quoting from the Consolidated Fund Expenditures, which makes a difference.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. minister says that the department is doing more work in Prince Edward Island now than it did some years ago under the late Administration. The hon. minister does not make that statement of his own knowledge, and he is not sure that it is correct. I am pretty confident that it is not correct, and I will look up the works and convince the minister that there was more work done in Prince Edward Island, at all events during the last few years of the late Administration, than is going on at the present time. I am quite satisfied as to that.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to have a statement prepared for my hon. friend just to see who is correct.

Mr. HUGHES: I shall be glad to see it.

Mr. ROGERS: I will ask the department to prepare it.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for Queens (Prince Edward Island) made some statement which at the moment can neither be proved nor disproved, but the accuracy of which can be judged by the fact that the hon. gentleman said that only as many men were employed now as were employed under the old Administration. He did not know the facts until I read out the figures and gave him the names of the men employed now. Then he was convinced that he was wrong.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: I am not convinced that I am wrong.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member has made a statement that reflects very seriously upon the captains employed upon the dredges at the present time, and he has made a statement that is not true in so far as the captains who were employed some years ago are concerned. He says that he suggested the appointment of a superintendent of dredging to keep the captains from loafing, and to see that they did their work properly. That, I think, is quite a reflection upon the men employed at present. I do not think that a superintendent of dredging was needed for that purpose. The men who were doing the work, and who were removed by the present Government, were men of whom no man in Prince Edward Island would say that they loafed, or did their work improperly—I am satisfied the junior member for Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. Nicholson) would not say that of them.

Mr. ROGERS: He did not say that anybody was loafing.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, he made the statement that the superintendent of dredging was appointed to keep the captains of dredges from loafing as they did under the previous Government, or words to that effect. Did not the minister hear that?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. HUGHES: Then his hearing is defective.

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. HUGHES: That is the statement that was made, and if it is not changed it will appear that way in Hansard. The hon. gentleman may not have desired to make that statement; perhaps he made it without thinking of what he was saying. But the statement is not correct; the captains employed under the previous Government were honourable men, who did their work and did it as well as it is being done now. I believe that the captains employed under the present Government do their work well. But there are too many officials appointed. I shall be glad to see the return showing the number appointed and the quantity of work done in Prince Edward Island some years ago and now. I make an application now for dredging in Bay Fortune harbour, during the coming summer. It is very much needed, and will be of great advantage to that place. Will the minister look into that?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not see any mention of that harbour in the Estimates.

Mr. HUGHES: I know that.

Mr. ROGERS: I will look into it.

North lake—boat harbour, $24,000.

Mr. HUGHES: Does the minister intend to spend that money this year?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. HUGHES: Why?

Mr. ROGERS: It is on a par with the other items: they are simply revotes and have to stand until the conclusion of the war.

Mr. HUGHES: Were tenders called for for this work last summer?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: Were they called for in May or in June?

Mr. ROGERS: In June. We had six different tenders, all of which
5 p.m. were too high according to the estimate of the engineer and were not accepted.

Mr. HUGHES: They were below the engineer's estimate I think.

Mr. ROGERS: Apparently one was. But while we intended last spring to carry on certain works, we found that in view of the expenditure for the war it was necessary to cut out other items, and every day economies of this kind were made. This is not any different from others.

Mr. HUGHES: But the war was going on in June last, and was then nearly a year old and our expenditures because of it were increasing. Yet the minister added to the expense by calling for tenders though he did not intend to go on with the work.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, we intended to go on with it then or we would not have called for tenders.

Mr. HUGHES: And then for the sake of $24,000 the minister decided not to go on.

Mr. ROGERS: We had a general rule on the subject, and dropped many others as well as this.

Mr. HUGHES: Did the department drop many others for which tenders had been called?

Mr. ROGERS: Oh, yes. We prepared in the spring a programme of work regarded as necessary to be carried out during the summer, and this improvement was evidently one of those to be undertaken. But some difficulty arose about the title to the property that delayed us, or otherwise it might have been gone on with. The district engineer states that at the time of making the survey the property owners affected by the new opening to be made were asked to sign an agreement relieving the Government of responsibility for any damage that might be caused to their property by the work, and with one exception they refused to sign. So he did not advise going on with the work until some understanding with the property owners was arrived at.

Mr. HUGHES: Yet in the face of that report the minister decided to go on with the work, and so he must have decided to settle that question.

Mr. ROGERS: We were in hopes of having the matter adjusted. But we were ready to take any excuse last year for not going on with work.

Mr. HUGHES: And the expense of calling for tenders will be just that much money lost.

Mr. ROGERS: It may not be lost. We may be able to go on.

Mr. HUGHES: But the minister said that the tenders were too high.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, but I will have to have a report of the engineer on that.

Mr. HUGHES: There is another reason for not going on with the work.

Harbours and rivers—New Brunswick—Bathurst—harbour improvement, $85,000.

Mr. TURGEON: Is it expected that the expenditure of this sum will complete the work of dredging at Bathurst?

Mr. ROGERS: I would not like to give my hon. friend a definite answer. He well knows that the dredging work at Bathurst has been a very important undertaking, and a very large one, in view of the development going on at that point. There have been very pressing demands for increased dredging. We have spent, as my hon. friend knows, a very large sum of money in connection with that work, and are in hopes that this amount will be sufficient to meet the requirements at all events of the present year.

Mr. TURGEON: What is the depth of water at low tide?

Mr. ROGERS: Seventeen feet.

Mr. TURGEON: What is the width of the channel?

Mr. ROGERS: The original plan was 250 feet, but we are doing only about 200 feet at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When were the plans made for this dredging at Bathurst?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not anything here that would show that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I was minister, at the urgent request of the people of Bathhurst and also at the request of the hon. member for Gloucester I had plans prepared for the work of dredging Bathurst Harbour and the work was commenced and carried on during the period that I was minister. Has the work been carried on along the lines of the plans which were prepared at that time?

Mr. ROGERS: The work that we have under consideration was started in 1913, so far as my recollection goes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the nature of that work?

Mr. ROGERS: The dredging of the channel and the work on the outside harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is the same class of work as was going on then?

Mr. ROGERS: The same class of work, yes.

Mr. TURGEON: It is a continuation of the work that was commenced under the preceding Government in 1910 and carried on in 1911.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think any work was done on the inside harbour before that time.

Mr. TURGEON: The plans had been made, but dredging was confined to the outside harbour. There was no use commencing work on the inside until vessels could get in from the outside harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There must be plans in the department for the complete work?

Mr. ROGERS: There may be.

Mr. TURGEON: I believe my hon. friend has followed the plans made by Engineer Voligny with perhaps some improvements as the development of the work proceeded.

Mr. ROGERS: I am glad to know that my hon. friend feels that this work is satisfactory.

Mr. TURGEON: It is, I must say. I give the minister credit for having attended to this work, which is very pressing. Large interests have suffered through waiting for a good harbour at Bathurst. Every year we have shipments of 40,000,000 feet of lumber, and the development of the pulp and paper business will necessitate not only ample harbour facilities, but deep water as well, so that large vessels can be brought in. If the amount stated is not sufficient, I would suggest that the minister increase the amount at once so that everything possible may be done during the summer to enable larger ships to come in.

Mr. ROGERS: For the present the pressing work is that of the turning basin. The ships are able to get in now, but there is no way of turning to get to the pulp mill. We are making provision for that turning basin. An item appears in the Supplementary Estimates for the past year, in addition to what appears in the main Estimates, to provide the necessary amount to complete that work this year. We are going right on with it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am glad indeed that the minister is continuing this work which was commenced during the time that I was minister. I took occasion to go to Bathurst and look into the question very thoroughly. I am satisfied that there is no more important public work so far as harbour development is concerned than that which is being carried on there, and I am very glad indeed that it is being proceeded with in such satisfactory manner.

Mr. McCURDY: May I ask the minister what his plans are with regard to Port Hood harbour development?

Mr. ROGERS: This, like other matters, has been deferred owing to war conditions. It will be taken up as soon as conditions permit.

New Brunswick—Campbellton—deep water wharf accommodation, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is being done at Campbellton?

Mr. ROGERS: We are not going on with the work there at present. It is one of the matters that are standing.

New Brunswick—Cape Bald — repairs to breakwater—pier, $1,500.

Mr. COPP: What work does the minister propose doing in connection with the Cape Bald breakwater?

Mr. ROGERS: The amount is required to continue construction of the protective work along the outer face of the approach to pierhead, composed of reinforced concrete caissons filled with ballast, and for general repairs. Estimated cost, ten caissons at $40, $400; labour and services of

diver, $200; concrete and stone filling, $400; general repairs, $500.

Mr. COPP: What was spent last year?

Mr. ROGERS: $3,500.

Mr. COPP: Is there a foreman who has charge of the work all the time, and who looks after the repairs?

Mr. ROGERS: John W. Brien, foreman.

Mr. COPP: Is it from his report that my hon. friend is speaking?

Mr. ROGERS: No, from the report of the district engineer, Mr. Stead.

New Brunswick—Dorchester—to complete wharf improvements, $3,000.

Mr. COPP: Is that new work, or just to complete?

Mr. ROGERS: This is just to complete.

Mr. COPP: $12,000 was spent last year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. COPP: The contract was for $12,000?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract price was $15,000.

Mr. COPP: Was that to extend the wharf there, or to build a new one?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $3,000 is asked for by District Engineer Steed to complete payment on the contract for the reconstruction of the old railway wharf, lately completed to rebuild a short section at the upper end of the old wharf, and to remove the yearly accumulation of mud from the vessel beds in front of the old and new wharfs.

Experimental Farm below Fredericton—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the object of this wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: It is for the use of the Dominion Experimental Farm below Fredericton and about 20 families living within a radius of one and a half miles from the proposed site. It will also be used by the Fraser Lumber Company, whose mill is one mile above the site. The experimental farm is three miles below Fredericton on the west side of the St. John river. The exports will consist principally of farm products, and it is estimated that $10,000 will be shipped annually from this place. I think, on reading the estimate before me, that this is a work that could very well stand for some time.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, I think so. There is a railroad running right through the experimental farm.

Green Point (Beresford)—breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. TURGEON: Does the minister intend carrying on this work this year?

Mr. ROGERS: No, not this year.

New Brunswick—harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $40,000.

Mr. COPP: What work is intended to be done under that item?

Mr. ROGERS: This is a general vote which is taken for each province to provide for incidental repairs that may be required during the year.

Mr. COPP: The minister has no special expenditure in mind which would be included in that vote?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Tracadie—to construct breakwater and breastworks, $3,500.

Mr. TURGEON: What does the minister intend to do at Tracadie this year? Will this work be proceeded with?

Mr. ROGERS: This vote of $3,500 is required for the construction of two breakwaters and breastworks. I do not think we will commence it this year.

Mr. COPP: Has the minister had any application or correspondence with regard to repairs to the Sackville wharf in the county of Westmorland?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, I think we have.

Mr. COPP: What does my hon. friend propose doing in regard to it?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not any information here to give to my hon. friend.

Mr. COPP: I wish to bring to the minister's attention the unfortunate position in which Sackville is placed in regard to wharf accommodation. We have had very poor wharf accommmodation there for a number of years. A great effort was made to induce the Government to make some repairs, or to build a new wharf. About 1909 or 1910 we got an appropriation and a new wharf was constructed at a point some distance from the site of the old wharf, which had practically tumbled down so that it was impossible for vessels to tie up at it. At the time of the construction of the new wharf there was some friction, as is usually the case where there is any change in the site of a wharf. However,

the wharf was constructed on the new site, 400 yards lower down the stream, at a point where there is a sharp bend, so it is possible for vessels to start out into the stream so as to avoid the difficulty of making the sharp curve in the river on a strong tide. Something like $40,000 was expended, and a very splendid wharf was constructed at this site. It was about completed at the time of the change of Government. A few people in the town were small enough to allow their politics to influence them to oppose any road being made to the wharf, and for some time we had no road. Finally a road was constructed to the wharf. But there is still no railroad accommodation. The result is that last year or the year before some pressure was brought to bear upon the Government and they made some small repairs to the old wharf, but these repairs were only sufficient to enable small vessels to come to the old wharf. The result is that captains in charge of large coasting vessels that formerly came to Sackville and delivered and took on cargoes, refused to go there owing to the lack of proper wharf accommodation. It is impossible to ship out timber from the old wharf or to handle the large amount of timber that formerly came in by that wharf, going to the adjoining town of Amherst. We have really no wharf accommodation, and practically this new wharf is going to pieces without being used.

It seems to me that it is time the Government took this matter up. I think the feeling which arose has been dissipated, and I do not think there would be very strong opposition now from the minister's political friends. It was only a few who caused the feeling. Some arrangement should be made between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Railways and Canals so that that wharf, which was intended for the public service, should give the people in that community some advantage for the money that was expended upon it some years ago. Under present conditions it is not worth a five-cent piece to the people of Sackville.

Mr. ROGERS: How far is the railway from the wharf ?

Mr. COPP: The railway runs right along, and there is a little spur of perhaps 300 of 400 yards. I think there is a plan in the Railway Department. Owing to a little local jealously the matter has not been taken up in a business-like way. It is a splendid wharf, and, while Sackville does not claim to be a very important community, the town is a growing one and a large amount of lumber is carried for export over the N. B. & P. railway now owned by the Government. At present we have not an outlet for the shipping of that lumber, because the larger schooners will not go to the old wharf. The result is that the shippers have to take the lumber to Dorchester, or Shediac, or somewhere else, where they can load the schooners. I would ask the minister to take this matter up, look into it, and see if some reasonable arrangement cannot be made to give the people of that portion of the province of New Brunswick proper access to the wharf.

Mr. ROGERS: From what my hon. friend has stated, it does seem too bad that a wharf costing $40,000 should be lying practically idle for the lack of the necessary connection. I have no knowledge of the local conditions, or of the disturbed feeling which he says exists there.

Mr. COPP: It is not serious.

Mr. ROGERS: I will be very glad to take the matter up with the Railway Department. I presume that a portion of it would come under the Railway Department, and we would have to make some arrangement with it to provide the necessary connection. The deputy has taken a note of the matter, and we will take it up with the Railway Department and see if we cannot have it adjusted.

Harbours and rivers, Quebec—Baie St. Paul, repairs to wharf and retaining wall, $6,500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that a new work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, we will spend that amount this year.

Cap Chat—extension of training pier, $7,500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I presume that that amount will not be expended this year?

Mr. ROGERS: No, that stands.

Cap Rosier—breakwater pier, $10,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That will not be expended, I presume?

Mr. ROGERS: That stands.

Chandler— wharf, $25,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is in Gaspé, is it not?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Chandler is the new name for Pabos, I understand. What is the nature of the work?

Mr. ROGERS: There are two proposals in connection with this particular item. One is that there should be an extension of the old wharf, and the other is that a new wharf should be built. The report states that $25,000 is required for the construction of a cribwork wharf 1,380 feet long, by 32 feet wide, with a depth of 32 feet at low water. There will be 49,959 cubic yards of cribwork at $2.75 per cubic yard, a total of $135,866.72. It is a very large expenditure, but nothing has been undertaken as yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am aware that it will be an expensive work, but the Government has not decided yet whether it is going to put up a new wharf, or repair the old one.

Mr. ROGERS: That has not been decided yet.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Chandler is a new name. A very enterprising American firm from Philadelphia has started there a very large industry, the manufacture of sulphide pulp. I visited the place last summer. They are employing some 800 men at the mills, and I understand that they intend to double that number in the course of the coming year. The pier in question was begun a few years ago. There was an old pier which is used by the fishermen, but the new pier, which was commenced, has not yet been completed. The intention of the company is to ship the pulp from that point. At present, thanks to the Gaspé railway, they ship their pulp from Gaspé basin. This means to them a large expenditure, but they were very pleased to use what facilities they had at Gaspé to ship their pulp to the United States where they have large orders to fill This company has built during the last two years 12 or 15 miles of a railway which goes deep into the woods, and they have built their line as far as the present landing pier. I called the attention of the minister some time ago to the fact that until last year the vessels which they used could anchor near that pier. With the trade increasing as it has increased during the last few months, this pier should certainly be extended. There is an alternative plan, and the engineer of the Department was kind enough to ask the company to point out which of the two would be more in their interests, and I understand their answer will be given shortly. The company have expended at Chandler something like $5,000,000 in buildings and other works, independently of the Gaspé railway. The railway that has been built in the last few years is a private owned one. The company has made of that little fishing village a town. I was struck when I visited it last fall to discover a town where a few years ago there were only a few fishermen's huts. I think the Government would do well to consider whether it would not be more in the interest of all parties concerned to accept the plan suggested by the company, rather than that of the engineer of the department. The large amount of capital invested by the company stimulates business throughout the whole district. I think the company's plan would be of great service to the public generally.

Mr. ROGERS: There appears to have been some misunderstanding about the two proposals. The pier that my hon. friend says the company would like would represent a very heavy expenditure, something like $135,000, but in view of the important work that is being carried on by the company—probably as good a work as is being done by any similar company in Canada—there is perhaps some responsibility upon the department to assist them in getting the necessary accommodation. I am in hopes that when we get the report, we shall be able to meet the company's wishes by extending the present pier. If we can make satisfactory arrangement we may have to expend some of this vote this year in order to help the company, which has a large amount of capital invested.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am informed that the alternative plan will be much less costly than the plan outlined by the engineers of the department, and the expenditure will be in the interests of the public.

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station—extension of wharves, $50,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that to be expended this year?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think so.

Harrington harbour—extension of wharf, $3,000.

Mr. ROGERS: As this work has been completed, I move that this item be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Hospital Bay—Magdalen Islands — breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this a new wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: This money is to be expended upon the construction of cribwork and a breakwater. When completed the structure will be 700 feet long, and will consist of nine isolated triangular cribs.

Ile Perrot South—wharf, $1 500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is this to complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the Government received a petition or a formal request that facilities be provided for the travelling public, either by the construction of a bridge for pedestrians or through some arrangement with the two railway companies, between the island of Montreal and Isle Perrot, and Isle Perrot and Vaudreuil? Anyone travelling from the island of Montreal to Vaudreuil has to have his automobile or carriage ferried across the river in a scow, and involves great delay and trouble. I know that in years past efforts have been made by several associations to get the Government to provide a bridge, and it seems to me that if overtures were made to the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk their bridges might be used for this purpose. Has the Government ever considered this question, and if so, what decision has been reached?

Mr. ROGERS: We have had petitions and requests on numerous occasions, and the matter has been especially brought forward by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries), who is very insistent in season and out of season in pressing the necessity for such work as my hon. friend has described. Unfortunately, however, we have no power under which it would be possible for us to build such a bridge. The construction of a work of that kind has never been undertaken by the Public Works Department. It is true that we build bridges across interprovincial rivers, but we do not build bridges across a river all of which is in one particular province, because that comes within the jurisdiction of the Government of the province in which the river is. It will be impossible for me to undertake this work, because I have no power to do it. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) would assist me in trying to persuade the Senate to pass our Highway Bill, then I would undertake to promise him to take up this matter immediately, because I know how much this accommodation is required for the Island of Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is true that at that point the river is exclusively under the jurisdiction of Quebec, but at the same time the bridge would be a means of uniting the two provinces, because it is practically the only route to Ontario.

Mr. ROGERS: It is hard to draw the line.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Dominion could give a grant to the province.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has a much more ambitious scheme than that; a scheme that we heard of during the last Chateauguay election. He wants a committee to be appointed to consider the using of the Canadian Pacific railway bridge from Lachine to Caughnawaga as a means of connecting the island with the south shore and also the bridge of the Canadian Northern at Isle Bizard. But really, badinage apart, the whole scheme is very important for the island of Montreal which is practically isolated from the mainland in the west and northwest. If you wish to leave the island of Montreal by automobile or carriage, you have to cross the river by means of the old fashioned scow. If the minister can find a way out of the difficulty, he will be doing a great service to the people in that locality.

Mr. ROGERS: I quite agree that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is a very ambitious representative, and properly so, because he represents a very ambitious constituency, and everything that can be done must be done to assist that hon. member and his important constituency.

Mr. GRAHAM: The fact that a certain Highways Bill was not passed all the way through Parliament should not be given as an excuse why the Dominion Government will not consider reasonable propositions that might or might not have come under that particular scheme. The Highways Bill was started on its career for a very different purpose from that of building bridges; it was started on its career in the county of Renfrew for the purpose of promising good roads to many municipalities. Men were sent into that county to tell the people that if they did certain things they need not look to the Provincial Government for aid, they could come down to Ottawa and they would get their roads built independently of the provincial aid.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They were injecting a little poison into pure politics.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact there is nothing in the world to hinder this Dominion from bringing in a Bill to aid the Provincial Government to build bridges.

Mr. ROGERS: That is what the Highways Bill provided for.

Mr. GRAHAM: That Bill provided for highways. If the Minister of Railways had proposed right away to take the entire grant for a year to build two bridges, he would likely have been opposed by other parts of the province that were entitled to some part of the money for highways. Even if he had a dozen Highways Bills, special provision would have had to be made for special work, because it would not have been practicable to take the entire grant that would go to Quebec or Ontario and expend it all in building two bridges which would serve only a small proportion of the people. There is nothing to hinder the Dominion Government from making, if they wish to do so a special case of these bridges and joining with the Provincial Government, the latter doing its full share in the building of the bridges which, although they do not technically connect the two provinces, would be practically, so far as the highway is concerned, interprovincial bridges, because to get from Ontario to Quebec along the St. Lawrence, one has to cross those two stretches of water mentioned by the hon. member for Rouville. When the time comes for the bridges to be built, as it will very shortly, I think the Minister of Public Works will see that it will be necessary for him to take the matter up as a separate project, no matter whether it be by a Highways Bill or not.

Mr. ROGERS: What my hon. friend has suggested is exactly what was provided for by the Highways Bill, because the Minister of Railways, in whose department the matter was, said that he could not expend a dollar of the money allotted to a province under that Bill without the approval of that province, and I am sure the Government of the province of Quebec, recognizing the importance of the bridges named, would be very glad to give consideration and assistance in every way possible to the carrying out of the construction of those bridges. If I remember aright, the amount which was to be given to the province of Quebec was a pretty large sum and it would probably more than cover the cost of building the bridges as suggested by the hon. member for Rouville. However, this is probably ancient history and I do not think anything can be done in the meantime.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the meantime, would not my hon. friend study that feature of the scheme as to whether or not the two railway companies could be induced to consider the feasibility of utilizing their respective bridges for pedestrians? I quite realize that any bridge to be built there would cost an enormous amount of money, and I do not see why the two companies could not come to terms with the Ottawa Government and possibly also with the Quebec Government and make arrangements to bring this matter to a head. I can assure my hon. friend that the question has become an acute one not only for the county of Jacques Cartier but for the whole island of Montreal. As my hon. friend from South Renfrew has stated, although the river at the point where I suggest the bridge should be built is exclusively within the boundaries of the province of Quebec, yet it is the meeting point of Ontario and Quebec. I am quite sure that the people of Ontario would appreciate the construction of the bridge or the adaptation of the two railway bridges for highway purposes just as much as the people of Quebec. I would urge my hon. friend to consult the two railway companies as to whether they would not make an arrangement.

Mr. ROGERS: I may say, that is now being done. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries) had it up some time ago, and he is taking it up with the railway companies. I expressed my willingness to join him and see what can be done in that connection.

Lachine wharf, $11,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Will that be built this year?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Quebec—Laprairie—protection works, $80,000.

Mr. LANCTOT: Before this item is voted I would like to say a few words regarding the protection wall at Laprairie. I may say, in the first place, that I am in favour of the expenditure. Will the minister be good enough to tell this committee the amount

of money paid to date to the contractors, Messrs. Duranceau and Poupart? Is there any money due to those contractors; if so, how much? I would like to know, also, the cost of the plank road built last spring, the amount of money paid to Arthur Dufort, the foreman, and the amount paid to Messrs. Viau and Lafrançois. These men were kept on the temporary road to replace the broken planks. I would like to know, also, the amount paid to Duranceau and Poupart to put up the bridge on the St. James river last spring. Did the hon. minister receive tender from Messrs. St. George and Carney, of Montreal, for the making of a macadam road instead of a plank road during last April or May? Is it the intention of the minister to proceed with this work this coming season? If so, will it be by day work or by contract? I assure my hon. friend that if he gives that work to the same contractors good results will not be obtained, because they are not qualified for such work. As I told my hon. friend before in this House, Mr. Duranceau is a tinsmith and Mr. Poupart is a retired farmer. Neither of them know anything about this kind of work. I would suggest to my hon. friend the name of a good contractor in my riding, Mr. Chagnon, who has been connected with concrete work in Montreal for the last forty years, and is well qualified to do that kind of work. I met him last week in the town of Laprairie, and he told me that he would enlarge the dyke by ten feet, fill these ten feet with earth, make a six-mile concrete wall and a good macadam road for the sum of $80,000. Will the minister tell the committee whether out of this $80,000 which he asks to be voted any money is to be paid for amounts due to the contractor? I hope the minister will see his way clear to get away from politics in connection with this work. I do not blame the minister as much as I do the member who has had the patronage in the county of Laprairie for the last four years. The minister knows well that Mr. Rainboth of Aylmer, who is a well qualified engineer, tendered for that work at $70,000.51. The tender of the other men, Duranceau and Poupart, was higher by a couple of thousand dollars. Anyhow, they did not sign the contract at that figure; the contract was given at so much a yard, and the result is that nothing has been done, although the department have expended from $80,000 to $100,000, and this year asks the sum of $80,000 to start the work again. As I have said, I do not blame the minister, but I do blame the one who had the patronage for trying to get votes out of this matter. I suppose he was trying to get that work done during the election. After the Liberal Government went out of power in 1911 five-twelfths of the amount voted, $27,000 was spent, and the balance was spent in the next year. During the election in Quebec a local man had the patronage and one of his supporters in the riding appointed at least twenty men as foremen in connection with this work. Some of them were disappointed because they did not get $3 a day as foremen—that could not pass here in Ottawa. A few received $3 a day, and the others $2. They were idle all day; they did no work at all, and as much money was spent in paying the foremen as was paid to the ones who did the work. I have heard many of my friends say that it was a pity that such a farce should go on in a riding so close to Montreal. I do not want to blame the minister for all that, because he does not know; but if anything of that kind happens again I shall come to Ottawa and tell him what is going on in Laprairie.

Mr. ROGERS: I appreciate the remarks of my hon. friend in respect to the question before the committee. This, as my hon. friend well knows, is a very important work. It is the main highway between New York and Montreal, and other points, the main highway over which all people travel with their automobiles between the United States and Montreal. I must confess that this very important undertaking has not been carried out as I had hoped that it would be and as I certainly believe that it should have been. In my opinion the blame should be attached not so much to the contractors as to the engineers who made faulty plans in connection with the undertaking and who have been dismissed for the mistakes they made in connection with the preparation of these plans. I shall be glad to give my hon. friend all the information that I possibly can. I understand that the amendment asked for in the Estimates is quite sufficient to complete the work and make it a very passable highway, satisfactory to all. The estimated cost of completing the work is as follows: Plans on price of contract, $23,600.46; plans on agreement of temporary road, $850; rebuilding of inner wall, $11,000. (That is the part that gave way through the faulty plan of the engineer, this

causing the difficulty and trouble which arose); erecting the parapet, $23,000; three additional culverts, $5,000; additional inclined roadways, $11,000; extra for asphalted macadam $5,400, a total of $79,850.46. In view of the fact that this dyke is a link of a very important international highway, extensively used by tourists from Canada and the United States, the roadway on top of the dyke cannot be opened to the public until the whole of the work has been completed. This dyke is being built in order to protect the town of Laprairie against heavy annual damages caused by ice shoves and floods, and also to afford better communication with Montreal. These floods have been caused, at least partially, by the construction of different public works which have had the effect of narrowing the flowing section of the St. Lawrence below Laprairie, such as the Victoria bridge abutments and piers, the Mackay guard pier, and the Verdun dyke. The total estimated cost of the work is $158,953. The total amount paid to the contractors up to August 18, 1915 is $56,920. Work on the contract was stopped owing to lack of funds, the vote of $20,000 made last session having been used partly for the construction of a temporary plank road, pending the completion of the contract. The work done during the past fiscal year consisted of the following: (a) 700 feet of the 15-foot road bed was laid and 2,226 tons of crushed stone delivered on the site of the work. Inspector, A. Dufort, at $3 per day. (b) A macadamized roadway, 6,500 feet long, was constructed in order to temporarily accommodate the traffic during the spring season. Stones, already delivered, were spread on the work and covered with crushed stone. Foreman, Roch Lefebvre, at $3 per day. (c) Construction of a plank roadway alongside the dyke for a length of 6,500 feet. This was necessary in order to accommodate the traffic during the construction of the dyke. An Order in Council was passed, December 4, 1913, granting authority to accept the tender of Messrs. Alphonse Duranceau and Noe Poupart, of Laprairie, Que., at unit prices (entailing an approximate expenditure of $72,678.73) for the construction of a protection dyke at Laprairie, Que. Contract No. 9,909, amount $72,678.73 (schedule of prices); contractors, Duranceau, A., and Poupart, Noe, Laprairie, Que., date of contract, January 21, 1914; date of completion, 18 months from 6th December, 1913. The Department of Public Works decided to commence the construction of this work with the last 1,400 feet (the whole work comprising 8,000 feet) and to have this length of the dyke completed within six weeks from the notification of the acceptance of the tender, the intention being to connect, this fall, the provincial road from where it ends along the route of the King Edward highway, as laid out, with the point where it joins the Old Road. This temporary roadway was necessary to accommodate the traffic during the construction of the dyke which was being built on the existing roadway.

District Engineer Michaud, in a report dated 18th April, 1913, states as follows:

In 1910, the Government decided that some steps should be taken to improve these conditions, and the sum of $10,000 was expended to raise the shore road six feet above its ordinary level from the town of Laprairie towards St. Lambert and use this dyke as a roadway. 3,000 feet of this was filled with earth and riprapped on the shore slope during the year 1910-11.

During the fiscal years 1911-12 and 1912-13, the work was continued and mostly completed for a distance of 7,900 feet to an average height of 13 feet above extreme low water. The shore side of the dyke was partly riprapped and cemented.

The flood of the spring 1913, which was 4 feet above this protection dyke, scored out the side slope which had not been riprapped, and damaged the road bed generally to a great extent.

In order to ensure a greater protection and build a more permanent dyke which must necessarily be the highway out of the town of Laprairie during the flood period, and a link of the King Edward VII Road from Rousse's Point to Montreal, which is undertaken by the Provincial Government with the aid of interested municipalities, the work already performed should be considerably extended. It will be necessary to raise the dyke 4 feet above its present level, macadamize the top on a width of 24 feet riprap and cement both slopes in order to secure permanency of all surfaces exposed to flood.

All the low shore exposed on the Laprairie basin for a length of 7,900 feet would be permanently protected, and free access in all times of the year would be provided for the town.

The Victoria bridge and the construction of the guard pier, as well as the execution of large works in the harbour has considerably narrowed the channel of the St. Lawrence river running past the island of Montreal.

The effect of this has been to heap up the ice at Laprairie and along the banks of the south shore of the river, and cause the water to overflow, resulting in great damage.

This is the engineer's report. I think I have covered the points about which my hon. friend has asked. If not I shall be glad to supply him with any further information which he regards as desirable or necessary. It is unfortunate that the work has not been as successful as it should have been and as I should have liked to have seen it, but there have been great

difficulties, due first of all largely to the fault of the engineer who made the original plans in a faulty manner, for which he suffered the penalty of dismissal. I cannot find any ground for complaint against the contractors, who have endeavoured to fill their contract. If my hon. friend has any information to the contrary I shall be glad to have it, because I recognize the importance of the work and the necessity of having it completed at the earliest possible moment. We found it necessary, owing to the delay, to erect a temporary roadway to accommodate the traffic during the past year; and I am glad to know that the temporary roadway so made was satisfactory. The amount now placed in the Estimates is supposed to complete the work, and I do not anticipate any further difficulty. We expect that the road so completed will give satisfaction to my hon. friend and to all the people of that locality. As I understand, many municipalities are directly interested in the success of this work. In addition to that, the fact that it is an international highway, necessary to accommodate the traffic between the cities in the United States and the city of Montreal, renders its successful completion a matter of great national importance.

Mr. LANCTOT: The minister has not given the amount paid to Messrs. Duranceau and Poupart to erect the bridge last year for the temporary roadway. I have been informed in this House that some $3,000 or $4,000 was paid for this work. I presume that something was paid to the firm for erecting the bridge in 1915. I also asked the minister how much money was paid to Messrs. Lefrancois & Viau. These men were working on the plank road all summer. I do not suppose they were doing that for their pleasure; they were receiving something, and I suppose they were employees of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Lefrançois was paid $2 a day. I have not the number of days.

Mr. LANCTOT: And what about Mr. Viau.

Mr. ROGERS: I have no mention of that name.

Mr. LANCTOT: I know that both of these men were employed on that road, as I have passed there many times on my way to Montreal. I do not say that they were working all the time, but they were supposed to be working and I have no doubt they received their salaries. Did the minister receive a tender from Messrs. St. George and Carney for the building of a macadamized road instead of a plank road, during April or May last? I was told that St. George and Carney sent in a tender of about $9,000 to make a macadamized road instead of a plank road. It would have been a greater benefit to the people of the locality to have a macadamized road instead of a plank road, because a plank road will not last very long. I am sure it will not last throughout this coming summer. The minister did not tell the committee whether it is his intention to start the work in May.

Mr. ROGERS: As soon as it is possible to start the work we will certainly do so, and we will have it completed as early as possible. That is what we are asking the vote for.

Mr. LANCTOT: If the work does not go on this summer, the people will say it is an election road.

Mr. ROGERS: They cannot say that; we have already spent too much money on it.

Mr. LANCTOT: This work has been going on all the time just for election purposes. The minister said it was the fault of the engineer. That may be, but the department has a foreman there who was appointed by the Government, a man named Dufort, who is paid $3 per day. Was he doing his duty in not reporting to Ottawa how the work was going on? What is the use of having a foreman if he does not do his duty? When the Government took office, Mr. Michaud was the local engineer, and the Tories in Montreal went to his office and told him that they would put him out. He told me so himself. They told him that the Tories were now the masters in Montreal. I do not say that Mr. Michaud did what he should have done. Mr. Michaud should have done his duty first, and then they could have put him out next day. That would have seemed right to me, but the politicians went to Mr. Michaud and told him that he was no longer master in the district of Montreal. The minister states that the local engineer did not prepare his plans. He did prepare his plans, but the contractors did not follow the plans, and Mr. Michaud could not make them do the work according to the plans. The foreman was there, and he should have telegraphed to Ottawa and told the depart-

ment what was going on; but he did not do so. The department is paying a foreman who did not do his duty.

Mr. ROGERS: I confess that I have not very much fault to find with what my hon. friend has said. Mr. Michaud, the late engineer, has now passed away, and I do not care to discuss in detail the circumstances surrounding the difficulty which arose in connection with this matter. It is true that we have a foreman there, but, as my hon. friend will understand, a foreman has very little to say, as against the engineer, who prepares the plans; he is simply there to see that the work is carried out.

Mr. LANCTOT: When the foreman is there, and a man puts a stone 12 inches on one side, and 6 inches on the other, and puts some earth in to fill it up, he should know very well that the stone will not stand. That was done at Laprairie; I saw it myself.

Mr. ROGERS: I am bound to accept the statement of my hon. friend. If he saw that done it was a very bad piece of work on the part of the foreman, who should be condemned.

Mr. LANCTOT: The then local member, Mr. Patenaude, saw it too.

Mr. ROGERS: I will call him to account for it at once.

Mr. MARCIL: How much is the work going to cost altogether?

Mr. ROGERS: About $150,000. We will have it completed this summer. I understand that we are going to have a magnificent job when it is completed, so far as the information we have at present goes to show. It is a very important work, and it is very unfortunate that there was fault in the original plan. We have had difficulty with the work all the way through. However, the fault is now corrected, and the work will be completed at the earliest possible date. We are going to use the temporary road until such time as the work is completed. The road we built last year has proved as satisfactory as could be expected. That temporary road is in good shape, I understand, this spring, and will be suitable for the traffic until such time as we have the work completed, which, I trust, will be before very long. We are going to put on a special force to hurry the work along.

[Mr. Lanctot.]

Mr. MARCIL: I am glad that the minister realizes the importance of this work, because, as a constant reader of the Montreal newspapers, I have heard more about that road during the past two years than about any other work in Quebec. There is a large amount of American and Canadian travel that way, and it is notorious that the road near Laprairie is—I do not know what parliamentary term I could use to describe it. The road there is a connecting link between the city of Montreal and New York, and the sooner the minister can complete the job the better. He can do no more useful work around Montreal than to finish it as quickly as possible.

Mr. GRAHAM: This piece of road is important in a good many ways. It is not only important; it is notorious. It is not only important to the city of Montreal, but its completion will be very important to all the towns and cities in the province of Quebec owing to the fact that the Provincial Government is pushing along a system of highways in that province that is reaching to the city of Quebec. A great many tourists by automobile will come not only from New York, but from various cities via Montreal, and will finally land in Quebec as the end of their tour. I have discussed this matter with a good many New York people who shied off from Montreal during the last couple of years on account of this piece of road. They would go as far as Saratoga and then turn into the mountains to Lake Placid, and down the other way and back to New York, instead of coming to Montreal, though many of them left home with the idea of visiting Montreal. They were warned not to tackle this piece of road, because they would have to get horses to haul them out. I understand that a good many of the farmers in that district did a good summer's work last year in hauling out automobiles. I think the Automobile Association of Montreal waited on the Government once or twice in regard to the matter. I know that some of the officials have abused me about this road. Once or twice I almost concluded that I was still in office. Last year I think I discussed the matter on this item for a few moments. One thing appeared to me to be very strange, if true. I was told by an official of the Automobile Association that the Quebec Government had offered their road-making machinery to hurry the work along, but that this offer was declined and the construction of the road is costing

a great deal more in consequence. I was told that on several occasions in Montreal, and the minister will know whether the statement is correct. If it is it would show that there has been a serious oversight which will prove rather costly and retard the completion of the road. I think it is safe to say that the city of Montreal, on account of the state of this road, has lost within the last two years—the temporary road helped out a little last year—not thousands, but hundreds of thousands of dollars in tourist traffic. Tourists would set out with Montreal as their objective, but would turn aside when they learned about this road. I am sure that anything the minister can do to hurry up the completion of this road will be welcomed by the people not only of the city of Montreal, but all along the line east of Montreal right through the city of Quebec. Some of our people down there go south for their holidays, but not so many, I imagine, as come from the other side to visit Montreal and other Canadian cities.

Mr. ROGERS: This is the first I ever heard of the offer which my hon. friend states was made by the Quebec Government. It may have been made to the engineers, but it never reached the department to my knowledge.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Automobile Association of Montreal is my informant.

Mr. ROGERS: I never heard of it before. This road along the bank of the St. Lawrence river has been very difficult to construct, the chief difficulty being with the water washing out the walls. I do not at all agree with what my hon. friend has said about the city of Montreal losing so much money, for the temporary road we built last year was entirely satisfactory.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was speaking of the year before.

Mr. ROGERS: The year before was when we started the work, and of course we could not be expected to finish it right away.

Mr. GRAHAM: Something or other went wrong and delayed the work.

Mr. ROGERS: The temporary road we put in last year was entirely satisfactory. I know that the Montreal Automobile Association was satisfied with it. I admit that prior to last year we had difficulties with the road, but the temporary road will be quite able to take care of the traffic this year until the main road is completed; and we will have the road completed as rapidly as possible. I will undertake to put a special engineer in charge of the work to see that it is done in the best possible manner.

Mr. DECARRIES: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I had many occasions to pass along that road which has acquired quite a notoriety, and judging from what I saw personally, the reason for the delay in completing the work is not due to a lack of equipment, as stated by my hon. friend from Laprairie, but, as mentioned by the Minister of Public Works, to the plans being inappropriate. As I took frequent trips along there in automobile, I noticed that this artificial highway, which is at least 15 feet high, is really a stone wall built with stones gathered from all over and set one above the other. The walls were perpendicular, the space between being filled up with earth and all kinds of rubble. With the spring thaw and freshets, those stones of course fell on each side and the road collapsed. The Government is not to blame; a plan had been drawn, which the minister expected to be satisfactory, as it had been prepared by an engineer of some repute. The plans were carried out, with disastrous results. I also would ask the Government to complete this work.

Mr. MARCIL: (Translation.) Will it be completed on the same plans as the old structure?

Mr. DECARRIES: (Translation.) I do not think so; experience has shown that the walls should not be made perpendicular, as they would certainly crumple down. The minister stated that the road would be built along lines approved of by competent engineers, and it is absolutely necessary to have it completed at once.

My hon. friend from Laprairie wished to know whether it would not have been better to build a concrete road along that highway? But why a concrete road?

M. LANCTOT: (Translation.) I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. DECARRIES: (Translation.) I should like my hon. friend to repeat what he said.

Mr. LANCTOT: (Translation.) I said that as a protection for the elevated road, a concrete riprap ought to be built.

Mr. DECARRIES: (Translation.) I I understood you to say that instead of a wooden road, you would rather see a macadamized road.

Mr. LANCTOT: (Translation.) Yes, as a temporary road alongside.

Mr. DESCARRIES: Why then build a concrete road alongside the elevated road which will be soon completed and will offer a splendid highway? Why a concrete road at the foot of the other one? It would be a perfectly useless and unjustifiable expenditure. As pointed out by the minister, the wooden road is excellent; I frequently drove a car along the road and I say that it is in good shape for the present. Of course it will not last for years and years; the wood will rot and the road will become impracticable, but while the wall is being erected that wooden road is all right. All the autos drive along as fast as they wish, sometimes speeding faster than the law will allow.

Hon. Mr. MARCIL: How long is the road?

Mr. DESCARRIES: I do not exactly know, but it begins a little to the east of St. Lambert and runs close to Laprairie. It must be about one mile long; but the member for Laprairie is better acquainted with the road than I am. At any rate what I am saying is for the purpose of showing that the fault does not lie with the Government. Quite otherwise; the Government by that work is giving the people of Montreal and surrounding counties, and to the travelling community of the province a road that will take them from Montreal right across the different parishes of the county of Laprairie even to the United States with the greatest comfort. The road, which is known as the King Edward VII Road is quite a beautiful highway, and becomes part of the road system which the province of Quebec is building, and I think the county of Laprairie has been particularly favoured by the Government in getting from them that bit of road.

For my part, as member for the county of Jacques Cartier, I should gladly see the Government spend some hundred thousand dollars in my county to open up new communications between the counties of Jacques Cartier and Vaudreuil either by building a road between the bridges or one connected with the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk bridges that cross the river between Sainte Anne and Vaudreuil. Here again there is room for improvement, and I hope that before long the Government will see its way to granting my request and give the necessary help towards the construction of the road, as it is the only point where communication can be established between the island of Montreal and the mainland, to cross from the province of Quebec to Upper Canada. Another road could be built between Lachine and Caughnawaga.

Mr. GRAHAM (Text): You were not here this afternoon.

Mr. DECARRIES: (Translation.) A bridge could be built in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific bridge, as was done for rigs along Victoria bridge.

At any rate, I hope to have an opportunity before the end of the session, to ask the Government some grant for those works, but, in the meantime, I congratulate the Government on what they have done for the Laprairie-Napierville road.

Mr. LANCTOT: (Translation.) I see that the hon member for Jacques-Cartier did not understand the gist of my remarks. He is inclined to enconomy. Economy is, indeed, a good thing and I approve him, but he made a mistake in stating that a concrete road would be too expensive. I never spoke of a concrete road but of a macadamized road, with broken stone, such as are built in the county of Laprairie. Is the member for Jacques Cartier aware that the wooden road in question costs at least fifteen to sixteen thousand dollars, and that a macadamized road would not have cost more than nine thousand dollars?

Now, the member for Jacques Cartier—although a lawyer—ought to know that a macadamized road lasts a great deal longer than a wooden road.

Mr. DECARRIES: (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to say that the wooden road is but a temporary makeshift and that if a macadamized road were built it would make it a permanent road in a way.

Mr. LANCTOT: (Translation.) Evidently the hon. member is bound not to understand me. He ought to know that an elevated road is always dangerous and that when the elevated road has been built, and we have the opportunity of using the lower road back and forth, to prevent meeting, it will be better than if we must all use the higher road. The hon. member might come into my county, and he will be made to understand by the people of Laprairie that what I say is nothing but common sense and that it would be folly to spend a whole lot for a wooden road which will have to be replaced next fall, unless the minister defers building the protecting wall until after next summer.

I do not know that I am mistaken, but I heard my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works say, in answer to my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), that he never had any communication from Quebec about that road. It happens that I have under my hand copies of some correspondence which passed between Mr. Caron and the Minister of Public Works himself, and I will read it to the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is Mr. Caron?

Mr. LANCTOT: Minister of Highways of the province of Quebec, now Minister of Agriculture. This is the correspondence:

Quebec, 21st October, 1913.

The Hon. Robert Rogers,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

Will you let me call your attention to the fact that there is still a large amount of work to be done, to complete that portion of the King Edward VII road under the control of your department in the parish of Laprairie.

No work of any importance has been done this summer and there is no probability that the road will be completed for the beginning of the summer of 1914.

It is not my purpose to reflect in any manner on the reasons which have prevented the work to proceed during the last summer. I wish only to state that the provincial part of the road is very near completion now and will probably be finished in two weeks time if we have fair weather.

The provincial government has spent a large sum upon this road and we are very anxious to have it completed for the beginning of next year, in order to accommodate the large tourist travel which will come from the border.

I thought that perhaps you would welcome an offer from my department to complete the road next spring. We have five of our outfits on the ground. Our contractor is there also with a large plant.

I think we could finish the embankment this fall and easily complete your part of the road for the end of June next if your department is willing to enter into an agreement as to the cost with my own department.

I am sure that you sincerely desire to complete this road as soon as possible and we are ready ourselves to co-operate with your department to attain this end if you care to consider our proposition.

Truly yours,

(Sgd) Jos. Ed. Caron.

Office of the Minister of Public Works of Canada, Ottawa,

October 27, 1913.

My dear sir,

I have your letter of the 21st instant in reference to the construction of the King Edward VII road in the parish of Laprairie, and in reply to the same I might state that the department called for tenders for this work recently and that a recommendation is now before council to award the contract. The contractor undertakes to perform the work in question this fall. Were it not that the proceedings had reached this stage I would have been pleased to take up with your department the work in question.

Your sincerely,

(Sgd) R. Rogers.

Hon. Joseph D. Caron,
Quebec, P.Q.

I would like to know if the minister remembers having received that letter and having sent that reply.

Mr. ROGERS: I have no recollection of the correspondence which my hon. friend has just read, but which of course, I quite accept as being correct. The correspondence is not in line with what was said by my hon. friend from South Renfrew, that an offer was received from the Quebec Government to supply the plant necessary for the carrying out of the work, which plant I understood him to say was offered while the work was going on. The correspondence which my hon. friend has read speaks for itself. The point in this particular matter was this: The Quebec Government were building the King Edward VII highway, and it was necessary for the Dominion Government to undertake this link at a point on the St. Lawrence where we have encountered a great deal of trouble owing to ice-jams and flooding which has caused the delay. My hon. friend a moment ago spoke of the macadamized road and suggested that we should have a macadamized temporary road instead of a plank road, and that we should continue them both. I do not see the necessity of having a double road, and I am glad to see that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries) bears out what I stated this evening, that the temporary road was entirely satisfactory during the past year to every one who had occasion to use it. Now, my hon. friend from Laprairie-Napierville states that this temporary plank road has cost something like $15,000. I am afraid he is in error because the contract was let for $4,000.

Mr. LANCTOT: Not $4,000 for the plank road, but for the road opened in 1914. The plank road built last spring cost more than $4,000, I am sure.

Mr. ROGERS: The figures I have before me show that a contract was let for a temporary road for $4,000, and we require an additional $850.

Mr. LANCTOT: The first contract was let at $4,000 for the building of a temporary road, in 1914; and the $850 is to pay Duranceau & Noe Poupart for the building of

a bridge last spring, if I understand correctly. But the plank road was made by day work, not by contract; and I can assure my hon. friend that it cost over $15,000. Now, while I am on my feet I might as well answer the minister. The money spent by the Department of Public Works, or by any other department, is spent for the benefit of the people and not merely to please the department. If you build a plank road for $15,000, you have a good road for one year; but you can build a macadamized road for $10,000 that would be there for all time. So, it seems to me that, for the good of the people, it would be better to have the macadamized road than the plank road. I am not a lawyer but only a farmer, and I understand things that way. When I spend money I want to get, if possible, something that will last for years and not only for six months. I think it will take a good many lawyers to prove me wrong in that. Let any of these hon. gentlemen come to my riding and discuss this matter with me—the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Patenaude) for one.

Mr. ROGERS: The hon. gentleman will remember that there was a very pressing necessity for immediate arrangements to be made for the passage of traffic: the public were suffering for the want of the connection between Montreal and the United States and elsewhere. To construct a macadamized road would have taken a long time, while we were able to lay down the plank road very quickly and so supply the missing link. That is the reason that a temporary plank road was made instead of a macadamized road. My hon. friend may be correct in his figures of cost; I am not going to dispute what he says, for I have not the exact figures before me.

Mr. MARCIL: Was the road made by day work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Why not by contract?

Mr. ROGERS: We were in too big a hurry; we needed a road in a very short time. I am not sure of the exact cost, but I will supply it to my hon. friend if he desires. Now that the plank road has served its purpose to the entire satisfaction of the public, and will serve until the permanent highway is completed, there is no reason to have two roads as one is quite sufficient for the traffic. I think my hon. friend will agree with me.

[Mr. Lanctot.]

Mr. LANCTOT: I have just a few words to add to what has already been said. The minister says it would take a longer time to build a macadamized road than a plank road. Of course—two weeks more. But is not he aware that we had been in the mud for three years previous to the building of the plank road? And does not he know that in our province as the fall season comes on even a dirt road is pretty good and we get along all right? St. George & Carney told me that this six thousand feet of road could be built in five weeks. Well, suppose you could build a plank road in two weeks. Then we should have to wait three weeks more to have a road that would be good for all time. Is there a man in this House who will tell me that, if the interest of the people is to be the ruling consideration, it would not have been better to make that permanent road?

Mr. DESCARRIES: Who is the owner of the land on which that temporary road is built?

Mr. LANCTOT: I understand that it is owned by the Beaudry estate and that Mr. Leblanc, Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, has an interest in it.

Mr. DESCARRIES: If you build a permanent road you will be obliged to purchase that land.

Mr. LANCTOT: The city of Laprairie could expropriate that little strip of property and build a road that would be good for all time; don't let that worry you.

Malbaie—to complete pier, $17,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: It appears that $17,000 was voted last year and this is
9 p.m. a revote of $17,000. Yet it is said that this is "to complete."

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, that is a mistake. This work has been completed, and I move that the item be struck out.

Motion agreed to and item struck out.

Murray Bay—to complete wharf improvements, $4,200.

Mr GRAHAM: To what extent does the Department of Marine and Fisheries repair wharves? What is their limit?

Mr. ROGER: Their limit is from $50 to $100.

North Timiscaming—wharf, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This work stands?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: No work has been done on this wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing.

Mr. MARCIL: I heard some very serious opposition on the part of the Conservative party some years ago against building Dominion wharves on inland waters. Has the policy of the department been changed in that respect?

Mr. ROGERS: This wharf is at the head of the lake, and appears to be necessary.

Mr. MARCIL: I do not say that it is not necessary, but the Conservative party when in opposition opposed the building of Dominion wharves in inland waters, contending that these were purely provincial works. Is it the policy of the present Administration to build Dominion wharves in inland waters?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid I would not be an authority on that question. I have never been in opposition, and I hope never to be.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the best confirmation we have had of the rumour that my hon. friend is soon to be exalted to another position. I will not object if he is, on his own account. The question raised by the hon. member for Bonaventure is one that created a good deal of discussion in the House at one time. After all, we have got to the point where we do shut our eyes perhaps, to certain niceties as to the line of demarcation between provincial and federal authority. Navigation to a large extent is under the Federal authority. Timiskaming and its chain of lakes are very important waters, connecting with the Ottawa river by various outlets. On behalf of the Opposition and the late Government, I am glad to see that the present Minister of Public Works eschews the works of his predecessors when they were in opposition. I maintained then, as I do now, that there are circumstances and conditions under which it would be no infringement of provincial prerogative for the Federal authority to step in and build on these larger lakes, particularly where navigation is of an important character and of no small dimensions, wharves for steamers of a considerable size, quite a number of which operate during the season of navigation.

Mr. MARCIL: I may say that that was the policy adopted by Mr. Tarte when he was Minister of Public Works; he started to build these wharves on lake Timiskamin. His policy at that time was stoutly condemned by members of the Conservative party. I am glad to see that the present Minister of Public Works has adopted a more progressive and enlightened policy in that regard.

Mr. ROGERS: I am pleased to know that I am a follower of the late Mr. Tarte in this respect. If this was his policy I am glad to subscribe to it, recognizing his progressive work as Minister of Public Works and the manner in which he contributed to the development of the various public works in connection with the department over which he presided.

Mr. GRAHAM: Montreal papers please copy.

Petite Rivière Est—breakwater, $19,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has any work been done in connection with this breakwater?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. MARCIL: Will anything be done this year?

Mr. ROGERS: No, I do not expect that anything will be done this year.

Rimouski—harbour improvements, $150,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What has been done here?

Mr. ROGERS: This is undoubtedly a very important work. I will read the statement for my hon. friend:

This amount of $150,000 is required to continue the harbour improvements at Rimouski. The improvements consist of a timber structure filled with stone, built parallel to the western and northern face of the present wharf, the whole length of the cribwork aggregating 1,458 feet, to be seated in a trench previously dredged to a depth of 25 feet below low water the dredging of a tidal basin 1,100 feet by 600 feet to a depth 25 feet below low water; and the filling of the space between the old and new works. Estimated cost, $350,000. This work will promote the development of trade in the district. Several important saw, pulp, and other mills are greatly in need of these improvements to facilitate their shipping trade. These improvements will also procure deep water accommodation and shelter for vessels frequenting the harbour and will make Rimouski a very good port of refuge, being protected by St. Barnabe Island and by the wharf. The work was requested by the Board of Trade of Rimouski in a resolution dated February, 1912.

Expenditure 1914-15, on contract No. 10,016	$ 55,781 29
Expenditure 1914-15, inspection, etc	2,106 84
Probable expenditure 1915-16	111,000 00

Total probable expenditure up to March 31, 1916.. .. ..$178,888 13

Appropriation, 1915-16, $50,000. The appropriation for 1915-16 will be over expended by $60,000.

Probable Cost of Work.

Amount of contract No. 10,016..	$355,445 50
Probable expenditure to March 31, 1916..	178,888 13
	$176,556 37
Amount asked for to complete 1916-1917..	250,000 00
Total probable cost..	$426,556 37

The work done during the present fiscal year consisted of the sinking of 600 feet of caissons. The dredging of the caisson berth has been completed. The superstructure of 300 feet of the caisson sunk last year has been commenced. Inspector, A. Pineau, $3.50 a day, for looking after the work.

Mr. MARCIL: Do I understand it is contemplated to spend $350,000 at Rimouski?

Mr. ROGERS: That is the total amount.

Mr. MARCIL: To increase the wharf and make a tidal basin?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there anything to justify an expenditure of that kind at the present moment—the minister cannot have been there lately.

Mr. ROGERS: No, I have not. This improvement at Rimouski has been under way for some time. Rimouski is an important point for the landing of ships. My hon. friend knows that some of the largest ocean liners frequently land at Rimouski, and there has been general complaint that we did not have the necessary wharf accommodation there. This work has been under way now for about two years, and it will take some time to complete it. It has been discussed in the House several times, and in my opinion very few works of the kind are more necessary than the building of the harbour at Rimouski.

Mr. MARCIL: Is Father Point to be abandoned altogether? No passenger boats ever stop at Rimouski. What depth is sought to be obtained there?

Mr. ROGERS: A depth of 25 feet at low water, and the filling in of the space between the old and the new work.

Mr. MARCIL: What was the tonnage at Rimouski last year and the year before?

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. ROGERS: As far back as 1911 thirty-two ocean vessels, of an aggregate tonnage of 56,757 tons, took their cargoes at Rimouski, although the depth of water at low tide was only fourteen feet. That has been the difficulty at Rimouski, and therefore it did not get the trade to which it was entitled. Ocean liners represented that as the depth of water was only fourteen feet it was impossible for them to go there. It is expected that after the completion of this work the trade of Rimouski will develop very rapidly, and that within a very short time it will probably more than double.

Mr. MARCIL: What becomes of Father Point?

Mr. ROGERS: We are not doing anything at Father Point in connection with this scheme. It is just left in its present condition.

Mr. MARCIL: Is it intended that Rimouski is to become a port to rival Quebec or Montreal, or is it to be a local port of call? There is no business at Rimouski to justify an expenditure of this kind. No sane man in the province of Quebec would attempt to justify that.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend will understand that there is a very large lumber business there, and, in addition, Rimouski has always been used as the landing point for the ocean mails.

Mr. MARCIL: The steamers do not go to the wharf.

Mr. ROGERS: They could not go to the wharf with a depth of fourteen feet.

Mr. MARCIL: It would be a great loss of time for a steamer to call at the wharf.

Mr. ROGERS: Now that we are affording twenty-five feet of water at low water, the ships will be able to land, and it will add to the convenience of the people not only in the Rimouski district, but all over Canada, by giving them their mails twenty-four hours or more sooner than by the present arrangement.

Mr. MARCIL: I am glad the minister is satisfied with his present scheme, because I do not see anything to justify it. No steamer going from Quebec or Montreal wants to waste time going into Rimouski. They simply stay in the offing and drop the mails, and pick up their pilots at Father Point. As to the lumber trade, 25 feet of water is more than is required for any sailing vessel or any lumber steamer

going in there. I think the minister is going altogether beyond the requirements. I remember as a boy, in the days of Sir Hector Langevin, that Rimouski was the favourite spending spot in the province of Quebec. More money has been wasted in the harbour of Rimouski, to my knowledge, than in any other port in Quebec, and I do not see anything to justify the present expenditure. How much is to be spent during the present year?

Mr. ROGERS: We will probably spend the amount of the estimate, $150,000.

Mr. MARCIL: There is to be no economy at Rimouski this year?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid my hon. friend really does not appreciate the importance of the work.

Mr. MARCIL: Not to that extent.

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid he does not appreciate the importance of the work to the entire people of Canada, who will get their mail from 24 to 36 hours earlier than they would if this work were not carried out. It is a very important piece of work from that point of view, if from no other. Then, too, passengers going to Europe can take their ship at Rimouski 24 hours later than they otherwise could. It is going to be of the greatest possible convenience to the people of Canada, and it has been strongly pressed on us and is considered as a necessary work. It is true that, in the past, ocean liners could not land at Rimouski and had to pick up their pilots at Father Point, and therefore the port of Rimouski has been neglected to that extent. This item is in the Estimates for the very purpose of remedying that condition.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the Marine Association of Montreal, or any of the large shipping companies, asked that work of this kind be done?

Mr. ROGERS: There has been an expressed desire on the part of everybody I have discussed the matter with for improvements there. They are regarded as a very pressing necessity.

Mr. VERVILLE: Did I understand the minister to say that the depth at low water would be 25 feet?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. VERVILLE: How will it be possible for a steamer carrying mail and freight to land at that wharf with a depth of only 25 feet?

Mr. ROGERS: That is at low water.

Mr. VERVILLE: I understand that, but suppose that a ship gets in at low water; how will it be able to draw up at the wharf with a depth of only 25 feet of water?

Mr. ROGERS: There are many ships that do not draw 25 feet of water.

Mr. VERVILLE: Not many mail ships.

Mr. HUGHES: The minister knows that every ship must have two or three feet of water more than her draught before she can move.

Mr. ROGERS: From 19 to 20 feet is what they usually draw.

Mr. HUGHES: A ship cannot be steered unless she has a few feet of water more than her draught.

Mr. ROGERS: If 25 feet is not deep enough we will go deeper.

Mr. MARCIL: As the result of the accident to the Empress of Ireland, what is the rule in regard to the calling of ocean steamers at Rimouski? Do the new rules not keep away those steamers from Rimouski?

Mr. ROGERS: That question can be answered by the Marine Department. I am not familiar with the rules and regulations as to landing; my business is to supply a wharf to permit of that landing, and that is what I propose to do at Rimouski, believing it to be in the public interest.

Mr. H. BOULAY: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has grasped the question. I fail to see on what grounds he finds exorbitant the expenditure now being made in the harbour of Rimouski; for he knows just as well as I do that it is one of the most important harbours on the lower St. Lawrence.

For many years past, the port of Rimouski has been the centre of an active trade in lumber, and the proposed improvements would enable ships to load right at the wharf. Heretofore, ships had to take on their cargo of lumber three or four miles away from the wharf, which entailed on the shippers the use of lighters. It is known, besides, that the Price Company has several establishments in the counties of Matane and Rimouski, and, every year, several of their

vessels are plying to and from the port of Rimouski. Here is therefore a requirement of the lumber trade. As regards the mail boats, even should these improvements be carried to completion, they would still be unable to reach the Rimouski wharf; to attain that object, some dredging and deepening of the channel would be necessary. Then again, those improvements would allow of vessels such as the Lady Evelyn, for example, with a draft of twenty feet, and which lands the mails and passengers from the transatlantic steamers, to reach the wharf under all conditions of tide. Moreover, the contract was granted previous to the outbreak of the war, and the work must be carried through. My hon. friend from Bonaventure was not so particular, when his friends were in power, about requesting the construction of wharves in his constituency at distances of every four or five miles. He is not in a position to obtain such favours just now, and that explains the bitterness of his remarks.

The people of the county of Rimouski have been neglected for a number of years, and it is only right that this Government should see to it that we are protected and that we get the improvements which the trade has been in need of for so long a time.

Mr. MARCIL: What the hon. member has said confirms what I stated, that this wharf will never be used by any of the ocean steamers, owing to the depth of water. Apparently it is to be used merely by smaller boats for the shipment of timber to the Price mills and other mills situated around Rimouski. It would be purely for local traffic. The only excuse given for this expenditure is that the county of Rimouski was neglected for a long time before the present Government came into power, and it is claimed that now is the time to make up for that neglect. It is also said that the work was started before the war broke out and that it must be completed. There is no other excuse for it. The hon. member for Rimouski took exception to my criticism because of the expenditures that had been made in my constituency. These expenditures were very moderate. The expenditure of $50,000 on this work is only the beginning. If we had time to calculate what has been spent on the harbour at Rimouski since the days of Sir Hector Langevin, this House would be amazed. If the members of this House were to visit Rimouski harbour and see the condition which it is in at low water they would come back convinced that this expenditure is a waste of money. I do not say that nothing should be done at Rimouski; far from it. I think a fair amount of money should be spent for local purposes, but to talk of making Rimouski a rival of Montreal or Quebec, or to imagine that the ocean steamers coming from the other side and intent on reaching Quebec or Montreal as soon as possible to land passengers and freight, will lose time in calling at the wharf at Rimouski, is perfect moonshine. I am surprised that the minister claims that the shipping authorities on the St. Lawrence have asked for any improvements of this kind for ocean liners. I would like to get an authorative statement on that point, because I have always understood that the owners of the great liners object very much to the numerous stops they have to make. They have to stop at Father Point for the pilot, at Rimouski for the mails, and at the Quarantine station to get a clean bill of health. Then they used to stop at Quebec, and by the time they reached Montreal the cost of the trip up the St. Lawrence was so great that they objected to it. The minister is attempting to pass this work for the general advantage of Canada, but it is nothing more than a work of local utility, and I think that, in view of the crisis through which we are passing, the requirements of the port of Rimouski could have been met by a much more moderate expenditure. I do not blame the energy shown by the hon. member for Rimouski. He has been very active in the matter, but all things considered, I think the minister would have done justice to Rimouski by putting in the Estimates one-quarter of the amount which he now asks the committee to vote.

Rivière du Loup, en haut—Lock and dam, improvements, $50,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Will anything be done here?

Mr. ROGERS: No, not this year.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any general scheme under way? This has also been described as a port of great importance.

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $50,000 is required for the construction of harbour improvements at Rivière du Loup. The proposed improvements will consist of an approach, pier and dredging; the approach to be constructed first and to form a separate contract. It will consist of two parallel lines of close-faced stone, filled timber cribwork laid 200 feet distant from the shore

outward, 610 feet long on the west and 700 feet long on the east side.

Both lines of cribwork to be 17 feet wide on top, the rear faces to be benched, and the space within to be filled with approved material. The top surface to be concrete macadam, laid on a stone surface.

Mr. MARCIL: Is a channel being dug to let the boats get into the wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: We are dredging alongside the wharf first.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the depth of water there?

Mr. ROGERS: About 20 feet.

Mr. MARCIL: Why is this being done at Rimouski and not at Rivière du Loup?

Mr. ROGERS: We had let the contract for the work at Rimouski before the war broke out. Furthermore, we regard Rimouski as a most important point.

Mr. MARCIL: What trade is intended to be developed at Rivière du Loup, transoceanic or local?

Mr. ROGERS: Largely coal for the Intercolonial, and timber.

Mr. MARCIL: Is Rivière du Loup still a calling place for steamers of the Canadian Steamship Company and other lines plying down the St. Lawrence?

Mr. ROGERS: Some of them call there, putting in at the Intercolonial wharf, as the other is not suitable.

Mr. MARCIL: Do the Government steamers for Murray Bay call there?

Mr. ROGERS: I could not say.

Rivière du Loup en haut—Lock and dam $10,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that part of the same work?

Mr. ROGERS: It has nothing to do with it. This is for a lock 400 feet in length by 35 feet wide, on the eastern bank of the Riviere du Loup. A dam with six waterways is to be constructed to regulate the flow of the river.

Mr. MARCIL: No work has been done yet?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Rivière Laguerre—improvements, $15,000.

Mr. ROGERS: This is in Huntingdon county; nothing has been done on this yet.

Mr. MARCIL: Is the object of the work to prevent the flooding of farms?

Mr. ROGERS: It is to build a canal from Riviere Laguerre through the marshy lands southeast of St. Anicet, south of Port Lewis and west of Ste. Barbe and St. Stanislas.

Mr. MARCIL: This is to prevent the flooding of the farms in the district. The work has been asked for for many years.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. Nothing has been done yet, and nothing will be done on this work this year.

Mr. MARCIL: This would have been a good place to make an exception in these war times, for the English name of this river is the War river. The farms in this district are flooded every spring, and as the Government are urging the farmers to increased production I think they might very well take some of the money they propose to waste at Rimouski and use it on this work in Huntingdon county, which is one of the most fertile districts in Quebec.

Mr. ROGERS: We are not sentimental enough to be influenced by names.

Mr. MARCIL: This would be a very practicable work, if I may judge from the Trade and Commerce Department pamphlet.

St. Alphonse—addition to wharf, $25,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has anything been done here?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing will be done this year.

Ste. Anne des Monts—Landing pier, $35,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: $60,000 seems to have been expended here.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, and $35,000 is required to complete the construction of the landing pier.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: $115,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What business is expected to be done at Ste. Anne des Monts?

Mr. ROGERS: It is largely lumbering and fishing. There are two mills there, but I could not say just what size they are.

Mr. MARCIL: I would advise the minister to take a trip through that locality this summer, and when he sees the size of Ste. Anne des Monts and the business that is done there—steamers calling there

only about once a fortnight—he will wonder why such an extravagant amount is being spent there in war times, when everything in sight is being taxed, and when next year's Budget will probably be double this year's. If the minister would visit the place I think he would be a little more inclined to be saving next year.

Mr. ROGERS: It is quite a good sized place, with 3,000 population.

Mr. MARCIL: I am not objecting to the size of the town, but to the size of this item, which is not warranted under the circumstances.

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière—wharf extension, $6,700.

Mr. MARCIL: Has anything been done here?

Mr. ROGERS: No and nothing will be done this year.

Ste. Anne du Saguenay—extension of wharf, $10,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Will anything be done there this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes we are going on with this work. The estimated cost is $10,000.

Ste. Cecile du Bic—wharf extension and harbour improvements, $13,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has anything been done here?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Ste. Croix—extension to wharf, $5,000.

Mr. FORTIER: Is it the intention of the Government to build this wharf? The minister has promised to do the work three or four times since he took office.

Mr. ROGERS: The proposed extension would necessitate cribwork structure 300 feet long, 200 feet of which would be 20 feet wide and the other 100 feet varying from 20 to 30 feet in width. The estimated cost was so very high that we did not feel justified in going on with the work. The estimated cost of the work, according to the engineer, is $41,580, and as that is a very large sum, the work has been delayed.

Mr. FORTIER: This work was commenced seven or eight years ago, and this amount to finish the work has been in the Estimates since this Government took office. The Government had an opportunity of finishing the work before the war broke out, and the minister promised me three times that he was going to call for tenders, but nothing as yet has been done.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend can understand that we are not calling for many tenders, and on account of present conditions we are delaying works that we consider even more important than this one. Hence this work has been delayed. Had the war not overtaken us, the work would have been gone on with two years ago; but since the war broke out we have been trying to get along with as little expenditure as possible, and this is one of the points that is suffering on that account.

Mr. FORTIER: I differ with the minister in regard to the importance of the work, because this wharf serves some five or six parishes, as the farm products and merchandise is taken from this wharf to the markets at Montreal and Quebec. It is the only way by which the farmer can get his products to the market.

Mr. ROGERS: I can quite appreciate what my hon. friend has to say about the importance of the work from a local standpoint; but in view of the fact that we are delaying works that we regard as even more important, notwithstanding what my hon. friend has to say, than this one, it happens to be in the list of those that are delayed. My hon. friend, I am sure, can appreciate the reasons why we did not go on with the work two years ago. We will go on with it just as soon as possible, because there is no doubt, as my hon. friend has stated, that it is an important work from a local point of view.

Mr. MARCIL: Ste. Croix is the outlet for the whole county of Lotbiniere. I have noticed many times in going to Quebec that the market boats from that region are very large and carry an immense amount of farm produce. Therefore, I think the small sum of $5,000 is really required, but in view of the generous treatment which Rimouski is receiving, I think my hon. friend should grant this small sum.

Mr. ROGERS: If $5,000 would complete the work, I would be very glad to expend the money, but unfortunately it would not.

Mr. FORTIER: Is the minister going to try to do something this year so as to complete the work as soon as possible?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid it will be impossible for us to do anything this year, because that $5,000 would not be of any

value so far as the completion of the wharf is concerned. It would take about $40,000 to complete it as it should be, according to the report of the engineer, and I do not think we could recommend the expenditure of that large sum of money for the wharf. I would not regard it as being of sufficient importance for the expenditure of that amount. If $5,000 would complete it, I would be glad to see the work carried out. $32,000 has already been expended on the wharf.

Mr. FORTIER: The people in my riding are under the impression that the minister is delaying the work until the next election. I may say to the committee that I do not want the construction of a wharf to be delayed. I recommend that the committee pass the item.

St. Germain de Kamouraska—wharf, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has anything been done there?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose it is among the items on which nothing is going to be spent this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

St. Irénée—addition to wharf, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose this is in the same class?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a great horse-breeding farm down there.

Mr. ROGERS: I did not know that.

Mr. GRAHAM: You have not followed the live stock situation in the country.

St. Jean, Island of Orleans—wharf extension, $23,400.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some money has been expended on that wharf. Is this amount to complete it?

Mr. ROGERS: No. We have not started it. This amount is just to survey the ground.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is in the same class as the others then?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Ste. Petronille, Island of Orleans—wharf, $20,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What is this for?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing has been done.

Mr. MARCIL: Has a survey been made?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. MARCIL: It is a most remarkable state of affairs—two large works of that kind and nothing done; both items revoted several times.

Mr. ROGERS: This is just like every other item that we are passing in this way. The delay is due to present conditions.

Three Rivers—repairs to wharf, $20,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a new item altogether?

Mr. ROGERS: The money is to be expended.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that to complete the wharf or to do some dredging?

Mr. ROGERS: To repair the wharf at Three Rivers.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the wharf been damaged by usage or by ice or how?

Mr. ROGERS: It has been damaged by usage. The wharf at Three Rivers is used to a very large extent for coal shipments.

Valleyfield—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that a new wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: It is an extension to the wharf at Valleyfield.

Mr. MARCIL: Nothing urgent about it?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think so.

Mr. MARCIL: Before leaving the Public Works Estimates for Quebec, I would like to ask the minister if anything has been done in Paspébiac. Last year an agreement was arrived at between the Department of Public Works and the firm of Robin, Jones and Whitman by which the department undertook to spend two or three thousand dollars on a wharf belonging to that firm. Has that work been done since last year?

Mr. ROGERS: No, the work has not been done. The deputy informs me that there has been some delay in the transfer.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the work be carried on this season?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think so.

Harbours and Rivers—Ontario, $1,051,800.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have here a number of items applying to places near together—Bowmanville, Brighton, Cobourg, Oshawa, Newcastle.

Mr. ROGERS: To set my hon. friend right, I may say that wherever the three amounts, revote, expenditure for 1916-17, and expenditure for 1915-16 are the same, these works are to stand for the coming year.

Mr. GRAHAM: What I wanted to ask was whether these harbours are now Government harbours altogether. There was an agitation some years ago with respect to these several harbours to have them taken over by the Government, and if I remember well most of them were taken over from private individuals and made Government harbours, and, as a consequence, considerable expenditure was necessary on wharves and other improvements.

Mr. ROGERS: I think the hon. gentleman is practically correct.

Mr. MARCIL: I was not here when the Minister of Public Works made the statement which he has indicated in his reference to the three amounts. Can he give us a plausible explanation of why these items are voted if the work is not to go on?

Mr. ROGERS: I am sorry my hon. friend was not here when I explained that matter when my Estimates were first taken up, but I may repeat it in a word. Each of the works for which there is an appropriation in the Estimates was regarded as a necessary work, and the vote was asked for in good faith and with the hope of carrying out the work. At the outbreak of the war we announced in good faith that these works would not be carried out during the continuance of the war; but we retained these votes in the Estimates as evidence of good faith, and as indicating that we proceed with these works as soon as possible after the close of the war.

Fighting island (Detroit river)—improvement to channel, $57,000.

Mr. PARDEE: Can the minister give some idea of what this improvement is?

Mr. ROGERS: The purpose is to dredge an alternative channel. District Engineer Lambe states that the object is to double track the existing deep channel in the Detroit river by widening and deepening certain parts on the Canadian side of Fighting island in order to relieve congestion of traffic in the American channel. The result would be the making of a channel with a minimum width of 300 feet and a minimum depth of 21 feet, which will be of immense benefit and assistance to traffic passing at this point.

10 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is an agreement, I suppose, between the two Governments on this subject?

Mr. ROGERS: This is all on the Canadian side.

Mr. PARDEE: That work will not be done this year?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. PARDEE: Why put in the item?

Mr. ROGERS: For good faith, as I have explained. This has been in for some time.

Mr. MARCIL: I am sorry the Minister of Public Works did not hold the portfolio of Public Works at the beginning of this Administration. I do not wish to go back into past history, but our late friend and former member for Jacques Cartier, Mr. Monk, was then Minister of Public Works, but there were several items for public buildings and other improvements in my constituency that had been put in in good faith, but they were struck out and faith was not kept.

Mr. ROGERS: That must have been a mistake.

Fort Frances—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I am right in saying that the International Waterways Commission or some other international body had under consideration the question of boundary waters in this vicinity, and there has been some difficulty as to the water-power development. No doubt, the Minister of Public Works will remember the points involved. Can he tell us if an agreement has been arrived at?

Mr. ROGERS: The International Joint Commission have had this matter in hand for some time. They have been giving it special consideration very recently and have had engineers from both sides of the line making surveys. I understood a few days ago that they were getting close to the point of final decision as to the height of the waters of the Lake of the Woods, which is the point that affects Fort Frances. Everything was proceeding in the most satisfactory and harmonious manner and the final decision was expected in the near future

French River dams—repairs and maintenance, $3,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Quite a large work was undertaken in connection with the French river, if I mistake not, which was announced in a general way to be part of the Georgian Bay canal scheme. The eastern terminus of that work for the time being was to be North Bay, at the east end of lake Nipissing. What has been done along the line of the development of the French river and lake; what is the nature of the work, and how much has been expended upon it?

Mr. ROGERS: I will read the information for my hon. friend:

This dam was constructed to regulate the discharge of Lake Nipissing, so that during the fall or low months the water level of the lake may be maintained about elevation 643·5 or about half way between mean summer level and high water. This will serve the purpose of facilitating the handling of the logs at the different mills on the lake, and also provide a constant depth at the various wharves and harbours where the department has made improvements by dredging. A contract for this work was awarded to J. F. Boyd of Sault Ste. Marie, in January 1911; contract price $13,365, but he gave up his contract in November, 1912. The work was completed by the department and the dam in working order by the first of October, 1913. Total cost of dam at Little Chaudière Rapids, $27,719.77. The only departmental work in the locality is the French River Dam Big Chaudiere, about 5 miles away. This dam is at present under construction. The French River dam is situated across the west channel of the Little Chaudiere rapids at the outlet of Lake Nipissing into French River. There is no town near the site of the dam. The nearest towns are Sturgeon Falls and North Bay, each about 42 miles distant.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Could the minister state why the contractor was permitted to give up the contract?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know; I have no information here as to that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps I did not make my question sufficiently clear. There is another item in the Estimates of $400,000 for the large development work in connection with what we call the French River scheme. My hon. friend will remember that it was announced that that was the beginning of the Georgian Bay canal project. That is what I have in mind; perhaps the minister has not that information with him to-night?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the information here, but I shall be glad to get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the recent negotiations that took place between the Ontario Government and those connected with the Seymour Power Company, including the Sun Life, I have been told that the sale included certain rights that the Seymour Company had on the French river. I am unable to find out from the Railway Department from whom the Seymour Company got these rights. The Minister of Railways said that he could find no information in the department in connection with the matter. When the negotiations were in progress one of the parties informed me that the French river property apparently stood in the way of the transfer at first, and finally it was included. Perhaps the information as to from whom the Seymour Power Company or the Sun Life secured the rights on the French river may be in the Public Works Department.

Mr. ROGERS: The deputy informs me that he has no knowledge of it. I am sure that I never heard of it; it is certainly not in our department.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is possible that these power rights originally belonged to the Ontario Government, and that these people got their original leases from the province.

Goderich—harbour improvements, $90,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: When will that be completed? That is one of our chief lake harbours.

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $90,000 is required for the following works: the completion of the extension to the southwest breakwater, contract with Mr. William Bermingham, $74,000; general repairs to the superstructure of the existing structure, $5,000; placing stone riprap for the protection of the river breakwater, $5,000; inspection contingencies, etc., $5,000; total, $90,000. The work will be completed before long. My hon. friend knows the importance of the Goderich harbour better than I do. It is a very necessary work. It has been going on for some time, and this completes it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I visited Goderich some time ago the work of constructing these concrete breakwaters was under way. The breakwaters were constructed in one place and floated into position; then the gates were opened so that the concrete was sunk to the bottom. The scheme had been adopted on the American side in the case of a number of harbours,

and I am curious to know how these concrete breakwaters have stood.

Mr. ROGERS: So far as the information of the department goes, they have been entirely satisfactory. They are built in boxes, floated to the required point and sunk. They have given entire satisfaction; we have rectived no complaints with regard to them.

Hamilton—harbour improvements, $250,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will that complete the Hamilton improvements?

Mr. ROGERS: This is a new scheme at Hamilton; it has not been started.

Mr. GRAHAM: $60,000 has been expended.

Mr. ROGERS: The amount spent was for the revetment wall that was built there last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: How much will it take to finish the whole job?

Mr. ROGERS: It is going to be a large proposition to complete the programme that the town of Hamilton has laid out—$250,000 or $300,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: $250,000 will not complete it.

Mr. ROGERS: It will not complete it, but it will do the necessary work until we are able to reach it. I do not expect we will be able to reach it this year. We are going to do the surveying, and have it all in good shape.

Mr. GRAHAM: It will make a beautiful harbour when completed.

Mr. ROGERS: It is undoubtedly a very desirable location, so far as the city of Hamilton is concerned.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hamilton does a good business there.

Mr. ROGERS: And they are getting in a lot of outside industries to be built around this particular locality.

Ontario—harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $65,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Is work in connection with the Georgian Bay canal scheme to be stopped altogether during the war, and is this small vote merely for maintenance?

Mr. ROGERS: The item passed a moment ago completes the work that has been undertaken in connection with the French river, and that is as far as we are going at the present time, beyond the research for information that is being made by Mr. Sanford Evans and these associated with him. The interim report of that commission, which I placed on the Table of the House a few days ago and which my deputy informs me will be ready for distribution in about 10 days, is replete with valuable information, and I am sure that if any hon. member will read the report he will find that we are receiving a good return for the labour that is being expended in connection with this research. If any hon. member will visit the office of Mr. Sanford Evans and those associated with Queen street, I can assure him that he will find Mr. Evans' conversation as to the Georgian Bay canal and the opportunities for development in that region to be of the very greatest interest. We have not yet reached a point where any definite conclusion or recommendation is made.

Kingston—harbour improvements, $120,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the nature of the improvements to be made at Kingston?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required to complete the improvements in this harbour, which consist of improving the wharves and roadway approaches, under contract with the Thunder Bay Construction Company. Two steel truss roadway bridges and one steel bascule bridge are to be constructed, under contract with the Hamilton Bridge Company. These improvements were originally asked for by the Kingston city council, by the Dominion Marine Association and by the Kingston Board of Trade. In 1913-14 $55,000 was spent and in 1914-15 $104,000. The work of constructing the wharf roadway was transferred to the Thunder Bay Construction Company shortly before the beginning of the year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What will be the cost of the bridges?

Mr. ROGERS: $114,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have seen in the papers, and I have also had other information, that there has been some difficulty in connection with what is known as the Cataraqui bridge. Is this the same bridge?

Mr. EDWARDS: This is the same bridge. This was originally a wooden bridge, built very many years ago, from one shore to the other with an ordinary swing bridge over the canal part. That is being replaced by a permanent structure which is filled in for all the distance except three openings

over which there are two steel truss bridges, and a bascule bridge for the passing of boats. It is all one structure, with three openings.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister say why the very exceptional course has been pursued of building bridges wholly within the boundaries of a province? It is contrary to the usual practice, all such work being left to the municipalities and the provinces.

Mr. ROGERS: I agree that the building of bridges is an unusual undertaking for the Dominion. It would not have been done in this case were it not that this is a combined wharf and bridge that will be of great advantage to the Royal Military College, in which the Dominion has such interest. It was owing to this condition that some years ago this work was undertaken. It has not yet been completed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was the bridge that occupied the site of the new bridge originally a toll bridge owned by a private company?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes. This bridge was originally a company bridge, and was owned by what was called the Cataraqui Bridge Company. The city of Kingston held part of the stock in that company, and when it became apparent that a new structure would have to be built, and when harbour improvements were contemplated, the city bought out the stock that was held by the private company. The Government had been using the bridge and paying some $1,400 a year for its use for military purposes. The building of this structure, as I understand it, was part of the general scheme for harbour improvements. That was the reason why it was filled in, the filling in taking the place of a wooden structure and acting as a breakwater, or protector, of the harbour to the east. One might say it is right at the entrance of the lake.

Mr. PUGSLEY: All I asked was whether this bridge was owned by the private company.

Mr. EDWARDS: At one time it was owned partly by the private company.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I only wanted to know if it was the same bridge.

Mr. EDWARDS: I hope I have made myself clear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Absolutely clear.

Mr. EDWARDS: I presume I may exercise my privilege as a member to speak to this work irrespective of what my hon. friend might want to know. I think that this structure is different from an ordinary bridge. I do not think the Government is open to criticism for building this bridge. It is a structure which is absolutely necessary in connection with the harbour improvements. It is taking the form of a bridge or roadway, for that is really what it is. In other words, if a bridge had been constructed anywhere else than where this work is going on; if, for instance, the structure had been placed further east, the Government would have been obliged to build a breakwater. So it is really a breakwater that is being constructed, and it takes the form of a roadway having three openings covered by bridges.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is wrong when he suggests that I was criticising the building of the bridge. I only asked the minister to explain the exceptional circumstances, which no doubt exist in this case, to justify a departure from the ordinary rule. When I was at Kingston some years ago, I inspected the harbour, and met with a good many of the principal people of Kingston, and I was impressed with the strong claims resting upon the Dominion Government. But, if I remember rightly, what influenced me most was the fact that the bridge led to the military grounds, to the property which is owned by the Government, and I thought that that was a good reason for treating the work differently from an ordinary bridge. I would ask the minister whether or not there has been some trouble in connection with the construction of the bridge, whether a number of dismissals have taken place in connection with it.

Mr. ROGERS: There were errors in connection with the work, and on the part of the engineer, Mr. Pense, which caused considerable difficulty. Mr. Pense was dismissed as the result of an inquiry. The information in his plans was inaccurate, but it has been corrected, and the difficulties are past. If my hon. friend wishes a detailed statement of the circumstances we will be very glad to supply it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the deputy will furnish it to me.

Leamington—repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. NESBITT: Will this vote finish the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Port Dover—harbour improvements, $50,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Nothing has been done at Port Dover yet?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Manitoba—Red river—improvements, $11,000.

Mr. NESBITT: What are the improvements at Red River?

Mr. ROGERS: This is for an ice-breaker.

Mr. MARCIL: I notice that there has been a lot of flooding in the Red River district this year. Is any protection contemplated to prevent such flooding in future?

Mr. ROGERS: The question has not arisen up to the present.

Red river—St. Andrews lock and dam—improvements, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the elevated roadway, which was contemplated when I was minister, been completed?

Mr. ROGERS: It has been completed, and is very satisfactory.

Winnipeg harbour—wharfs, $35,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is for wharfs in Winnipeg, itself, I suppose?

Mr. ROGERS: In Winnipeg itself.

Sturgeon river—improvements, $9,500.

Mr. NESBITT: This is only a creek. What work are you doing there?

Mr. ROGERS: We are making the river navigable.

Mr. NESBITT: You could not navigate anything bigger than a shingle on Sturgeon river.

Mr. ROGERS: It also serves for drainage purposes. This amount is required for the removal of weeds and log jams, and the construction of a dam on the Sturgeon river. There is a growth of weeds in the Sturgeon river that requires to be removed, and also a log jam in the same river, in the vicinity of Devil's lake, Onoway, and Lac Ste. Anne that will also have to be removed in order to create a current and thereby reclaim haylands for the settlers. The dam is proposed to be built about one mile east of St. Albert, a village on the Sturgeon river, and is for the purpose of raising the water in the river and in the Big Lake, a couple of miles west of the village, so that navigation for pleasure craft may be had at any time during the open season. The work is necessary in the interest of navigation on the Sturgeon river, which under the existing conditions is at a very great disadvantage, and it has been asked for by the district engineers.

Fraser river—improvements, $450,000.

Mr. ROGERS: This is for dredging and the completion of the North Arm Steveston jetty.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It occurred to me when I had the pleasure of visiting Vancouver a few years ago, when I was minister, that there was a magnificent opportunity for creating a harbour on the north arm of the Fraser, where there is a very great frontage of land well adapted to the establishment of industrial enterprises. I do not think the expense of making such improvements as would be required would be very great. I understand that a board of harbour commissioners called the North Fraser Board of Harbour Commissioners, has been created, and I am informed that some plans have been submitted to the Government for approval, going in the first instance to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I think it would be desirable to encourage as far as possible the operations which the Board of Commissioners have in mind, not authorizing, of course, any very great expenditure at the present time. Will this $450,000 be limited entirely to the jetty, or will it be used in connection with the dredging of the north arm of the Fraser in the vicinity of Burnaby, Point Grey, and South Vancouver, which are the three municipalities, I think, more especially interested.

Mr. ROGERS: We have had a petition from the North Arm people, but in view of the amount of work that we are doing in Vancouver and Victoria, we did not feel that we could take on this extra work just now. The matter is under consideration, and as soon as we feel justified in the expenditure of a further sum of money on the Pacific coast, we shall take up the work.

Mr. GRAHAM: I promised the hon. member for Edmonton that I would ask that one item be allowed to stand, so that he might have an opportunity of speaking on these Estimates.

Mr. ROGERS: That will be all right; he can speak on any other item.

Stewart—repairs to wharf, $1,700.

Mr. GRAHAM: This work is under contract?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, and in progress.

Stickine river—improvements, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is going to be done on that river?

Mr. ROGERS: Owing to obstructions in the form of snags, etc., it has been impossible to run the steamers more than one trip a year on this main artery of travel for prospectors going from the coast into the Interior of northern British Columbia. This amount is required for clearing the obstructions and making the river navigable. The work will benefit the whole interior.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will $10,000 complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: It will enable us to make a start.

Mr. GRAHAM: Which end are you going to start at?

Mr. ROGERS: The mouth of the river.

Surf inlet—repairs to wharf, $6,800.

Mr. ROGERS: I understand from the officers of the department that this amount is not required, and I therefore move that the item be struck out.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is an important locality; large operations are going on there now. Perhaps the wharf has been entirely washed away. Is that the reason for striking out this item?

Mr. ROGERS: There is no justification for the reconstruction of this wharf. The only people who use it are a few prospectors and one large mining company, which is at present developing a gold mine seven miles from the wharf. The report I have here says:

I consider that a wharf would be unnecessary at the present time. The amount of $6,800 was included in my Estimates for the ensuing year to cover the construction of a wharf at this point, but I would respectfully request that it be cancelled in view of what I have just learned of conditions in that locality.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I happen to have met only a very short time ago the president of the company which is proceeding as rapidly as possible with the construction of a mill, the creation of water-power, the development of electricity, and the expenditure of $750,000 or $1,000,000 at this very place. When that report was made, it might have been justified, but I do not think it will be justified now. My information is that the company intend during the coming summer to employ in the vicinity of 500 men, so that the work would be entirely justified. Some few years ago a wharf was built there by the Government, and I understand that this vote is simply for repairs. I would like if the minister would reconsider the matter, because I think it would be quite a disappointment to these capitalists if they found that the Government was not disposed to give them any encouragement even to the extent of repairing a Government wharf. The result, I am sure, will be that they will have to spend the money themselves, because they have the capital; they are arranging for a large development, and they are actually at work to-day. They will require to take in a large quantity of machinery which, of course, they cannot take in unless they have wharf accommodation. Perhaps the minister would allow the item to stand, and then he can treat it like other items and go on with the work or not, as he may be advised later. I am sure my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has heard of the company which is proceeding to operate now on a very large scale.

Mr. ROGERS: The action that I am taking is on the recommendation of our engineer who, in December of last year, recommended that it was not necessary to have this item in the Estimates, and therefore we are asking to have it struck out. I have also this letter dated the 25th of February, 1916, written by G. B. Hull, the district engineer:

Department of Public Work, Canada.
District Engineer's Office.

Prince Rupert, B.C., Feb. 25th, 1916.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 17th inst. regarding my reports as to wharf at Surf Inlet, B.C.

A request for an appropriation to repair this wharf of $6,800, was made in September 1915, between that time and my report of December 21, the Tonopah Belmont Development Company bought all the land and mineral claims near the location of this wharf. They now control the foreshore on both sides of this inlet for a distance of a mile on each side. Previous to this time there were several people in the vicinity of the wharf, and the wharf was a public necessity, but since the Tonopah Belmont Development Company have taken over the mineral claims and the land even the lumber men have left and they are now the only occupants. I intended, and thought I had, made it clear in my report of December 21, but in reading it over I see that I have not done so, although I had requested in my report that the recommendation for an appropriation be cancelled.

The Tonopah Belmont Development Company is a very wealthy American mining Company

with large capital, and who intend erecting, not only a wharf, but stamp mills, power plant and residences near the location of this wharf, and they are plenty able to provide for themselves without the expenditure of any public money for their benefit; and as matters stand now a wharf built at this point would be practically of value to themselves alone. It is for this reason that I requested the cancellation of the Estimate sent in in September.

Fisherman running into this place for refuge do not need a wharf as the anchorage is good and will protect at all times from storms, and there is no doubt that should they desire to tie up the Development Company will have no objection to their doing so to the Company's wharf after it is constructed.

I am informed by the manager of this company that they intend filing their plans almost immediately for the approval of this structure.

J. B. Hunter, Esq.,
Deputy Minister,
Department of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Therefore they are undertaking the work themselves.

Motion agreed to.

Harbours and rivers generally, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose this is an item to do things for which you have no regular appropriation?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: It covers work throughout the whole of Canada.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: After you exhaust every other appropriation you resort to this one? It is a sort of reserve fund?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is the court of last resort.

New dredging plant—Ontario and Quebec, including Victoria island shipyard, $35,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: What will the new dredging plant include?

Mr. ROGERS: Construction of new tug to replace Marie Louise, $6,000, the hull and boiler of this tug have been condemned by the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries; track extension for derrick hoist from wharf to machine shop at Victoria island shipyard, $3,000; lengthening large shipways at Victoria island shipyard, $2,000; installation of a hand elevator, and altering shop for storage purposes at Victoria island shipyard, $1,000; one Daniel's plane, or equal, with motor at Victoria island shipyard, $1,500; one circular saw, complete, motor driven, at Victoria island shipyard, $1,000; four 25-ton Norton ball bearing jacks for Victoria island shipyard, $400; six oil tanks, 60 gallons' capacity each, at Victoria island shipyard, $300; one double end punching shear for Victoria island shipyard, $2,250; to provide improvements to different units of dredging plant fleet in Ontario and Quebec, $10,000; amount approximately required for unforeseen improvements to the Victoria island shipyard, $7,550; total, $35,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that dredging is needed at the entrance to Ha Ha bay on the river Saguenay? There is a large pulp mill established there. I understand that the company is building a large pier out of their own sources and they expect that the Government will help by doing some dredging. I am told the dredging is very much needed at the present time because they have four ships loading at this period of the year and they ship pulp to England, France, and the United States. If they could use the Government wharf which is near at hand, they would not require that dredging; but after several years of experience they find that the ordinary traffic on the river, the Richelieu company's boats and the other boats, tax the capacity of the wharf and they therefore have decided to build a wharf themselves, and they require a little dredging there. They expect the Government to start work as soon as possible in order that they may be able to ship their pulp to Europe and the United States. I would urge upon my hon. friend to take up the matter immediately.

Mr. ROGERS: This matter has already been discussed in the department. There is a pressing necessity for the dredging that the hon. gentleman suggests, and an engineer has been sent to make a report. As soon as that report is received I shall be glad to supply the information.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have a suggestion to offer. In dredging generally there has been a reduction from $2,307,000 to $1,703,000. The item for slides and booms generally is $5,000, the same as last year, and the item of Dominion bridges generally is $5,000, which is very small. The interprovincial bridge across the Ottawa at Hawkesbury, for which $80,000 is asked, will probably not be gone on with, and the same with the international bridge over the St. John river. Unless some hon. gentlemen wish to discuss some of these matters, I suggest that

after a word about the vote proposed here for the North Timiskaming bridge over the Quinze river, we might pass all down to and including item 150, and adjourn. What does the minister think of that proposition?

Mr. ROGERS: That will be quite satisfactory. The North Timiskaming bridge is over the Quinze river, and it is estimated that $55,000 will complete it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is the Quinze river in Quebec or in Ontario?

Mr. ROGERS: It is in the province of Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM: And I see that the Quebec Government is to contribute $15,000. So here is a precedent for carrying out works on the plan to which I called attention this afternoon. The structures at Ste. Anne's and Vaudreuil would be in the same position.

Mr. ROGERS: This North Timiskaming bridge is only about a mile from the boundary.

Mr. GRAHAM: But it is not so much of an interprovincial nature as bridges at Ste. Anne and Vaudreuil would be. This is a precedent for what I suggested this afternoon—the building of works of importance by co-operation of both Dominion and Provincial Governments even though the works be all in one province.

Mr. ROGERS: It is quite possible, of course.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would suggest further, with the minister's consent, that item 151 be taken up, as one of our friends from Prince Edward Island wishes to say a word upon it.

Telegraph and telephone lines—Prince Edward Island—for half cost of reconstruction of telegraph lines jointly owned by the Anglo-American Telegraph Company and the Dominion Government, $17,000.

Mr. HUGHES: Is this work to be done during the coming summer?

Mr. ROGERS: This is a jointly-owned line, as my hon. friend understands, of the Government and the Western Union. We have been awaiting an arrangement with the Western Union which, I understand, has now been arrived at and the work is proposed to be carried out at once.

11 p.m.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Anglo-American sold to the Western Union, or has it sold to the Great Northwestern?

Mr. ROGERS: To the Western Union.

Mr. HUGHES: This is the land line?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: The Government is bearing half the cost of reconstruction, and there is a subsidy as well, I believe, of $8,000 or $10,000.

Mr. ROGERS: There is a subsidy for the cable service between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, but not for this particular reconstruction.

Mr. HUGHES: These people are very economical in their service in some places on the island.

Mr. GRAHAM: In their service or in their rates?

Mr. ROGERS: The purpose of the vote is to correct that.

Mr. HUGHES: For instance, the company gets the services of operators free, for the railway station masters act as operators, and the only compensation given is that the telegraph company carries the railway messages free. In the town where I live the company is so economical that they will not even provide a boy to carry the telegraph messages, but the railway officials have to deliver the messages whenever they get time from their regular duties. I should think that a company that is receiving so many advantages ought to be compelled to give a better service. And when the last train has left—I think the latest train is about six o'clock—the station master closes his office and you cannot get a message through afterwards. Sometimes he generously keeps the office open when he knows that there is business to be done, but the company give him nothing for the extra work. I call the special attention of the minister to that. I think something should be done to compel the company to give a better service. At Charlottetown, perhaps, they give a service more suitable to the place, and at Summerside. But at Souris, for instance, where there is a good deal of business done and where a considerable portion of the time of the railway officials is taken up with telegraphic work, as I have pointed out the company will not even provide a boy to deliver messages but throws that work all upon the railway officials.

Mr. ROGERS: The object of this vote is to correct the very conditions to which my hon. friend refers. The details that are being worked out now will give an extended telegraph service to the locality and provide also for the delivery of messages as my hon. friend has suggested. Such service as is given by the telegraph lines in other portions of the Dominion will be applied in Prince Edward Island as well.

Mr. HUGHES: Will an extended service be given at Souris?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: That is much needed.

Mr. ROGERS: Delivery of messages will be provided for and other details of a similar character.

Mr. PROULX: I would like to ask the minister if he intends to have anything done this year with regard to the construction of the interprovincial bridge across the Ottawa river at Hawkesbury?

Mr. ROGERS: No, I do not think it will be possible to do anything this year.

Mr. PROULX: I understand that a contract has been awarded for the construction of the substructure?

Mr. ROGERS: No, the contract has not yet been awarded. My hon. friend is aware of the fact that there has been a great deal of pressure for the construction of this bridge. It has been the desire of the department to proceed with the work, but there was some delay in the beginning of 1914, and from that time on we have not undertaken to let the contract, much as we have been pressed to do so, and much as we appreciate the necessity for this bridge. I hope that the time will not be far distant when we shall be able to carry out this work, but I would not like to promise it for the coming summer.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.

Friday, April 28, 1916.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

The Speaker informed the House that he had directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table the reports of the Librarians of Parliament and of the Civil Service Commission in the matter of an increase of salary to Mr. Alfred Carter, accountant of the Library, together with His Honour's recommendation in the matter.

[Mr. J. J. Hughes.]

OMISSION FROM HANSARD.

DEBATES COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. SCHAFFNER presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates, as follows:

House of Commons,
Friday, 28th April, 1916.

The Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates beg leave to present the following as their second report:

Your committee have had under consideration the question of the accuracy of the report of a passage in the speech delivered by the Honourable the Minister of Militia and Defence on the 2nd March ultimo, which read as printed:

"There was no quarrel between that gentleman and myself as to who should dictate the patronage. The trouble was that I found something not exactly square and I did not care whether he was Grit or Tory, his head came off."

Your committee, upon inquiring into the matter, have found that the reporter, in the haste of transcription, accidentally omitted certain words, and that the accurate report, according to the reporter's notes, should read:

"There was no quarrel between me and the other gentleman as to who should dictate the patronage. The trouble was I found the fellow grafting, and when I found something not exactly square, I did not care whether he was Grit or Tory, his head came off."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) F. L. Schaffner,
Chairman.

THE DAVIDSON COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PUGSLEY: When may we expect the report of the Commission issued to Sir Charles Davidson to inquire into the purchase of various materials and supplies, submarines, etc.? It is stated in the newspapers that Sir Charles Davidson has handed a portion of the report to, among others, a clergyman, who was requested to look over it and give his opinion with regard to the purchase of submarines. If the report is ready to be handed out to private individuals, it surely ought to be submitted to this House. I have been told—I do not know how accurate my information is—that Sir Charles Davidson is ready to submit his report, and has offered to submit an interim report to the Government, but there has apparently been no expression of a wish on the part of the Government to have that report. That may or may not be true, but the min-

ister will be able to tell me when we may expect an interim report at least, giving the proceedings to date.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The report is pretty nearly concluded, and we may expect it to be finished almost any day. I do not suppose my hon. friend would take exception to the course pursued by the commissioner in trying to elicit all possible information in reference to a subject in which my hon. friend is interested, the purchase of submarines. In some respects a clergyman ought to be able to give information about such an engine of destruction, but whatever was shown to the clergyman was shown with an idea and a desire to elicit information from the witness in reference to some remarks or strictures that he had passed, based upon newspaper reports, and it was to complete, and to complete on a good basis, the evidence of the witness, that that portion of the report was handed to him. There was nothing improper in that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Was my hon. friend consulted by the commissioner? He seems to know a great deal.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I take my information from the newspapers, and from some remarks I have heard about the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My point was that if the report is in such a condition that an interim report can be shown to private individuals, it certainly ought to be submitted to this House, because Parliament is the body which is first entitled to receive the report of the commission and the evidence which has been taken by that commission.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend could argue that on the interim report. It was a page of the evidence which was shown to this witness, in order that he might be enabled to sustain or to withdraw or restrict the statement he had made with reference to the transaction, a statement which, I understand, he made on newspaper reports.

SASKATCHEWAN RIVER WATER SUPPLY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. KNOWLES: Will the Minister of Public Works tell us how the matter stands with regard to the gathering of data in connection with the supply of water to certain towns from the Saskatchewan river? There was, I think, a commission which undertook to gather data as to the cost, etc., of bringing water from the elbow of the Saskatchewan to different towns, including Regina and Moosejaw. The minister made some public utterance on the matter some time ago.

Mr. ROGERS: I have not in mind at present the exact standing of the matter. It has not been up for consideration for some little time, but I will be glad to look it up and give the hon. gentleman any information we have in the department.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE GRAIN ACT.

On Committee of Supply being called:

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Before the House goes into Committee of Supply I propose to make a short statement with reference to an item which is to be submitted in Committe of Supply—the vote for the administration of affairs under the Canada Grain Act. I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House in doing so, but I have found, in my experience, that when we get into Estimates the committee drifts off into some particular line of controversy, and the Estimates for a most important service may pass through the committee and be finally disposed of while no connected idea of what that service is is brought out by the questioning or is presented to the committee. So that, just for a few moments, I beg the indulgence of the House while I refer to this grain system of ours, which, in a way, is a most wonderful and important development.

When I took charge of the department in 1911, we had the Manitoba Grain Act and part 2 of the Inspection Act, under which the grain business of the West, in so far as it came under the supervision of the Government, was carried out. Besides that legislation, there had been examinations and reports of commissions with reference to a revision or consolidation or reenactment of the Grain Acts so as to bring them more into conformity with the necessities of the situation and with the growth of production in the West. Very valuable information had been gained before that in this way, as I have said, and in 1912 Parliament entered upon the work of perfecting that legislation, and the Canada Grain Act, much as it stands now, was the result of its labours. On the whole,

I think that Parliament was successful, by the co-operation of both sides of the House in a very friendly and frank way, in attaining a legislation which has stood the test of the four of five years which have passed, and has stood it well. Some more or less important amendments were made to the Act two years ago, and with these amendments the Act stands as it was passed in 1912. Under that Act, from 1911 to the present, a very large development has taken place.

The fundamental feature of that Act, as contrasted with the Act which preceded it, was in placing the administration of the grain system in the hands of a commission, with headquarters at Fort William, instead of, as under the old method, trying to administer the Act from the department here in Ottawa. Three gentlemen were selected who, I think, have justified their choice, and who, from 1911 to the present, have been continuously and busily engaged in the administration of that Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: I observe that there is no objection on the part of any hon. gentleman to the statement which the hon. minister is making, but I must draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is no motion before it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think we had better go into Committee, so that I may finish my statement. I seem to have got one day behind this week.

SUPPLY.

The House then went into Committee of Supply.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I was going on to mention the fundamental changes that were made in the legislation passed in 1912, and I was speaking of the formation of the board as one of the chief of those changes. Besides the administration of the Grain Act in the way of licensing, certification, weighing, and inspection generally, power was given to the board to construct elevators, and under that power action has been taken which will be detailed a little later. So that the Grain Board with its newly constituted powers had something more to do than simply to administer the clauses of the Grain Act referring more particularly to the carriage and inspection of grain.

Under votes of Parliament that have been granted, they have carried out those extraordinary duties in the construction of a large addition to our storage and elevator system. Looking at it, as it is now, it seems to me that Canada is one of the best equipped countries in the world, having regard to its population and its general resources. Outside of the United States of America, this is really the foremost country in the world in point of elevator equipment, not only as to capacity for storage, but as to the distribution and situation of the elevators, extending as they do from one coast to the other and being strategically, as it were, placed at the chief points for the reception and shipping of grain. Starting at Halifax, you have a storage capacity, small in extent, of 500,000 bushels; coming to St. John, you have a storage capacity of about 2,000,000 bushels; coming up then to Quebec you have a storage capacity of a little over 1,000,000 bushels; and at Montreal you have a storage capacity of 5,000,000 bushels. Then, you enter upon the large storage districts of our country, extending through the whole of Ontario, with the great heart and centre at Fort William, then stretching over the Northwest, until finally, at the harbour of Vancouver, the last finished of the series built by the Government is now just about ready for operation. It may surprise the House somewhat—it would one who has not looked into these matters— to know that the total storage capacity for grain in the Dominion of Canada is 172,000,000 bushels, which is a very large proportion of the total grain production of Canada that is liable to come under storage and transit conditions.

Passing from that, which is the general view, we have all kinds of elevators amongst those that I have mentioned. We have the private elevator; we have the hospital elevator for taking care of the sick grain of the country and nursing it back to health and substance again; we have the mill elevator for the convenience of the mills scattered through the country; we have the public elevator and the terminal or transfer elevators at the several ports. The Government elevators form a very considerable part of this whole system. Last year there were inspected of the grain of the country, at Winnipeg, 183,000 cars, amounting to 305,000,000 bushels, or a little over twice as much as was inspected at Winnipeg in the preceding year. That measures the activity of the grain industry and of the grain transit business through a centre like Winnipeg, which is the great debouching point for grain that is raised in the West, and which will remain so to a large extent, with the exception of what may be taken off

through western exits either towards the far East or via the Panama canal to European markets.

The Government elevator system commenced with the building of the terminal elevator at Fort William. I may say just in passing that the Government-controlled-and-owned elevators have a total capacity of 22,500,000 bushels, and that those that have been built and are operated under the Grain Board have a capacity of 14,000,000 bushels at the present time. As I have just stated, a big terminal elevator, with a capacity of 3,250,000 bushels, was built at Fort William, and has been in operation now for about three years. In the succeeding year the policy was adopted of having a number of internal storage elevators constructed, and the points that were chosen were Saskatoon, Moosejaw, and Calgary, with transfer port elevators, one at Vancouver and the other at Hudson bay, to be ready for work when that route, if it becomes a grain route to Europe, is opened up. The Government elevators are the most up-to-date of any elevators in the world. They are built on the most approved plans, they are all operated by electricity, they are all equipped with the latest and most effective drying machines, cleaning machines, and apparatus and choppers for the dockage, so as to chop or grind this refuse in a way which will destroy its fecundity and therefor diminish the weed troubles which might arise as it is being used throughout the country as fodder for stock. These Government storage elevators perform the office of furnishing to the people, where they would not otherwise have them in any degree, or to a very limited degree, opportunities for the treatment of grain that becomes damaged, for the cleaning of grain, for the drying of grain, and for the putting into condition the dockage and refuse which is fed to stock.

There is also this added benefit which has arisen from the Government elevators in the interior. Up to the time of the establishment of these elevators, the farmer at Red Deer, for instance, if he sold his grain, had to wait until that grain found its way to Winnipeg, was inspected there, and the certificate of its grade and weight came back to him at Red Deer. That might consume anywhere from 14 days to a month. In the meantime, he had no document upon which he could go to his bank and get advances on his grain. The fact that at Moosejaw, Saskatoon, and Calgary, which are now inspection points, this grain may be inspected and weighed and almost immediately thereafter the man may get his certificate and may take it to his financial man or bank and get advances upon it, is a very great benefit to the farmer.

In the matter of cleaning, it is surprising to find the quantity of dirt which is carried and paid for, if you sum up the total transit of grain from the place of its production to the ultimate point of its disembarkation. Whatever good arises from the cleansing of grain, in the way of making it a more saleable product, or in the way of preventing the cost of the carriage of useless material, which accrues to the farmers in the various districts and the producing centres, comes from the facilities which are given by these storage elevators.

These storage elevators, and the terminal elevator, involve an outlay of capital of $5,500,000; or it will be about that when the finishing touches are put upon the Vancouver elevator which, as I have said, is now about ready for work. That expenditure of $5,500,000 has resulted in providing a storage capacity of 14,000,000 bushels, with the incidental advantages of which I have spoken. It is gratifying to know that, as the people come to find what service may be rendered by these Government elevators, they are taking advantage of them. Last year and this year, I think I may say, the revenues which have been derived from the elevators have exceeded by a fairly good amount the expenditures which were necessary in order to have them carried on. The total revenues from the Government elevators last year were a little over $800,000; so that you see the whole matter forms quite an important business in itself.

In order to carry on the operations of that system, the department has, under the Board of Grain Commissioners, about 496 employees at work during the busy season. In 1912, the first year of the operation in the West under the new Grain Act, the number of permanent employees was 79; last year, 1915-16, there were 98; so that there has not been a very large increase in the number of permanent employees when we take into account the fact that whereas in 1912 there was only one elevator, in 1915-16, four elevators were being operated, which of course required a larger force. The increase in the number of employees is of the temporary class, who are employed chiefly during the busy period of the grain season. Under the Grain Commissioners and the Chief Inspector there are detachments of deputy inspectors, samplers, and trackmen, extending all through the sys-

tem; and, if one could visualize at any one time in the busy season the work of those men and the tremendous current of grain which passes under their supervision, and every bushel of which has to be inspected, certificated, and weighed, one would get a very pleasing idea of the busyness of the grain industry of the great West and of the country as a whole. These few remarks are all that I intend to make with reference to the general system.

I come now to another point, that is, to explain very briefly what has been asked from the beginning of the session, the commandeering of grain in November last. I have laid on the table of the House, and the members have it in their possession, a statement which covers all the essential facts; and those who have studied that statement will have the most of the information that I am able to give them this afternoon. The main circumstance which led up to the commandeering of the grain was the very large, and, to a certain extent, abnormal crop of wheat and of oats which was raised in Canada last year. The Government has been, in the different departments and as a whole, constantly on the alert for every opportunuity to direct the attention both of the British Government and of the allied Governments to the opportunities which they might have in Canada of providing for themselves those necessaries both as to food and other equipment which they needed for the work and sustenance of the war. This year not only had Canada a very large crop of grain, particularly wheat and oats, but the production of the world was very large. Our neighbours to the south had their bumper crop—a larger crop than had ever before been reaped in the United States. Australia, which the year before had had a failure in her wheat crop, and had been obliged, as also had New Zealand, to import grain from far-distant countries, Canada included, last year had a bumper crop of wheat, a very large amount of which was available for export. Therefore the Government, in pursuance of its policy of being alive to the necessities of the case and the opportunities that might occur, was especially anxious to call the attention of Great Britain, which had more knowledge of Canada, and of the allied governments of France and Italy, which had not so much knowledge of this country's capabilities, to the possibility of their supplying their wants from Canada and to the advisability of their throwing as much of that trade as they possibly could into the hands of Canada, which was supporting the war. Not that we wished to be paid in any way for what we were doing in reference to the war; but, naturally enough, if supplies were to be bought, we urged that due regard should be given to allied countries which were especially well situated to supply certain lines of demand. Negotiations running over two or three months were constantly in hand, and at last on the 23rd of November an order was received, practically from the Allies' commission, but through the British Government, asking the Canadian Government to procure for them a large quantity of wheat. The cablegram was received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Right Hon. Bonar Law. It is well to remember the date, because nothing could be done towards filling the order until it came to hand. Whatever negotiations were under way, whatever prospects were held out, not a step could be taken to procure a single bushel of grain until the definite order to procure the grain was received.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That order has not yet been laid upon the Table.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the memorandum which I laid upon the Table, I mentioned the fact and, I think, the date, and I said to my right hon. friend that the cablegram which covered the order traversed to a certain extent the previous negotiations and covered a wider range than the order, and that it was not thought wise to lay it upon the table of the House, but that if my right hon. friend wished to see it I would be very glad to let him peruse it. That is the way in which that matter stands at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister have any objection to giving us now his summary of the purport of the cablegram which constituted the order, eliminating those parts which have nothing to do with it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The purport of the order, in so far as it affects Canada and the purchase of wheat by Canada, can be summed up in a very few words. It was an order to purchase a very large quantity of wheat.

Mr. OLIVER: A given quantity?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The given quantities which were to be bought at that time were preceded by negotiations which looked towards other quantities, and this first

purchase was as a commencement and, in one way, as a reserve to be drawn upon as it was needed; so that the meaning and significance of the order, looking to preceding negotiations, was that we were authorized immediately to commence purchasing. There was the desire not only to have the grain purchased, but to get it just as quickly as possible. The urgency of the order together with the date at which it came, the 23rd of November, made it necessary for the Government to act quickly. The 23rd of November brings you pretty close to the very active season of shipping, pending the close of navigation on the lakes. The Government had to decide how the purchase should be made.

Right here let me say frankly and decidedly that the British Government did not dictate to the Canadian Government any method to be employed in procuring that grain,—I suppose they never thought of such a thing. All we were asked to do was to purchase the grain. There are three ways in which the grain might have been purchased. Judging from remarks I have heard in the House it seems to have been thought by some, and it may be thought still, that the better way would have been to have gone to the West and buy direct from the individual farmers the grain that was required. I think a little consideration will make it clear that that would not have been a wise method to pursue. In the first place, it was not possible. We could not have sent to the farmers of the West a number of buyers and by any possibility have got the grain to Fort William before the closing of lake navigation; and that, if there were no other consideration, precluded the adoption of that method of purchase. Another method of purchase was to select brokers and have them buy on the grain exchanges the amount required, some 12,000,000 bushels more or less. The first objection to that is that you pay a large commission. The Government was in the place of the purchaser and to a large extent trustee for the purchaser, and, consequently, it was its duty to buy the grain at the very best possible price.

Mr. OLIVER: Did the order convey any statement as to price?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Nothing. Then, as to the use of brokers; if the business had been done through only one broker difficulty would have arisen, and if more than one broker had been employed competition would have arisen. The moment a government begins to purchase grain on the exchanges, no matter how secretly, there is telepathic connection which makes the information common in a very short time, and then the knowledge that the Government is purchasing and that brokers are competing for grain for the Government causes an increase in the price and may lead to a very large increase. A year before this operation, European governments commenced buying grain in Canada and the United States. They bought openly. As a result the market went wild and the prices rose rapidly, away beyond any actual value. Those prices, of course, could not be maintained, but they were very uneconomical and expensive to the countries that were buying. Taking these things into consideration, and after having taken the best advice they could get and studying the question for what time was allowed them—for there was not much time left—the Government came to the conclusion that the fairest way all round was to take possession of the grain by commandeering it. As a result of their decision, on the 27th of the month they sent an order to the Government elevators at Fort William and the public elevators in eastern Canada and the Government-controlled elevators, to retain all wheat in store at that hour, of the grades of No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3, and reserve it for the use of the Government. That was done, and as a result 10,300,348 bushels of these grades was commandeered at the head of the lakes and 3,321,458 bushels in the eastern elevators, a total of 13,621,806 bushels. The price which was current on the day when the commandeering order passed was the price paid for that grain, $1.04⅜ for No. 1 Manitoba, and proportionate prices for No. 2 and No. 3. The market before that had been on the upgrade, not violently, but still upwards. That being the case, I think we are justified in concluding that every man whose grain was taken stood to lose nothing on the money he had invested in the grain. If he were not a speculator, if he were not holding for a profit, if he were disposed to be just the seller for the day, he received a fair and equitable price for his grain. He had an honest price, whether he got a speculative price or not. There is this consideration also, that the grain which was bought was held mainly by middlemen. Had the Government gone on the market and bought grain from day to day at ascending prices, the man who bought the

grain at lower prices would have been the one to profit by the increased price brought about by the purchase. But, in commandeering, that state of affairs cannot obtain; you commandeer and you have the grain on the instant and at the current price of the day. After the buying of a large quantity of grain by the Government, even by the commandeering process, the idea gets abroad that possibly more will be bought. In any case, a very large quuantity has been taken out of the market and out of the hands of the holders, and these people must go back to the primary source, to the farmer, to replenish the store. Then, whatever increase in price takes place in commandeering, or shortly after, while the re-purchase is going on, redounds to the benefit of the producer, or primary holder, that is, to the farmer himself. I grant that difficulties have to be met, and would have had to be met under any form of purchase; but, taking all things into consideration, I believe that the method followed was the best for the Allies. They got the grain at the current rate of that day, at one equable and honest price, and had to pay nothing by way of increased valuation which would have taken place if the grain had been bought on the instalment plan from day to day on rising prices. So that the Government performed its duty as trustee of the allied nations by getting the grain for them without paying a commission price, at the current rate of the day, and without the risk of any increasing prices which might be due to the buying of grain by the Allies in the market.

An additional reason why haste was a factor in the arrangement when that grain was commandeered was that as much as possible of the grain should, in the interests of the allied nations, be got out before the freezing up of the lakes and at the cheapest possible rate of carriage. That also was a factor in determining the Government to commandeer the grain. When the grain was commandeered, difficulties arose: we knew that they would arise; but it was possible to mitigate those difficulties. The first difficulty was this: if 10,000,000 bushels of grain taken by the Government, which was in store at the head of the lakes awaiting an opportunity to utilize the short period of lake transit which was left to it before the closing of navigation, had remained in the hands of the Government, any person who had wished after that date to take advantage of lake transit would have had to commence by a re-purchase, which on the most rapid arrangement would have made him late by days and perhaps by weeks in getting to Fort William and making ready for transit by the lakes. Some method, therefore, had to be arranged by which there should not be a stoppage of the outflow of the grain by the lakes for the limited period of lake traffic that remained. That difficulty was got over in a way that is usual at Fort William and at such places. The grain commissioners loaned that grain to those who had vessels in readiness and who wished to get their grain out to the United States lake ports or to the eastern lake ports of Ontario, keeping the bill of lading, a perfect security, under the condition that the grain was to be replaced within ten days. Some 7,500,000 bushels were thus loaned, and from the morning of the day after the commandeering when that system was adopted, to the night of Tuesday, 10,000,000 bushels took water at Fort William—a record output in the history of the lake ports. No barrier, therefore, was opposed to the quick and ready transit of grain by the only water route which was available for a short period of time. Every bushel of this grain was restored and got into transport condition at the head of the lakes within ten days from the time that the loan was made. Thus was that difficulty overcome.

4 p.m.

The next difficulty that arose was this: Nearly all the eastern millers of Ontario had grain in the eastern elevators or at Fort William—almost entirely in the eastern elevators—which they expected to get quickly by the lake route in order to keep their mills going. The mills do not hold much in reserve. Indeed, many of them hold scarcely anything in reserve; they hold it in the elevator and take it out from day to day or from week to week as they require it. When this grain in the eastern elevators was commandeered the supply of the mills was entirely cut off. In order to keep the mills supplied with grain and to provide against the closing of the mills, many of which were engaged on contracts for flour for the allied Governments, we adopted this arrangement; we unconditionally released all grain that was commandeered in the eastern elevators, upon the deposit with the Government of a guarantee by the millers that the grain had been bona fide contracted for and that it was to be ground

up in their mills and used for no other purpose. We released about 1,900,000 bushels of grain from the commandeer; that grain went into the hands of the millers, and the millers' operations went on just the same as if there had been no commandeer. This provided for that difficulty. It reduced the total quantity of commandeered grain by that amount; but you could not go into these elevators and commandeer a portion of the grain; you had to commandeer the whole, and the total commandeer was a little more than was necessary for the supply of the allied nations for the months of December and January.

Mr. KNOWLES: How much would have actually supplied the requirements of the Allies for the two months that my hon. friend mentions?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I could not tell my hon. friend how much. Purchases are still being made on account of the Allies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: By the Government?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, not by the Government.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister referred to two specific months, and said that a certain amount was too much.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did, because certain quantities were to be delivered each month.

Mr. MARCIL: Did this commandeered grain leave the country by Canadian ports?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will come to that in the course of my narrative.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I understand the minister to say that the reason for the commandeering of about 13,000,000 bushels of grain was the urgency of the occasion. He says that 7,500,000 bushels of the grain that was commandeered was loaned to the shipping companies and a further 1,900,000 bushels as loaned to the millers. That would leave 3,000,000 bushels for the use of the Allies. If that was all the Allies required for six months, why was the commandeering not confined to that 3,000,000 bushels?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think the answer to that is very easy. Before a single ship could be sent or ordered to be sent to an Atlantic port, there had to be a certainty that the grain would be there for it when it came, and it was impossible to buy grain and send it down to the seaboard in driblets. It was absolutely necessary that there should be a certainty of an ample supply of grain in order that the Allies might intelligently arrange for its transportation. It is true that 7,500,000 bushels were loaned out of the Fort William elevators, and loaned for a period the utmost limit of which was 10 days; but that was not subversive in the least of the system which the Allies would put into operation for carrying their grain. Even if, on the day of the commandeer, and when a cablegram went that so much grain had been secured, the Allied Governments had been able to send ships out, the ships could not have reached Atlantic ports before the return of the grain that had been loaned and its gradual movement to the Atlantic seaboard. The difficulty that arose was along this line: Bona fide contractors, with the Old Country purchasers for grain, found that by this commandeer the grain which they had contracted for with those purchasers, and for the transport of which cargo space had been taken—and the cargo space itself was coming across the ocean and must be met here—could not be procured, and that, if the commandeer remained upon that grain, and there was no condition under which they could fulfil their contract except by going back to the West, purchasing a new supply, and bringing it down to the seaboard, much of it necessarily having to come by rail, it would have been quite impossible, in many cases, for them to have carried out their contracts on time, and the vessels would have had to wait in port to be loaded, with heavy demurrage. The arrangement made to overcome that difficulty was this: To the man who had a bona fide contract with British purchasers and who showed the evidence of that contract, we released the quantity of grain required to fill that contract, and he gave us his undertaking and deposited his guarantee that he would return that grain, in store, at a certain time. Under that arrangement no difficulty of any moment arose with reference to the bona fide contract men who were exporters of Canadian grain to the British market. Some trouble and some confusion was no doubt caused; but at the same time I must say, in justice to both grain holders and grain buyers, in Winnipeg, in Montreal, in Toronto, all along the line, that, although they would have preferred that the commandeer had not taken place, they took it in good spirit.

They fell in with our plans and did not object very strongly. There was, on the whole, a hearty co-operation with the Government in the carrying out of the arrangements that made it possible for them to keep their contracts.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister said the grain was loaned to people having contracts. What was the limit of the time for which it was loaned?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That grain was to be returned at different dates, and those dates were, as nearly as possible, arranged in connection with our knowledge of the possibility of vessels coming to receive it, and being able to get here at certain dates.

Mr. KNOWLES: Did all of that grain have to be returned before the close of navigation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. Very little of the export grain could be returned before navigation closed. That grain would have to be returned after navigation closed, and returned in store at Fort William, which was done. So that those three arrangements which I have tried to explain, carried out in connection with the commandeer, caused the least possible confusion and derangement of the grain trade, and, on the whole, I think it has worked out exceedingly well.

I know that some criticisms will come. One criticism will be founded upon a question which will be asked: Has all of this grain gone out yet? I answer to that: No. Then the further question will be asked: Why were you in such a hurry to get the grain on the 27th day of November if it has not all been carried out up to this date? This much I shall say, that there has been always more grain ready for loading than could be carried by the ships provided by the Allies to transport it from our ports; and the balance of the grain will probably not leave our ports before the middle of May, when the last of it will be taken out from the port of Montreal. Just about the time of the commandeering of the grain, the difficulty of obtaining tonnage for the Allied powers for the operations of the war and other operations subsidiary to them became acute; and, although Italy, one of the allied powers, was in great need of that grain, in dire need of it—because Italy, before the war had been declared, had carried on a very brisk trade with Germany and had sold a large proportion of her wheat to Germany, so that when the war was declared between Italy and Germany—Italy came into the war—

Mr. MARCIL: Italy and Austria. Italy is not at war with Germany.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Anybody can sleep on that who wishes. It does not appear to me that they are very friendly with each other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They could buy and sell though.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In a technical point of view, no war has been declared. That is true. But, in the other point of view, Italy is doing her level best to destroy the cause of the Teutonic Allies, and doing it with a bravery and a consistency that has not been excelled by any nation which has been engaged in the war. So that, intervening, was this extreme scarcity of tonnage; and, although there has been necessity for the quickest possible transit of that grain, it has been impossible for them to provide the vessels necessary more speedily than they have done. Three-fourths of that grain has already left the Atlantic seaports, and probably a little more than one-fourth remains yet to be taken out. Now, I think that is all the statement I have to make with reference to the commandeering.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: For whose benefit was the wheat bought?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As I think my statement shows, the wheat went into the hands of the Allied Commission in London. That is a commission on which representatives from Italy and Russia and France and Great Britain sit. There may be some others on it, but these are the principal representatives, and they are under the presidency, or chairmanship, of a British official. That Allied Commission purchases supplies of every kind necessary for the war, or for the sustenance of the people engaged in the war. They have their methods of finance arranged in conjunction with Great Britain, and they sit there as a commission, receive bids, make contracts, and make purchases, and they do this in common session. The moment that the grain commandeered was in our possession it was handed over, at exactly the cost and charges that were incurred, to this Allied Commission, and from that time it has been under their charge as to its disposal. They asked the Department of Trade and Com-

merce to undertake the supervision of that grain from the point where we procured it to the seaboard, and to see that it met the ships at the different ports. My department undertook that supervision and has been carrying it out.

Mr. MARCIL: Are these Canadian ports?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They are not all Canadian ports. Wherever the Allied Commission, which is providing the vessels, could get a vessel to go most conveniently and most economically, they asked us to send the wheat, and this wheat has been provided and loaded at ports from Baltimore in the South to Halifax and St. John in the North.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The commission has purchased also in the United States.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think that that commission is purchasing very much in the United States, but the Allied Governments are making purchases in the United States. I think these purchases are very largely through other agencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has this commission purchased any wheat in Canada besides what the Government purchased for it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think I may say that before that time, and since that time, the countries represented on that commission have purchased in Canada, and purchased very largely.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I see by the correspondence brought down that France purchased direct in Canada without the intervention of this commission. I know—it is public knowledge—that the Allied Governments have been purchasing largely in Canada. What I want to know is whether that commission has purchased in Canada from private parties in addition to what was purchased through the Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, the commission has purchased, and is purchasing.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this the only occasion on which the Government was called upon to commandeer?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend must not put it in that way; he must not say that the Government was called upon to commandeer. The Government was not called upon to commandeer; it was called upon to purchase. Commandeering was resorted to a year ago, or a little more, when a quantity of oats was secured in that way for the French and British Governments, I think.

Sir WILFRED LAURIER: The action taken by the Government in the month of November last, at the end of the season, was absolutely exceptional, and no such action should be taken by a government except under exceptional circumstances. A government should not interfere so as to dislocate trade in any way, or to raise an obstacle to the ordinary channels of trade unless there is an absolute necessity for doing so. So far as my information goes, and I think it is perfectly accurate—it is within the knowledge of everybody—no government anywhere ever commandeered any commodity except for the purpose of immediately supplying the people for consumption. There may, perhaps, be circumstances where a different course has been pursued, but, as a rule, no commandeering of any commodities ever took place in any country unless there was a possibility of famine in the particular commodity, and the government saw that the people were suffering. In this instance, the Government received information, as my hon. friend says, on the 23rd of November last that the Allied Nations were wanting wheat. In the statement which he places before the House my hon. friend proceeds as follows:

> Early in the autumn of 1915 when it became evident that Canada, in common with the United States and Australia, would have large surpluses of wheat for export, representations were made to the British Government with a view of interesting it and the Allied Governments in the purchase from Canada of a generous portion of the large quantities they would undoubtedly require.

That was certainly a very commendable action on the part of the Government—to try to enlist at once the good-will of the Allied Nations and to see that they supplied themselves in Canada with a commodity of which we had a large surplus. Then my hon. friend goes on to say:

> These representations were successful and on November 23, instructions were cabled to the Canadian Government by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to purchase a large quantity, delivery to begin in December and continue for the following months.

It would have been sufficient to draw the attention of the Allies to the fact that we had a very large crop in Canada, and then to leave the ordinary channels of trade to supply the necessities of the Mother Country and the Allied nations. The Government, however, thought they would go into the business themselves; they became pur-

chasers of wheat for the benefit of the Allied nations, and the result of their efforts was to secure the magnificent quantity of 13,000,000 bushels. That was all they could do or all that they attempted to do. When there was a surplus available for sale of at least 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in the month of November, my hon. friend, by the method he adopted, secured 13,000,000 bushels. Was there any necessity for that action? What purpose was served, or what benefit accrued to anybody from it? What reason was there for dislocating trade, as it was dislocated at the moment—so much so that two days afterwards my hon. friend was obliged to see that that man got his quantity and that other man got his quantity, that the shippers got their quantity, and the millers their quantity—what was the reason for such action if the object could have been accomplished just as effectively by the ordinary methods of trade, which would have been far better than the the extraordinary methods followed by the Government. My hon. friend has attempted to justify himself, and I do not think that he has made out a case at all for resorting to this extraordinary process. He said that the wheat was bought without any commission, but every purchaser is prepared to pay commission where the ordinary methods of trade are followed, and there is no reason at all why the ordinary methods of business, which are legitimate, should not have been followed. There is no reason why. The only excuse for it is that it was a case of necessity. My hon. friend is aware that at the time this extraordinary, this despotic, action was taken by the Government, there were serious complaints coming from all over Canada from men in the business that the Government were interfering with their legitimate operations, and up to this day I have not heard a single good reason why this extraordinary action of the Government was taken. I submit that there was no excuse for the Government to interfere, and that these operations should have been left to the trade. At the very moment when my hon. friend was taking this extraordinary action, the French Government, as appears from the correspondence which my hon. friend has brought down, was a purchaser of grain in Canada, and my hon. friend seized part of the grain which belonged to the French Government, and which had been purchased on their behalf by the Hudson Bay Company. Was there any reason why my hon. friend should not have employed either the Hudson Bay Company or other operators rather than by arbitrary action to take hold of the grain that was on the lakes and in the hands of the operators at that time? Whilst in times of war we are not disposed to be critical, at the same time I submit very sincerely that there was no justification whatever for such action.

There is another thing: I do not see why the whole of the correspondence has not been brought down. My hon. friend knows the rule of this House, that if a public document is quoted it must be laid on the Table. My hon. friend said that there were some parts of the correspondence that were confidential. Anything that is confidential I do not ask for, but what is not confidential should have been brought down for the information of the House. That is the rule that has always been followed. The whole of the correspondence has not been brought down. I see by the return that an Order in Council was passed on the 4th December last. This order in council was afterwards cancelled and was replaced by another one which is in these terms:

> The minister further reports that the action which he has taken for the above purpose is set forth in the telegrams, copies of which are hereto appended, and that the instructions given in the messages signed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Solicitor General were sent after consultation with him and at his request in pursuance of the proposed appropriation and control of the wheat aforesaid.

The last paragraph of this Order in Council, which was passed on the 8th December, is in these words:

> The minister recommends that the Order in Council P.C. 2873, respecting the appropriating of wheat, passed on the 4th day of December, 1915, be repealed.

That is to say, they first passed an Order in Council on the 4th December, and four days afterwards, on the 8th December, this Order was repealed and replaced by the one to which I have alluded. The first Order in Council was not brought down. I suppose it is not very material, but still the order of the House was to bring down all the correspondence, and in this the order of the House has not been carried out. Then, here is something that appears to be very strange. There is another Order in Council passed on the 8th January, in which it is stated that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Finance recom-

mend that " in order to in part effectuate the provisions of the Order in Council of the 4th December, 1915, ratifying the appropriating " of wheat and so on, a certain disposition be taken. But the Order in Council of the 4th December had been already repealed. On the 8th January, in order to effectuate the Order in Council of December 4, an Order in Council is passed, notwithstanding the fact that the Order in Council of December 4 had been repealed. I just make these comments, because it seems to me that the whole thing is very irregular. Whilst I am not disposed to insist upon the irregularity of the proceeding, still it is a thing which ought not to be repeated. The last statement made by my hon. friend showed that there was absolutely no necessity for the proceeding. He acted suddenly, saying there was great necessity for having it done immediately. The purchase was made on the 27th November, before the close of navigation, but the wheat had not all been delivered to the allied nations that purchased it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then where was the necessity?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I anticipated that criticism, and I have answered it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the answer?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When my right hon. friend finishes his remarks I will answer him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Now he gives us the excuse that it was impossible to secure tonnage to expedite the shipments. Everybody knows that, but if my hon. friend had not the tonnage to expedite shipment there was no necessity for any such hurry to commandeer the wheat. If there was to be any benefit to anybody on account of the condition of the wheat market, certainly the vendors, the producers, were entitled to it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no fault to find with the remarks of my right hon. friend in the way of criticism at this moment, not in the least. If he had been leading a government at that time, and the circumstances had developed exactly as they did, and it had come to the point where action was necessary, he might not have had acted in the same way that this Government did, but his Minister of Trade and Commerce might have adopted a different method of procuring action along the lines which he has indicated would have been best, and might not have taken the method which we took. It is simply a question of the judgment of the purchasing authority—the Government in this case—as to the conditions at the time of the purchase and the necessities of the case. Upon the conditions as they were, and the necessities of the case, this Government came to the conclusion that they must get that grain and get it at once, because it was necessary to have it.

I will take up in order what has been stated by my right hon. friend by way of objection. First, he said that commandeering should never be resorted to as a general rule, and has never been resorted to, except in the case of some great necessity in the country itself, such as lack of food, where privation, if not starvation, must ensue unless the Government commandeers, takes hold of, and feeds out gradually and by ration, as it were, what is necessary to prevent such privation or starvation from taking place. But there are other circumstances in which, upon the very same principle, commandeering might take place. I have mentioned the condition of Italy in reference to the shortage of wheat. The shortage of wheat in Italy at that time was absolutely acute. The information was before the Government that Italy needed a certain quantity of wheat, as much or more than the wheat which was commandeered, and that they needed it absolutely at that time. There was no bargain that the Government here was to prepare or supply the tonnage which should carry the wheat. The necessity was there. Italy and the other allied Governments were to look after the wheat being carried, and at the time that order was given the expectation here was—and no other expectation could have been formed under the circumstances—that that quantity of wheat was absolutely necessary, would be called for, and would be taken out of the country within a very short time. Now, what I have stated, I think, is absolutely plain and fair. What I stated was that acute scarcity of tonnage supervened, which made it impossible for the Italian Government, with the aid of the British Government and the Allied Governments, to get sufficient ships to carry that wheat out at once, and Italy's needs had to be and were to a certain extent met by going to another market and getting what she wanted from another source.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: When was the wheat shipped to Italy and how much was shipped ?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Wheat has been shipped ever since and is being shipped now.

Mr. MARTIN: Was any wheat shipped to Italy say, within six weeks after the commandeering took place?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think there was.

Mr. MARTIN: By the commandeering of the wheat we did not assist any dire need in Italy, because Italy would have been in need yet so far as the action of this Government is concerned.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend may think that is a criticism, but I hardly agree with him. If we had known everything, if we had known that this intervention of scarcity of tonnage would take place and that the Italian Government would not be able to get the tonnage to send for the wheat when we expected them to send for it and to get it, and if we had acted upon that knowledge, then we could have taken our time and have procured the wheat from time to time and in driblets.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I do not wish to interrupt the minister, but it seems to me that if the commandeering of the supply of wheat was such an absolutely urgent matter at that time, it would have been an easy matter for the Government to ascertain whether there were available vessels in which to take that wheat out.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It was not the duty of this Government to find the vessels. When an order comes for wheat and when there is urgency for that order, you fulfil it under the circumstances and conditions as they are at the time. If something intervenes so that the shipping cannot be found, and the wheat cannot be sent forward, that comes afterwards; it is not within the knowledge of the purchasing party at the time the purchase is made.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask a question?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Will you allow me to go on until I answer the objections of my right hon. friend ? I will take his question after I get through. He must always give way to his leader.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says every purchaser is prepared to pay a commission. He argued that the consideration that this wheat got in that way would not have to cost more to the Allied Governments was not a tenable one, because every one who purchased knew that a commission was to be paid. Well, I would not like to say that in cases of war necessity—and this was war necessity—it is good doctrine that, even if you can get wheat at a lower price by paying no commission, it is still well to adhere to the course of trade and pay a commission. My right hon. friend is on dangerous ground when he presses an argument of that kind.

My right hon. friend says that the Order in Council of the 4th of December was not brought down. There is no objection to its being brought down. After the Order in Council was passed, it was found to be defective in certain respects, and instead of passing an order just to amend that Order in Council, and leave them both with efficacy, the Government thought that the best way, as is often done, was to embody the first Order in Council in the second, with the amended portions, and pass the one Order in Council covering the whole thing. I will give my right hon. friend the first Order in Council at any time if he thinks it is necessary to have it.

Then, he made a statement with reference to the Order in Council of January 8 being based on the Order in Council of December 4, which was cancelled. Perhaps that may be technically a ground for criticism, but the Order in Council of December 4 was virtually in and formed the substance of the amended Order in Council which was passed on December 8, The Order in Council of January 8, was, I think, largely for the purpose of financing the whole arrangement. If my right hon. friend would like to know what the arrangement was, I may say that a credit was opened with the Bank of Montreal, which advanced the money necessary to pay for this wheat as the payments fell due, that the Government stood behind that loan as a guarantor of it, and that the whole of that amount has already and long since been paid off.

Now, if my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has a question? Maybe my hon. friend wants to make a speech instead of to ask a question.

Mr. KNOWLES: I will surprise my hon. friend by not making a speech. I would like to know who initiated the whole business? Did the proposition start from this

Government or on a request from the Old Country?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have already answered that half a dozen times, I think. I said as plainly as a man could say that the British Government never indicated to this Government how it should procure that wheat—whether it should buy it under commission, buy it by an agent or broker, go to the farmers and buy it direct, or how it should buy the wheat. Our order was simply to procure the wheat for them, and this Government takes the whole responsibility of the method it took to procure the wheat.

Mr. KNOWLES: I did not ask the minister with regard to details of that kind. The minister was proceeding to say that it was none of the business of this Government how the wheat could get to Italy. I thought it was an opportune time to ask him who first opened negotiations looking towards this Government being the instrument of getting the wheat across. Did this Government take the first step towards facilitating the supplying of wheat, or did the request come from the Old Country because of the dire need of Italy, and so on?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend must have that information. The whole action was based upon the statement that with the supply that we had the Government was anxious to direct all possible purchases of wheat to this country; and from the time the crop began to be garnered until the order came we were in constant communication with reference to supplying not only wheat but other supplies and necessaries to the Allied Governments; and you may say if you like that the suggestion came from this Government to the Allied Governments asking them sympathetically to consider all possible purchases of supplies from Canada, and that after negotiations had gone on for a certain time in respect to this and many other things, this order came for the purchase of wheat.

Mr. BURNHAM: Has fault been found with the minister for not having commandeered more wheat when he was at it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know. Fault may have been found in a great many ways. That has not come particularly to my mind, although I do recollect now, when my hon. friend mentions it, that some persons were strongly in favour of our commandeering the whole western crop.

Mr. BURNHAM: I thought my right hon. friend was in favour of it.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend has favoured the House with a speech in two parts, one dealing with the question of elevator accommodation and the actions of the Grain Commission for the Government's handling of the grain trade generally, and the second part dealing with the details of the commandeering of wheat last fall, which is probably one of the most controversial matters that could be brought up in the House of Commons. The whole question of the Government's handling of the grain trade of Canada is necessarily important in the last degree, and, being important, is necesarily controversial. If I take the opportunity of criticising the policy of the Government and its administration in regard to its handling of the grain trade generally, I hope it will not be said that I am doing so particularly from partisan motives.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not at all.

Mr. OLIVER: It is desirable that there should be a clear understanding as to whether the policy pursued by the Government is the best policy or not the best policy, and, as some of us hold differing views, it is our duty to place those views before the country.

The minister spoke of the amount of elevator accommodation in Canada and expressed the opinion that very satisfactory conditions exist in this country in regard to the transportation and handling of grain. He said we were probably the best-situated country in the world in this respect, at any rate next to the United States. He said that we have a splendid system of handling grain, one of our advantages being that grain is handled under the Grain Commission and in part through elevators which are the property of the Government and are under the control of the commission. This, of course, brings up the question whether the Government has used the best judgment in the interests of the country in its location of the elevators, in the expenditure of money upon these elevators, and generally the results of their policy to the producers of the grain. I apologize for introducing a matter so controversial, but it is necessary that we should know where we are at in this matter. I am compelled, therefore, to recall to attention the fact that before the present Government took office, in the contest which resulted in their taking office, it

was declared to be the definite fixed policy of the leader of the party which is now in power,—declared from platform after platform throughout the Prairie Provinces—to take control of the terminal elevators if they were returned to power. This Government has not implemented that promise made by the present Prime Minister, then leader of the Opposition. Far from it; instead of assuming the control of the terminal elevators, by which means alone it is admitted on all hands it is possible to maintain efficient control of the handing and distribution of grain, the Government has spent a large amount of money in elevators, but not for the purpose—and not with the result—of reaching that end. They have spent large sums, not to say enormous sums, ostensibly in the direction of implementing their promise. They have built one elevator at Fort William. But we have the authority of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, expressed last year if I remember well, or, if not, the year before, that it was not possible for the Government to regulate the grain trade by its control of that elevator. So far from the Government being able to regulate the grain trade through that elevator, the minister admitted that the operation of the elevator was subject to the general conditions governing the grain trade—that is, the Government's policy at Fort William was controlled by the conditions instead of the Government controlling the conditions, which was the pledge of the Prime Minister before he became Prime Minister. In the line of attempting to meet the needs of the grain trade, but without actually implementing the promise made, the Government has seen fit to establish what are called internal elevators at three important points in the grain-producing areas of the West.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce has been good enough to place before the House very lucidly the ostensible purpose of establishing these elevators and the results expected from their operation. Everybody will be glad if these elevators achieve the purpose that the minister has laid before the House as that for which they were established. But, up to the present time, they certainly have fallen very far short of achieving either that, or, I might almost say, any other purpose. For, until this year, there was practically no grain in these elevators, and this year the grain that is in them has been, in large measure, forced into them by the regulations and control established by the Grain Commission for that very purpose. The grain is not there because it naturally flowed into these elevators; nor was it caused to flow there by anything that the minister set forth to-day; but the grain is there in large measure because the regulations of the Grain Commission and the Railway Commission have sent it there. The fact remains that the expectations, if they were as stated, have not been realized, and the expenditure made has been of very little effect. There may come a time, as I said the other night, when weather conditions may be such that these elevators will be useful as drying plants; but, as elevators for the storage of grain for export, they have not, up to the present time, served any useful purpose.

I recall that when this matter was under discussion before the expenditure was made it was indicated by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), then Minister of the Interior, that the Government had in view at that time that such elevators would be of great advantage to the milling industry of Canada. I can easily conceive how they would be of great advantage to the western milling industry, or even to the eastern milling industry; but as to their being of advantage to the producer, the bulk of whose grain still must find an export market, I am sorry to say, however good the intentions may be, the results have not been what were expressed.

The Government has spent money in building magnificent elevators where elevators were not an urgent necessity—they may be useful in time to come, but they have not been an urgent necessity up to the present time; but it has not spent money to build elevators where, during the present year, elevators have been urgently needed, that is to say, at Quebec and at St. John. Had the elevator accommodation which is now provided in the interior of the prairies been located at Quebec and at St. John the grain could have been brought forward during the winter, stored at Quebec awaiting the opening of navigation there, or carried through to St. John and sent forward during the winter as transport offered. My hon. friend said the other night that there was not any transport to take it. Well, as I have said to him on other occasions, he proves too much. If that can be proved, then we are simply out of business, and we cannot afford to be in that position.

We needed the elevator accommodation at Quebec. We knew that we were going to need it, because we were building at enormous expense a railroad to carry grain, winter and summer, to that point. We did not provide the accommodation there or at St. John, and we have suffered. We have to-day millions of bushels of grain in the Prairie West, at the head of the lakes and west of the head of the lakes, that should have been at tide water waiting every opportunity of being taken across the ocean. Moreover, our railroads would have been employed in carrying the grain there. But because that money was not spent at the right time and in the right place upon elevators, we have the grain in the West, where we do not want it; we have not the money that we should have got in exchange for the grain had the elevators been where they ought to have been, where they would have facilitated the export of grain rather than giving benefit only to that band of philanthropists, the milling industry of Canada.

Taking the other section of the hon. minister's speech and dealing with the question of the commandeered grain of last fall. As has already been said by the leader of the Opposition, no condition on this side of the Atlantic or on the other side called for such action, if we are to judge by any precedent that has ever been set. When there was not merely an abundance but a superabundance of grain; when there was not merely a crop but a double crop; when that crop, as my hon. friend has said, was coming forward as it never came forward before and was available to anybody who would buy it and pay for it, why could it have been necessary to interfere with the ordinary course of trade by laying hands on this man's or that man's or the other man's private property, to his detriment and to the detriment of the country at large? The hon. minister has given us absolutely no reason to-day for the action that was taken except that the Government was following the policy which it has consistently pursued since the beginning of this war: to be ready at any time and under all circumstances to hamper and hinder and injure the farming industry of the country under the pretense of that injury being for the welfare of the Empire or the good of the Allies. There was no more reason for commandeering this wheat than there was for prohibiting the export of wool or of horses, for preventing British and French buyers from purchasing horses in Canada or for doing any of the other things that the Government have done, to hold up the farmer and detract from the profits that he would naturally make. I speak of this matter feelingly; it is a serious matter. When this same Government that seizes the farmer's wheat in the elevator without justification or cause of any kind is asked why it did not seize the steamers to carry that wheat across the ocean, they say that that would be impossible; that that would be contrary to all rules of business. Why, they say, the British Government did not do that; the Governments of the Allies do not seize vessels to carry wheat

5 p.m.

across the ocean, except for war purposes. They do not, my hon. friend says, interfere with the ordinary course of business. But my hon. himself interfered with the ordinary course of business. He had no hesitation in commandeering the farmer's wheat and disarranging the business of wheat carriage from the West to the Atlantic coast. He did it without justification from any point of view, without even the request, as he has admitted to-day, without even a suggestion from those who desired to secure the wheat. They did not ask this Government to seize the property of this or that or the other citizen of Canada for their benefit; they never made such a suggestion. Let me call attention to this fact—though it is not pleasant to do it. Statements were given out in the newspapers when this commandeering took place—and we are bound to believe that these statements were given out in some way by the consent of the Government—that the commandeering took place at the request or order of the British Government. That was the idea that was spread broadcast throughout the Dominion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Who spread it?

Mr. OLIVER: Newspapers supporting my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not one of them. Has the hon. gentleman a quotation?

Mr. OLIVER: It is a fact; there is no argument by which—

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not a fact.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend had better not butt in; he has not been doing himself much good by that lately. A plain fact is a plain fact. I am not holding the Government directly responsible. I am not saying that the Government put it in the Canada Gazette, but I am saying that newspapers supporting this Government did spread that idea broadcast, and I cannot think that they did it without having some indication from the Government that warranted them in doing it. To such an extent was that idea spread—my hon. friend will not deny this—that the British Board of Trade cabled to Canada to deny that the British Government had anything to do with the commandeering of that wheat.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman know for a fact that that was cabled?

Mr. OLIVER: Certainly: it became necessary for the protection of the good name of the Government of Great Britain for the Board having authority in the matter to cable to this side of the water to deny that they were responsible for that action. It may seem a light thing to my hon. friend to interfere with the business that relates to agriculture when it seems such a tremendous thing to interfere with the business of shipping, or nickel, or any of these other matters. But I want to say—and this is why I am speaking so strongly—that inasmuch as the agricultural industry is the principal wealth producing industry in this Dominion of Canada, it not only is entitled to every advantage that this Government can give it in the way of administration, but it is entitled not to be interfered with in any detrimental way unless the gravest reasons can be brought forward for that interference, no such reasons having been brought forward in this particular case.

It was most unfortunate that this seizure of wheat at Fort William should have been made within the last few days preceding the close of navigation. The minister has said that it was because the close of navigation was so near at hand that it became necessary to seize the wheat. Well, if it was necessary to seize the wheat because the end of the season of navigation was near, it was necessary that the seizure should have remained on that wheat and that the seized wheat should have gone forward while navigation was open. But, inasmuch as the wheat seized was, in large proportion, afterwards released, his argument that it was necessary to seize because the close of navigation was approaching falls absolutely to the ground. He said that during the few days following the seizure a larger amount of grain took water at Fort William than during any similar period in the history of the country. That is probably true; but it is also true that there was either one or two days when grain did not take water. There were only 8 or 10 days in which grain could take water, and the seizure of the grain held up that grain for that time. Much more grain would have taken water had the seizure not taken place. The minister rested his case practically on the near approach of the close of navigation. That was the chief reason why it was necessary to seize instead of buying—in order to get the summer outlet for the grain. But long after navigation closed, as the Minister of Railways told us the other night, the Government itself, over its own railroad, gave a rate on grain to Montreal absolutely identical with the summer rate. Thus the minister is left without a shadow of a ground of reason for seizing the grain at the time he did. The grain could have been bought at any time, and could have been brought forward at any time during the whole winter at exactly the same rate as it was being shipped out at Fort William on the day it was seized. There was therefore no reason why that grain should not have been bought in the ordinary course of trade, so far as facilities for bringing it forward or the cost of transportation was concerned. In the ordinary way it would have reached its ultimate destination. As a matter of fact it has not yet reached its destination, although the course of trade was interfered with.

When in Winnipeg recently I asked a gentleman connected with the Grain Exchange what estimate was placed on the losses of dealers owing to the disarrangement of the market. He said the amount was variously estimated, but that the minimum was $200,000 of direct loss to the men engaged in the grain trade in Winnipeg and the western country owing to the action of the minister. I ask the minister if he thinks it was right to disarrange the trade of our country to an extent sufficient to cause a loss of $200,000 to men who my hon. friend says were speculators. Well, they were speculators; there is no doubt about that. So is every man who buys a stock of groceries and puts it into his store and sells it out again. The grain

trade of Canada and of the world is carried on by speculators. They are just as necessary a part of the grain business of our country as the elevators or the railroads or as my hon. friend's grain commissioners. There must be men to buy and sell grain or grain will not be bought and sold, and when the minister lightly suggests that because it was grain dealers who lost the $200,000 it is a matter of no concern to the people of the country, I can only say I cannot agree with him. The grain trade is in the hands of the grain dealers in large measure; just as the Grain Commission controls the direction of the trade in a certain way, just as the railroads carry the grain and the elevators handle it, so the grain dealers are the men through whose hands it passes.

Mr. WRIGHT: I understood the hon. member to say that the grain commandeered was owned by the farmers who had shipped it to Fort William in cars. The hon. member now says that the bulk of the grain was owned by grain dealers and not by the farmers.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to be understood as having said that the grain commandeered belonged to the farmers. I was speaking of the general situation. That is a matter with which I shall deal later. The grain crop goes through the hands of the grain dealers. If the grain dealers dropped $200,000 by reason of the interference of the Government, they will see that they are insured against any further contingency of that kind by taking it out of the farmer in any future business transactions. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Q'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) pointed out this session that since the grain was commandeered there has been a greater spread between the track and street prices than before, simply because the dealer was insuring himself against any further interference by the Government in the transactions of the grain trade.

Mr. BURNHAM: Then the speculator did not lose. That proposition has gone by the board.

Mr. OLIVER: The speculator says he did lose. Part of the grain that was in the elevators at Fort William and that was seized belonged to the farmers, part of it to the millers, and part of it to dealers.

Mr. WRIGHT: In about what proportions?

Mr. OLIVER: I understand that about 3,000,000 bushels belonged to the farmers. That was grain that had been shipped to Fort William in car lots by the farmers who produced it. It is a remarkable fact that it was 3,000,000 bushels that was held by the Government. Nearly 2,000,000 bushels was returned to the millers and seven and a half million bushels was returned to the dealers, but 3,000,000 bushels was held by the Government—the 3,000,000 bushels that belonged to the farmers.

Mr. WRIGHT: Surely.

Mr. OLIVER: Surely. And on the 3,000,000 bushels that belonged to the farmers the farmers lost the benefit of the advance in price to which they were entitled, and which they would have received if the Government had not seized their wheat. The Government loaned back to the dealers and back to the millers, but they did not loan back to the farmers.

Mr. BURNHAM: Was that all the wheat they had?

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. BURNHAM: Then, why did they not sell the other wheat?

Mr. OLIVER: The reason why they did not sell all their wheat was that the Government did not facilitate the transfer of that wheat to the Atlantic seaboard. They have the wheat on their hands yet, but not that particular 3,000,000 bushels. It is a remarkable fact that the amount of wheat which the Government held synchronized with the amount of wheat which the farmers had in the elevators, and while the handling of the grain of the miller and the grain dealer was facilitated, the farmer simply lost without recourse, and he has no recourse yet. I think it is only right to point out that, in this case, as in other cases I have mentioned, the Government has absolutely disregarded, not only the interests, but the elementary rights of the greatest of our wealth-producing industries. It has set up from time to time that it has done these things in the interests of the prosecution of the war, but, in this case, if I may so, it has been caught with the goods. It commandeered wheat on the plea of urgency, and it has that wheat yet, and those on whose behalf it commandeered the wheat have not taken it away and have not furnished the transportation to take it away. Could there be anything with less excuse and less reason than the action which this

Government took; could there be less ground for blaming the war conditions or the needs of the Allies?

Mr. WRIGHT: Might I be allowed to make a comment or two upon some of the statements made by the hon. member for Edmonton? (Mr. Oliver). As a matter of fact we have absolutely no proof, beyond his assertion, as to the amount of grain which was held by the farmers. From the little knowledge I have of how grain is handled in the western country, I say that there is a comparatively small amount of grain held by the farmers in the elevators at Fort William. Occasionally we meet a farmer of a speculative turn of mind who has become wealthy by growing grain in a large way, a man perhaps owning 50,000 acres, and he will handle his grain as an ordinary grain dealer. A few men of his kind may have had grain in the elevators at Fort William, but the average farmer working a section, or a half-section or a quarter-section does not, as a rule, have very much grain in the elevators at Fort William, or anywhere else, except at home where he may have a little stored waiting for the price to rise to the point at which he can safely sell it. He will use the elevator in his home town to some considerable extent, but I have not known many cases where a farmer would ship his grain to Fort William and hold it there. If the men engaged in the grain business have suffered as seriously as my hon. friend from Edmonton would suggest, the grain probably belonged to a man in the grain business and not to the farmer in the West. If a large quantity was held by the farmer, it would certainly mean no loss to the grain dealer, because he would have nothing to do with it; he would have advanced no money upon it, and would therefore have no claim upon that grain.

My hon. friend protested against the Government commandeering that grain and not taking it away immediately to the Atlantic coast. I ask, what difference would it make whether it was in the elevators at Fort William or down at the Atlantic coast, when it could not be shipped out of the country? What possible difference could it make to the grain dealer?

Mr. OLIVER: What earthly purpose was served by commandeering the grain if it was not possible to get it forward?

Mr. WRIGHT: We will suppose that a gentleman in the Old Country wired an order to a grain dealer at Fort William to buy him so much grain. The grain dealer secures that grain, and he sends it as far as Fort William and has it stored on the order of the man who has purchased it. He has done his duty; he has complied with the terms of the order. It is then up to the man in the Old Country who has ordered that grain to get it away, to provide the accommodation across the Atlantic so as to allow the grain to go forward. If this Government, at the request of the people of the Old Country, secured so many million bushels of grain, I think they complied with the requirements of the case; they secured the grain. It may be a question, as the hon. gentleman indicates, whether they took the wisest course, or not. That is a question for debate.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. WRIGHT: But I think they performed their duty when they secured the grain, and we have the positive assurance of the minister that it has gone forward as fast as it could be removed from the Atlantic coast. What more could have been done? I ask any reasonable man in this House, or in this country, whether the Government has not done all it could do? I do not think that the farmer in the West has suffered loss to the extent of a five-cent piece, and I do not think the dealers have lost very much by the action of the Government. They might have lost if the Government had been in a position to take away the grain at once. They might have suffered some annoyance from delay in replacing the grain taken away. But when it was found that the grain could not be removed immediately they were allowed to take some of the grain and to replace it at Fort William at a later date when it would suit the Government to have it removed to the Atlantic seaboard. Consequently, they suffered no loss. In fact, I do not see how anybody suffered loss. I think the farmers of the West, as a class, got a better price for their grain, following the action of the Government, than they would have got had the Government not taken that action, because the very fact that the Government stepped in and was storing grain had the effect of putting up the price. The price went up, and remained up for some considerable time as the result of the Government's action, and then it dropped back to the normal, and it has been lower ever since.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood my hon. friend to say that the action of the Government in commandeering the grain raised the price throughout the West?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Then had the Government not better commandeer a little more and raise the price again?

Mr. WRIGHT: If the hon. gentleman suggests that I have no objection at all.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Does my hon. friend make that suggestion?

Mr. OLIVER: If the Government can raise the price substantially on 100,000,000 bushels of grain by commandeering 10,000,000 bushels we all agree that they should do so.

Mr. WRIGHT: The fact of the matter is that the price of grain went up, but when the grain could not be got out of the country the price began to fall. Compared with the price at Liverpool, I say that owing to the action of the Government the price was higher in the West than it was before, and than it is to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the hon. gentleman not urge the Government to heave it up again, to commandeer another 10,000,000 bushels?

Mr. WRIGHT: I leave that to the hon. gentleman, who seems to have the well-being of the farmers of the West at heart. Why does he not take action?

Mr. OLIVER: Because I do not think that the action of the Government had the effect which my hon. friend says it had.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. gentleman is quite entitled to his opinion, and I think I am entitled to mine, and I think I know as much about the grain business as the hon. gentleman. I do not think that very much fault can be found with the Government for taking that action. I admit that it is a question open to debate, and every man is entitled to his opinion. In my opinion it was the wisest course to take in order to be sure of obtaining that much grain, because, if it had been left to be purchased in small quantities, as the hon. gentleman thinks it ought to have been, they might not have secured the grain as easily as they did. I do not see what good would have been accomplished by taking any other course and I do not see any point in the objection that the hon. gentleman has raised. I think he is actuated more by a desire to find fault with the Government than by any other motive.

Mr. OLIVER: May I ask my hon. friend this? He considers that the action of the Government in commandeering the wheat raised the price and thereby conferred a benefit on the country—the farmer.

Mr. WRIGHT: I did not say on the country; I said on the farmer.

Mr. OLIVER: On the farmer; but the reason given by the minister is that buying the grain in the ordinary course of business at that time would have raised the price.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot say that I am surprised that the action taken by the Government in this case has met with the opposition of certain hon. members on the other side of the House. My experience of recent months has been that the more commendable the action the more violent and direct is the opposition. My imagination would fail me were I to try to conceive of any course this Government could take that would not be described by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) as an attack upon the farmers of the West. If we commenced a system of distributing public money to each farmer individually, we would be met with a complaint by the hon. member that we were robbing the farmers of western Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: No harm in my hon. friend trying it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But my hon. friend's argumentative attacks are often transparent fallacies. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) takes the ground that the course adopted by the Government was an extraordinary one and could only be justified by extraordinary causes. I do not know that I can take any exception to that pronouncement. The leader of the Opposition, while by the accident of fate, he has passed through the world as a Liberal, is to those of us who know him best, and I think to the country as a whole, well understood to be about the most pronounced Conservative, in the right meaning of the term, that there is in Canada. If this Government does strike out upon new and strong lines in any matter, the first and the last to oppose is the leader of the Opposition. When we seek to ground our course on the plea of emergency, he is the loudest in disap-

proval, and sets to work to show, not always with success, that no such emergency exists. In the case of the appropriating of the wheat, the Government were faced with the necessity, as it appeared to them from the documents in hand, of procuring a large amount of wheat in a short time with the probable necessity, through their agency or otherwise of procuring a larger quantity in a short time in the future. This appeared to us in definite form on the 23rd November. The courses open to us have been mapped out, and I do not need to relate them at length. But the Government could not go into the market, through an agent, and procure the wheat within the time limited unless with results which we deemed would be inconsistent with our duties as agent and trustee. The Government, under the circumstances, selected men acquainted with the business whose advice would be valuable. The advice of these men was obtained, and not only under the circumstances were we able to obtain it as to the course to be pursued in respect to the actual purchasing of the grain, but as to the difficulties that would be met with in the purchasing of it by other means and as to the best method of solving those difficulties. The preponderance of view was that the proper course, consistently with our duty as the agent of the allied commission, and to the producers in Canada was to take the grain by appropriation. The views obtained were obtained in a confidential way as should be done in these cases. Two of the men whose views were so given have seen fit to state in part what they said to the Government and not to state the rest of it, but even with that I do not feel compelled to go farther and put the whole position assumed by these men, and assumed by the others who were called in, in reference to the matter, upon record. It may become necessary later on.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is it true that one of the largest and most reputable commission houses in Canada stated that they could get the grain without any extraordinary means?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is quite true that there was scarcely a commission house in Canada that was not ready to buy the grain at the usual rate of a cent a bushel. It would be a very strange commission house that would not be anxious to do that, but I am justified in saying this, in answer to my hon. friend from Moosejaw, that there was not one who did not readily agree that for the Government to go into the market and get the grain that was required would result in the inflation of the market——

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Edmonton says "hear, hear". I know what he has in the back of his head—that had we gone about it by the means of sending of agents into the market the farmer would have received the benefit. No one denies that the farmer would have got the benefit just as he has it now. But there is one result which would have accrued, which has not by our method accrued, and that is that immense profits which would have gone to the middleman, who is usually the object of jealousy and attack on the part of the hon. member for Edmonton and other members of the Opposition, would have been extracted from the pockets of the Allies for whom we were acting. The hon. gentleman does not say "hear, hear" to that, but he knows it.

Mr. OLIVER: Grain is handled for a certain commission, a percentage of half a cent a bushel, and I suppose the buyers would have bought it on that commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No doubt they could have bought it, and they would have been very glad to have done it. It will be observable to hon. members in this House that after villifying the middlemen, and all who look like middlemen, if it is necessary for the purpose of opposing the Government of the day, the hon. gentleman can quite readily assume the role of the champion of middlemen and agents. He says, and the leader of the Opposition backs him up in this assertion, that every purchaser is ready to pay a commission, and consequently the Government should be ready to let the commission man come in and get his commission on every purchase.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Would it not have been possible, without employing any commission men at all, to have done exactly the same thing that you did in the purchase of seed grain—employ the men in your own department to purchase that grain, they getting their salaries and no commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That undoubtedly would not have been possible. The only way to have got it otherwise would have been to have employed some one to get it

on the market and pay the usual commission.

Mr. TURRIFF: You had Wesley Allison.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt that had these hon. gentlemen been in power that is just the course they would have pursued. I am going to the heart of this question; I am going to discuss it seriously, as it deserves.

Mr. KNOWLES: And it needs discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It needs discussion and it will get discussion. Hon. gentlemen say that we could have pursued the course of putting an agent, or agents, into the market and commissioning them at so much per bushel to buy the grain. It is argued that the amount procurable was not large proportionately to the amount traded in at that time on the grain exchanges. In one sense that is true, but not in any sense that means anything in relation to this discussion. It is true that grain is traded in by the millions of bushels on the Grain Exchange. The same grain is traded in perhaps ten, perhaps fifty, perhaps a hundred times, and consequently the whole volume of trading is very great. The thirteen or fifteen million bushels, as in this case that we have in mind, might, before it ultimately reached a purchaser for export, have been traded in ten or a hundred times. But the purchase for actual export and use of thirteen or fifteen million bushels is a very large transaction, even in relation to the trading of the Grain Exchange. It may represent five, ten, or twenty times that amount of trading in volume as the grain in the usual way of trade proceeds. Now, I think I have made that clear.

There was not one of those who were called to give their opinion on the case, and who should have been qualified to give that opinion, who did not agree that it would have been utterly impossible to conceal the principal behind the agent, and to avoid, in part at all events, the result which accrued the year before—an inflation of the market to the benefit of the dealer and speculator in grain, and to the disadvantage of the consuming public and the Allied Commission. It was felt at the time that there would be some dislocation in regard to contracts already entered into, and means were canvassed by which that could be reduced to the minimum. The advice of those men was taken upon that and was followed, and I think they and the country are to be congratulated upon the thoroughness of this work and the success which attended the reducing of that dislocation to a minimum. That, of course, appertained to the dealer alone, a man who is entitled to be treated fairly by Governments as by all, and that was the principal objection—may I go further and say the only objection—urged against the course taken by the Government by those called in. No obejction against the course taken was offered by any one called in to advise the Government, and no objection, except for political reasons, could be urged to-day by any one except as it affected the middlemen, the dealers, and the speculators.

Mr. OLIVER: Who were the parties whom the hon. member consulted?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two of them the hon. gentleman knows; the others were eastern men. Personally I have no objection to giving the names; but, as the matter concerns the Department of Trade and Commerce, and as they were called by the minister, I will leave him to decide whether or not he will give their names.

Mr. OLIVER: In all cases they were dealers or speculators.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no. The hon. gentleman seems to know who they were, but he wants to ask in order, if possible, that the names may be published.

Mr. OLIVER: We know perfectly well that Mr. Crowe of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and Mr. Crerar of the Grain Growers' Grain Association were consulted by the hon. gentleman, and they are dealers and middlemen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and the objections were solely from that viewpoint; nor was it suggested by any one, nor would it be suggested to-day, except for purely political reasons, that from the point of view of the producer, the farmer, any possible objection could be taken.

Mr. OLIVER: Did the hon. member or any of his friends consult the western farmers on the subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that the association for which the hon. gentleman often stands up will stand beside him when he says that Mr. Crerar, of the Grain Growers' Grain Association, in no sense represents the western farmer. I am led to believe that he, in his position as representative of the Grain Growers' Grain Association, and his institution exist for the benefit of the western farmers.

Mr. OLIVER: And Mr. Crerar advised against this seizure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Crerar did not advise against the seizure from the point of view of the farmer. So far as his advice and criticism went, they were based solely on the interference that would be caused to the trade in the hands of the middleman and the speculator. If I were to tell the hon. gentleman all that was said from the point of view of the farmer, I am sure it would be no comfort to his argument this afternoon. From the point of view of the farmer every consideration advanced was in favour of the commandeering.

Mr. OLIVER: It is only fair, when the hon. member brings authorities to bear upon the subject, that he should state what those authorities said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will be just as fair, and fairer, I think, than some of the speakers who have preceded me in this debate. The opinions of the gentlemen I do not intend to state, nor to give their names, further than they have given them themselves. The minister may do so if he desires.

Now we come to the actual results of the commandeering. To purchase in the open market, as to purchase by the method taken, would, as can be easily understood by any one acquainted with the trade, clearly bring about an increase in price; but as to which method would have the greater effect it was difficult to measure. Both methods would very likely bring about a rapid increase in price. To have adopted a method of purchasing in the open market within the time desired would immediately —all were agreed on this and all agree today—have resulted in something of the nature of an inflation in price. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite and also hon. members on this side: Would this Government, commissioned as a Government to act as the trustee of the Allied Commission, have been justified in taking a course which would have added to the value not only of all the grain in the West, but of the grain sought to be purchased in store and brought about a largely inflated price for the benefit of those who held it in store and for the loss of those for whom the Government were acting?

Mr. OLIVER: It did not seem to bother the Government very much in the case of shells and fuses.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is anxious now to get on to the subject of shells and fuses. Some of his friends are just as anxious to get off the shells and fuses. Now we are discussing the question of wheat, and I intend to keep to it.

Mr. KNOWLES: I think honestly the hon. gentleman is sorry that he ever touched the wheat last fall.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman may decide what his opinions are; I presume he will give me the prerogative of deciding mine. I am discussing the effects of the course taken. The effects of the course we did not take would have been clear; it would have added at once very largely to the value of the grain in store to the benefit of the grain speculators. It is really refreshing to hear the hon. member say that some speculators told him that the loss to those men was $200,000, and that he thinks that we committed a great wrong. It seems to me that it is only about three weeks since the hon. member argued here that they were a band of ringsters, a combine to extract money from the western farmers by depressing the price of wheat. Now he weeps tears because he finds the course we pursued took $200,000 from their profits for the benefit of the Allied Commission. For myself, I do not think it did. They failed to make the money they otherwise would have made; there is no doubt about that, and they may regard that as a loss. They would have made the money if we had taken the course of buying in the open market all the grain they held in store for speculation; and that may be how they measure their loss. If we had put commission merchants into the field to buy, every cent of rise in the price per bushel would have meant $130,000 out of the pockets of the Allied Commission and would not have meant a dollar in the pockets of the farmers of Canada beyond what by the rise actually took place. The course we pursued had the effect of raising the value of the wheat back of the elevators in Fort William in the hands of the farmers and unsold; it had the effect of raising the level of markets all the way westward. The other course would have had that effect also; but this course did not have the effect of raising the value of the grain in the hands of the speculators and taking it out of the pockets of the Allied Commission, whereas the course my

hon. friend recommends would have done that.

Mr. OLIVER: What we were recommending was that they should leave trade to follow its own course when there was no urgency.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The course the hon. gentleman recommends would have put money into the pockets of the speculators of whom he is the champion this afternoon, and would have taken it out of the treasuries of the Allies. But the money that went to the owners of grain, by reason of the rise in value of the grain after the commandeering, went into the pockets of the farmers, and they have got it.

Mr. OLIVER: Could the hon. gentleman raise the price again?

Mr. MEIGHEN: When new cases arise we will consider the circumstances and will be governed by the same considerations that governed us before, and I may tell the hon. gentleman that he has said nothing in this debate that will be considered worthy to enter into the discussion of that matter.

Mr. OLIVER: Seeing that the Allies have not got much of the wheat yet, it seems likely they will not deal with the Government again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is complaining now on the part of the Allies. They got their grain at $1.04\frac{3}{4}$, whereas his method, according to his own argument, would have given them the grain at $1.30, or something like that.

Mr. OLIVER: They have not got it at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have got it so far as our delivery is concerned.

Mr. OLIVER: But they cannot eat your delivery.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Had not the hon. gentleman better go across and help them? We have fulfilled our contract. Now, if the hon. gentleman has anything pertinent to the argument to interject I have no objection to be interrupted, but surely he does not think that he deceives me by complaining of the conduct of the Allies and attributing that to this Government. We took it for granted—and we have no reason yet to think we were misled—that the Allied Commission desiring the grain within a very limited time and would be able to take deliveries and get them over. No doubt the Allied Commission believed they could do so; there is no question they had reason to believe they could. But the exigencies of war are beyond the exact measurement of even the Allied Commission, though possibly not beyond the exact measurement of the hon. member for Edmonton. The exigencies of war they were not able to take with accuracy into consideration and adjust their conduct exactly to them. Events arose, doubtless, which they had not in contemplation, and they were not able to get the grain across—which was their part of the work—within the time they had anticipated. But our end of the bargain was fulfilled, we lived up to our end of it by getting the grain for them and getting it at a fair price, the market price. That was the fulfilment of our duty to the Allies for whom we were acting.

Mr. KNOWLES: How much did the Allies ask should be secured for them?

Mr .MEIGHEN: Hon. gentlemen have asked that ad infinitum, and they have been told it, so far as we can tell it, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The order that was given us was filled. There were other messages and negotiations preceding the order which affected the necessities of the order as actually given, and which made it our plain duty to have that order filled within a very limited time, and, to that end, to get the grain by the expropriation method. Any other method would have inflicted upon those for whom we were acting a severe loss from which the farmers themselves would have gained no benefit beyond what they have gained by the method adopted.

Mr. KNOWLES: I desire to correct the statement of the hon. minister. I did not ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce before what the quantity was. I did ask as to the time. Of course, if the minister does not care to tell the amount, that is all right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question was asked and answered, and I thought it was the hon. member from Moosejaw who asked it.

Mr. KNOWLES: I was not here when the question was answered, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell me what the answer was.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount is represented by the amount delivered.

Mr. KNOWLES: But how much did they ask the Government to secure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The figures are on record—some 13,000,000 bushels were actually commandeered.

Mr. KNOWLES: Did the Allies ask for 13,000,000 bushels or what more did they ask for?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount they got represented what they asked for.

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. gentleman does not need to answer if he does not wish to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the hon. gentleman understood that it was 13,000,000 bushels?

Mr. KNOWLES: Did they ask for 13,000,000 bushels?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not recall the exact wording of it, but it was put within such limits that the amount we actually procured for them in this way fulfilled the order. The hon. gentleman knows that it is not possible to place on record the communications that passed in regard to that matter between this Government and the Allies; if not he has not any adequate sense of his responsibilities as a member of Parliament. These communications, as one can well understand, contain statements of fact and apprehensions which should not be made public, and no man with a proper sense of duty would ask that they should be made public.

Mr. KNOWLES: Surely you can make that much public.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That much has been made public.

Mr. KNOWLES: When?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the House—now. How often does the hon. gentleman want an answer? The order was given in such terms that the grain procured at the time amounted to a fulfilment of the order as to the grain required and as to the time. I do not see that any more is pertinent to the case. It is argued that there was a dislocation of trade, and a peculiar twist of reasoning was gone through by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that all the grain except that received from the farmers we gave back—that the farmers had three million bushels and the dealers and millers had seven and a half million bushels, and that we gave back the grain to the others, and we kept that of the farmers and have it yet. The grain we gave back was returned within ten days, or rather it was not given back at all but merely loaned in order that there might be no stoppage in the fulfilment of orders and the outflow of grain at Fort William. It was all done under contract, duly secured, for the return of the grain in the same channel, and it was returned—and that is all there is to this assertion about delay. And not only that, but by the centralization and control exercised at Fort William by the adoption of that method, greater speed was made than ever was known before in the history of that port. The hon. gentleman has complained of a delay of a day or two. There was no delay; there was no cause for delay. I know that the order was given on Saturday night and the following morning, on request from Fort William, I myself instructed them, on behalf of the Government, that there should be no delay whatever in the loading of any vessel or in the pouring out of the grain through the funnel at Fort William.

Mr. MARCIL: Was this the only order received from that commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, other orders have been received at various times, perhaps not from this special commission.

Mr. MARCIL: How were they dealt with?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not recall whether it was in pursuance of a foreign order or not, but we did on a former occasion commandeer another class of grain. Other orders have been filled by purchase, but in those cases there was time enough to make purchases without unduly affecting the market and without loss to those for whom we were acting.

I was dealing with the question of delay. By means of the organization and centralization of control in the department, so far from there being any delay in the pouring through of the grain, there was expedition, there was facilitation, there was a saving of time. Within a period of four or five days after the commandeering of the grain, there was a larger issuance of grain from Fort William than ever before in the history of the port. Let me give, as it were, a picture of the method followed. Fort William is like a great funnel through which the western grain pours. After the commandeering, the grain continued to pour through that funnel as before but expedited by the fact that the Grain Commission controlled the vessels into which the grain went, and were able to see to it that each

vessel was loaded fully at one elevator, instead of passing from elevator to elevator. The grain continued to pour through that funnel with greater expedition than it had come through before. But while it was doing so such grain as was necessary to fill orders went to the fulfillment of those orders, and the remainder of the grain as it entered the funnel was appropriated to the purposes of the Government order. That is a picture of what actually took place. There was virtually no dislocation in that regard. There was great fear of dislocation. There was, indeed, very great apprehension, particularly on the part of grain dealers in Winnipeg, that it would not be possible to meet these difficulties in any adequate way, and that these dealers stood to suffer great loss. But when they were apprised of the actual method adopted to adjust the situation and to meet all their legitimate demands, they were one and all loud in their approval of it. I wish to endorse what the Minister of Trade and Commerce says in regard to these men. It was our desire to keep down their losses, to keep down even their apprehension, to the lowest possible point. It was their desire, I believe, to meet us in every way that they could, even if they felt that it would be at a loss to themselves. They did meet us in a proper spirit; they assisted the Government by every means in their power in the carrying out of the appropriation in such manner as to result in the least possible discomforture and inconvenience. I believe also that the farmers of the West, except, possibly, a few who may be of the same mind as hon. gentlemen opposite, or too much under their influence, have approved the course adopted.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I would like to ask the minister if he has any information as to how much of the grain in the elevators belonged to the farmers?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot give the exact figures, but I am glad the hon. gentleman mentioned that. Very careful inquiries were made before the appropriation took place as to about what percentage would be unsold in the hands of the farmers. The figure that was generally adopted —indeed, I think it was the only percentage that was suggested—was twenty-five per cent. I think the Estimates given were all about the same; it has worked out something like that. There have been complaints that grain that really had not been appropriated at all was paid for by grain companies at the commandeered price, on the representation that the grain was included in the appropriated grain. It may be—indeed I think it is a fact—that grain that was never really appropriated and that still remained the property of the farmer was represented—perhaps innocently in some cases—by grain dealers as being appropriated and was settled for by the grain dealer with the farmer at the appropriated price. We have had complaints along that line. In fact, the Grain Commission, whose duty it has been to follow up such cases wherever complaint was made, have compelled grain merchants in many cases actually to pay to the farmer the additional price because they had settled on the representation that the grain had been appropriated, although it had not been appropriated at all. The final outcome of it all is this: about 3,000,000 odd bushels of farmers' grain and about 10,000,000 odd bushels of speculators' grain were appropriated at Fort William. All of it was paid for at the market price. Previous to the date of appropriation the market had been a slightly rising one. Whether it would have continued to rise an hour longer, no human being could say. It might have fallen the very next day; we cannot tell—it might have risen. At all events, previous to the appropriation the price had been rising, and $1.04⅜ was paid for No. 1 Northern wheat. One would almost think, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite argue, that to appropriate grain was to commit some awful injustice; that to buy grain or anything else at the market price was doing the owner or proprietor of the grain very serious injury. There is no doubt the fact that unless circumstances otherwise demand it is the right of an individual to choose his own time of selling, but to say that serious injury or any injury is done is to exaggerate the facts. I have heard it argued by hon. gentlemen opposite—I think by the hon. member for Edmonton—why do you not expropriate the manufacturer's product? You expropriate the product of the farmer; why not expropriate that of the manufacturer? Well, there are some manufacturers in this House and I put to them the question whether one of them would not be very glad if the Government came along and expropriated all his product at the market price? Would there be a happier day for him in the whole history of his manufacturing career?

Mr. OLIVER: Not if on a rising market.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If on a rising market, neither he nor any one else knows whether the market will rise for another hour. If he does know it, he is able to go on the market and buy against his belief and make money on the rise. However, I do not say that it would be the part of any farmer to go and buy against it. He got the full value of the grain that he had in store the day that it was appropriated, and he got more than that: he got the added value to every bushel that he had behind, and I do not think there were many farmers in western Canada of those who had grain in store who did not have several bushels behind for every one that they had in store. He got the profit that accrued by reason of the increment of value added to what he had left, and he got a fair price for every bushel that he sold. So that, taking it all in all, the farming community of Canada, by virtue of the course taken, were the gainers not by thousands, but by hundreds of thousands—yes, by millions. They would have been gainers also had we taken the other course. The speculators were not by our method losers. On the other hand, they were not the gainers that they would have been if we had taken the course suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. They were not the gainers at the expense of our principals, the Allied Commission in Europe. That is what I conceive to be good Government business; that is the course a good Government should pursue. Where it can eliminate the middleman it should do so; where it can act for the benefit of its principals, it should, as any other agent do so faithfully and firmly. That is what we did in this case; we did it to the advantage of the producers and to the advantage of our principals, and they are the parties whose interests we were bound to have in mind.

At six o'clock, the House resumed and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 76, for the relief of Christopher Sinclair.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill No. 79, for the relief of Hope Fothergill Baily.—Mr. Thoburn.

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Robert Charles Vondrau.—Mr. Scott.

Bill No. 93, for the relief of Percy Lynn Woods.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 88, to incorporate The Manitoba and Saskatchewan Bible Society.—Mr. Schaffner.

Bill No. 82, to incorporate The Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Nesbitt.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Ever since the House assembled in January last we have been waiting with a good deal of curiosity to know what reasons would be given by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the unusual course that was taken by the Government in commandeering the wheat required for the Allied countries. We certainly expected that there would be some good reason behind the action that would justify the Government in dislocating the trade of the country to the extent which it did, but when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and his colleague the Solicitor General, the two ministers who were interested in carrying the transaction through, gave their explanation before the Committee to-day we found that they had really no excuse to give other than that in their judgment the course which they took was the best in the circumstances. My hon. friend the Solicitor General, complained that there was nothing that the Government could do that would satisfy the Opposition. I am prepared to agree with the hon. gentleman that we cannot expect much from this Government that we on this side of the House would be able to agree with. One reason that was given by the hon. the Solicitor General, and one which he seemed to think would cover up everything else, was that, by commandeering 13,000,000 bushels of wheat last November, the Government raised the price of wheat to the farmer in the West. Let us look into this for a few moments to see what justification, if any, there is for that statement on the part of the Solicitor General. At the time that the wheat was commandeered, there were at least 200,000,000 bushels of wheat in the West to be sold.

My hon. friend suggests that the action of the Government in taking 13,000,000, out of 200,000,000 bushels, had the effect of raising the price of wheat and making every bushel that the farmer had worth more than it was before. You might as well say that if a dozen farmers brought in 200 bushels of potatoes to sell on the Ottawa

market, and one householder in Ottawa bought thirteen bushels, that would put the price of potatoes up all over Canada, because the percentage would be the same. That is only one of the absurdities of the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite. You must remember that the price of wheat went up all over the United States at the same time. As a matter of fact, our Canadian market simply followed the trend of the market of the United States. For many days prior to the 27th November, when the minister commandeered this wheat, the price had been advancing, and surely no man in his senses would say that, because my hon. friend took 13,000,000 bushels off the market by commandeering it, or in any other way, he had put up the price on the 200,000,000 bushels in Canada and on the 700,000,000 or 800,000,000 bushels in the United States. The 13,000,000 would be about one per cent of the wheat that was affected. And our hon. friends offer that to the farmers of the West as an excuse for the action the Government took in commandeering this wheat, and try to get out of an awkward corner by attempting to make the farmer believe that the action they took has given him a better price. It is not possible to tell absolutely what my hon. friend had in his mind when he did this. I would be inclined to believe that the minister did what he thought was the very best under the circumstances. I am inclined to believe, also, that his colleague, the Solicitor General, thought he was going to pull off a good political stunt. At that time there was a good deal of agitation for free wheat, provided I may be allowed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to mention free wheat again in this House this session. There was considerable agitation at that time for free wheat, and the Solicitor General took this view of the matter: Now, here is an opportunity to commander 13,000,000 bushels of wheat. Usually just as navigation is closing for the season there is a drop in the price of wheat. Of course, my hon. friend had to take some chances, because for a considerable time the price of wheat had been going up; but as soon as navigation closes the price usually drops down. The Solicitor General, I imagine, expected to find himself in the position that the Government had commandeered a certain amount of wheat, a large percentage of which was owned by the farmers in the West, and as these particular farmers would have received an enhanced price for their wheat, it would have shown the acuteness of the Government and that the Government were working in the farmers' interests. Unfortunately for the calculations of my hon. friend, if that was his view, the very opposite took place. The commandeering of this wheat, instead of enabling my hon. friend to make political capital, has acted as a boomerang. The price of wheat kept going up, and the farmers who had wheat stored at that time, and who had to take the price that was offered with no option in the matter, are the men who have suffered and are complaining bitterly about the way they have been treated.

The minister said to-day that it was perfectly right that the farmer, generally speaking, should be allowed to decide his own time and to use his own judgment as to when he would sell his wheat and what price he would take for it. No one is complaining that the price received for that wheat was not a fair price. It is a pretty fair price—$1.04¾ at Fort William for No. 1 Northern. But surely the farmer had the right to say whether he would sell that wheat at that price or not. If my hon. friend had offered to buy that wheat from the farmers very many of them would have sold probably at that price. But there were hundreds of farmers who had wheat down there, and who did not want to sell at that time. These were men who had got their threshing done, had sold a car or two of wheat to settle up the accounts connected with the threshing, the store accounts, and the account for growing the crop. They expected that the price of wheat would go up, and they had shipped their wheat down to Fort William intending to hold it for the spring market. You must remember that a farmer cannot hold wheat in his home elevator. No country elevator, whose business is to handle wheat, not to store wheat for a long time, will allow itself to be filled up by holding the wheat there. A farmer puts wheat in the elevator on the understanding that the elevator has the right to ship that wheat down to the head of the lakes and put it in storage there. It does not make any difference to the farmer; it does not cost him any more to store it at Fort William than it does at the home point. He is quite agreeable to that, and if he wants to hold the wheat until the following spring, or to take advantage of any advance in price during the winter, he puts his wheat in storage at Fort William or Port Arthur. If he desires to sell all he has to do is to sign his certificate, hand it over to the

buyer, and get his cheque for the amount. I want to assure the Solicitor General and the minister that there was a great deal of that wheat held by the farmers. It was acknowledged to-day in the House that there was something like 25 per cent owned by farmers. My information is, and I got it from a prominent member of the Grain Exchange who was in a good position to know—and if I am astray in my figures, the minister, who probably knows exactly, can set me right—that there were over 5,000,000 bushels of this wheat belonging to farmers stored there and not sold on that day. Those farmers have lost quite a sum of money. A number of farmers in my constituency have brought the matter to my attention. One of them whom I ran across down here a month or so ago told me that he had three cars of wheat at Fort William, the wheat was commandeered, and at the time he was speaking to me the loss was about $750. Another farmer in the vicinity of Frobisher had 10,000 bushels of wheat in store at Fort William that he was holding for spring, and at the time he wrote to me about it he could have sold for $1.25 a bushel, whereas the price he got from my hon. friend was $1.04¼, so that he was out $2,500 on the transaction. There are scores and hundreds of farmers throughout the prairie country who have suffered just in the way that the two I have instanced have suffered. I imagine that none of those farmers would object to having his wheat commandeered if it had been a necessity in connection with the war, a necessity for Great Britain or for Canada, or even for any of the Allies of Great Britain; but the position they take, and naturally so, is that this was done without any justification; that the minister could have procured his 13,000,000 bushels of wheat without causing a ripple on the wheat market and without dislocating or disrupting the trade or causing any inconvenience for anybody connected with the trade.

One of the ministers stated this afternoon that the Government had taken advice on this matter. We do not know all to whom they applied for advice, but we know that Mr. Crowe, one of the most prominent grain buyers in Winnipeg, and Mr. Crerar, President of the Grain Growers' Grain Association in Winnipeg, advised against the course which the Government took; at least, they said so in interviews which were published in the newspapers and which I have never seen contradicted. Mr. Richardson, of Kingston, probably the largest grain dealer in Canada, stated that his advice was absolutely against it, and that grain could have been purchased without interfering in any way with the trade, without hurting anybody, and without raising the price. Mr. Richardson instanced one occasion on which there was only 4,000,000 bushels of Kansas red spring wheat on the market, of which his firm had purchased 2,500,000 bushels without raising the price a fraction of a cent. At the very time that my hon. friend commandeered this wheat, wheat was pouring into Fort William at the rate of two or three million bushels a day; so that the question was only one of a week's receipts, and, by giving a broker an order to buy it quietly, the wheat could have been purchased without causing any disturbance whatever.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce stated that you could not buy from the farmers. I do not think that is correct. On the very day that my hon. friend commandeered that wheat, there were millions and tens of millions of bushels of wheat throughout the West, every elevator where the grain had been threshed being practically filled to its capacity at the end of November. As I pointed out the other day, my hon. friend could have bought that wheat, because the market price for wheat in the elevators of the West was practically ten cents a bushel less than the market price for wheat on the track ready to be taken to Fort William, for which the price of $1.04 was paid. It would have been a boon to the country to have taken that wheat out of the elevators in the West, and it could have been taken out by the National Transcontinental and been landed at Portland or at St. John, provided that the Government had given the same rate over the whole route as over the part from Armstrong to Quebec, and in that way they would have procured the wheat at a lower price for their customers, the Allied Governments. Yet my hon. friend or his colleague this afternoon laid great stress on the duty of the Government to buy this wheat at the best possible price, I think, for the Kingdom of Italy. In that case, why did they buy November wheat on the 27th of November? Why did they not buy December options? At that time December wheat was six or seven cents a bushel less than November wheat; and, as the minister apparently knew that they did not need the wheat then, he could just as well have bought the wheat to be

delivered a little later, and secured it at about seven cents a bushel cheaper, if he was working so hard in the interest of Italy, which was to get the bulk of the wheat. To prove that my hon. friend did not need the wheat then, I may say that no sooner had he commandeered the wheat than there was such a rumpus raised by the dealers and the millers that he immediately, out of the 13,000,000 bushels, turned back 7,500,000 bushels to be replaced later on. Therefore he could just as well have bought December wheat and paid that much less for the people for whom he was purchasing.

Another statement made this afternoon was that there was the utmost need of haste to meet the dire necessities of Italy, who, previous to going into this war, had sold herself short of wheat, and therefore had to get a great deal more, and that as a consequence the Government could not wait an hour, but must immediately commandeer the wheat. That sounds very well, but it does not bear analysis. At the ordinary rate of consumption of wheat by people who use wheat flour, the people of Italy from November 27 to the present time would have consumed about 120,000,000 bushels of wheat. That is taken on the basis of seven bushels per head of the population, which would be a fair average for a country of English-speaking people. Italy, however, may not use so much wheat; she may use more of other kinds of grain or of fruit. Let us suppose that she uses only two-thirds as much wheat as English-speaking nations, that would still leave about 80,000,000 bushels that she has consumed from November 27 to the present time. If there had been the necessity for haste which one would judge there was from the way in which this Government undertook to procure the wheat, Italy would many months ago have had at the various ports sufficient tonnage to take 15,000,000 bushels of wheat across the ocean. Therefore the argument that tremendous haste was necessary does not hold good for a minute. As my hon. friend from Edmonton pointed out this afternoon, this wheat was no sooner secured than the Government undertook to satisfy the millers and the dealers. The large millers were given all the wheat they needed, and the dealers were given wheat to fulfil their contracts, but no farmer was given the option of taking his wheat back and making other disposition of it. The farmers were left out of the deal. There were, however, a good many small millers who suffered very much from this high-handed manner of dealing with the wheat.

Take the case of the small miller in the East who had made contracts for 10,000 or 20,000 bushels of wheat. That wheat is in the elevator at Fort William awaiting shipment. The commandeering takes place. These mills have no contract for the delivery of flour to any of the allied countries, therefore they do not come under the rule which would allow them to borrow their wheat back from the Government. But these mills have contracts with buyers, bakers and flour dealers all over the country. When they bought wheat they sold flour to a similar amount—that is the practice with the miller. So, in this case, the miller had bought his wheat and, on the basis of the price he paid, had sold his flour. The Government steps in and takes his wheat, and he has to go on a rising market and buy at an advance of five or ten cents a bushel, and yet he must sell his flour at the price at which he contracted to sell it. In this way many small mills through the country have lost large sums. The men who got out all right are the big millers and the big dealers—which is what usually happens in the transactions made by hon. gentlemen opposite; the smaller dealers, and the farmers particularly, get no consideration whatever, nor have they power to help themselves in such a case as this. Did I understand the Minister of Trade and Commerce to say that when the allied Governments ordered wheat they ordered oats also?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: Probably I got that confused with the statement he made that oats had been commandeered once before. There is one point I would like cleared up. Would the minister say just what part of this 13,000,000 bushels of wheat was shipped out of Fort William before the close of navigation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not the exact figures before me, but I think it must have been about 7,000,000 bushels.

Mr. TURRIFF: Then, do I understand that the rest of the wheat is still at Fort William?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That would not necessarily follow.

Mr. TURRIFF: Was there a special rate on it by rail? Perhaps the minister would

say whether there was a rate on it of six cents a bushel from Fort William to Quebec.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think there was any rate of that kind.

Mr. TURRIFF: I found it a little difficult to harmonize the statement that approximately three-quarters of the wheat commandeered had already been shipped to the allied countries with the other statement that only about one-half had been shipped out of Fort William before the close of navigation—unless, of course, it was sent down at the high Canadian Pacific rate by land during the winter months. At all events the Government has apparently had enough of commandeering wheat, and the allied countries have apparently had enough of ordering wheat through the Government; both are apparently satisfied to leave each other alone for the future. The minister stated this afternoon that these foreign countries were still buying wheat in Canada; but, as I understand, they have not ordered any more wheat through the Government. I think that in that they show wisdom. Evidently the whole transaction did not prove very attractive to them, even though the Government was not charging any commission —of which a strong point was made this afternoon. Apparently these allied governments are satisfied that when they want wheat it is better to go to an ordinary dealer and buy it in the ordinary way. I am very glad these governments have come to that conclusion, because, in spite of the argument of the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright), I am satisfied that the commandeering of the wheat did not raise the price of wheat by a fraction of a cent, and so did not benefit the farmers. On the other hand, the farmers who had not sold their wheat, but had it in storage, lost, probably, half a million dollars on the wheat they had.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. TURRIFF: It will be carried, but there is no hurry. We know perfectly well that the Minister of Trade and Commerce brought this matter up to-day to kill time, and that is all right. The minister is not crying "carried," because he does not want it carried just now, and so his friends had better wait with patience. It will be carried in good time and probably whenever the minister wants it.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. gentleman says that the Minister of Trade and Commerce introduced this to kill time. The hon. member himself is aiding and abetting the minister in that?

Mr. TURRIFF: I plead guilty to the charge. I do not object to help the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I would rather help him than any other man in the Government, or than any man behind him. But, as hon. members opposite are anxious to get through with this, and as probably the purpose has been served now that we have spent some time over it. I will not speak at much greater length, but will give some hon. member opposite an opportunity to do what neither of the ministers, apparently, was able to do—give a reasonable reason for the action of the Government in commandeering this wheat.

If any hon. gentleman opposite can suggest some reason that will satisfy the men who owned the wheat, they will be accomplishing something worth while. According to my hon. friends opposite—according to the minister, at all events—the commandeering of one per cent of the wheat that was on the market put the price up to from 25 to 30 cents a bushel within a month afterwards. The hon. member for Edmonton, I think, this afternoon suggested that if that was the case, why should not the Government commandeer another quantity of wheat and put the price up? The price has gone down about 15 cents a bushel during the last two or three months. Very soon the farmers of the West will begin to haul out the wheat that they have not yet marketed. If this commandeering of wheat raises the price, my hon. friends would have a good opportunity between now and the time this wheat is hauled to do something more for the farmer. But I imagine that the Government will not attempt it again; they have had enough in this one effort, which was acted as a boomerang.

During this afternoon something was said —I want to bring this to the attention of the Minister—about an investigation being made by the Grain Commission into cases where dealers had settled with farmers on the basis that their wheat, stored at Fort William and Port Arthur, had been commandeered, whereas it really had not been commandeered at all. If settlement were made on this basis a month after the commandeering, there would be an approximate difference in the price of 25 cents a bushel, and the dishonest dealer would have an opportunity of robbing the farmer to that ex-

tent. It seems to me that that is a pretty serious matter. A great many farmers may, without knowing anything about it, have been treated this way by questionable dealers, and I think it would be well worthy of the attention of the Board of Grain Commissioners to find out the amount of wheat commandeered was owned by the farmers in the elevators at the head of the lakes. I know that my hon. friend would not want to see any one cheated in that way, and if this course were adopted the Government could be sure that no farmer in the West was getting unfair treatment. I hope that in future, when this Government is called upon to secure wheat for any of the Allied Governments, they will, instead of commandeering it, put some one upon whom they can depend on the market to buy wheat in the usual manner, and avoid disrupting trade in the manner that it was disrupted in the month of November last, to the advantage of no one and to the great disadvantage of the farmers in the West.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina): I wish to make a few remarks on some of the questions raised by the Minister of Trade and Commerce this afternoon, not so much with regard to the commandeering of the wheat as with regard to the policy that has been pursued by this Government since 1911 on the question of terminal elevators. The minister apparently takes a great deal of credit to himself and to the Government for the establishment of the Grain Commission and the general policy

9 p.m. that has been followed since the establishment of that commission with regard to terminal elevators in Canada. The minister is no doubt aware that the Grain Act which he introduced in the beginning of the year 1912 was exactly the same Grain Act, with one or two exceptions, the chief of which I shall mention in a moment, as that which had been introduced into the Canadian Senate during the reciprocity session of 1911, but which never got as far as the House of Commons. However, the grain men and representatives of farmers' organizations in the various provinces of the West appeared before the Banking and Commerce Committee of the Senate and a general agreement was arrived at as to what the Grain Act should be. In 1912, after the present Government assumed office, the minister introduced a Bill, which so far as the Grain Commission and the principle of Government control is concerned, was exactly the same act as that which had been practically passed by the Canadian Senate under Liberal administration in the year 1911. Whatever success, therefore, has come from the Grain Act as at present existing and the system of Government control may largely be attributed to the fact that under Liberal administration there were men who knew something about the situation and were able to cope with it. I must say that I believe that the system of Government control in connection with the grain situation in Canada has proved fairly successful. In the sessions of 1909, 1910, and 1911 the question of Government control and Government ownership and operation of terminal elevators was discussed in this House. On two different occasions members of the then Opposition from western Canada moved resolutions in the House of Commons in favour of Government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. The last resolution, moved in the winter of 1911, was to the effect that the Government should acquire by lease, expropriation or otherwise—these were the very words used in the resolution—the terminal elevators of Canada. The question before the House of Commons on that occasion was not the establishment of one Government elevator, but the acquiring by lease, expropriation or otherwise of elevators throughout the country. That was the policy of the men who now occupy the treasury benches. In the sessions of 1909, 1910 and 1911 the policy advocated by members of the present Opposition, then supporters of the Government, was the policy of Government control that was carried out in their Grain Act of 1911 and adopted by this Government when it came into power. I remember hearing the present Prime Minister in the city of Regina in the month of July, 1911, during the recess in the reciprocity session of this Parliament. In the western newspapers he was reported as expressing himself in exactly the same way as he expressed himself on the platform in the city of Regina. He said on that occasion that if the Conservative party were returned to power, if he were leading the Government of this country, the Government would take over the terminal elevators throughout Canada. How has this Government fulfilled that pledge? I am not saying that I was in favour of that policy. I was always in favour and am now in favour of a system of Government control of terminal elevators. But the members of the present

Government, then in opposition, promised the people, on public platforms as well as on the floor of Parliament, that they would take over, own and operate the terminal elevators of this country. I believe the people of this country expect that any political party that is elected to administer the affairs of Canada is bound to carry out in some degree at least the pledges that its supporters make to the people while they are carrying on an election campaign, particularly those planks of their platform that they vote for in the House of Commons. I venture to say that the present Minister of Trade and Commerce voted for Government ownership and operation of terminal elevators in the House of Commons on more than one occasion. If he did not it was because he was not present, because every other member of his party did and the members of western Canada particularly from Manitoba, were one and all in favour of Government ownership and operation of terminal elevators. In so far as the carrying out of that policy is concerned all the Government did was to establish one terminal elevator at Fort William. It is true that they established an elevator at Vancouver and interior elevators in Saskatchewan and Alberta, but, so far as any effect on the grain trade or on the general grain situation is concerned, all this Government has done is to establish one Government terminal elevator at Fort William. They might just as well have allowed a private company to build that elevator for all the effect it has had on the grain trade. That was done as a sop to the people of western Canada, in order to show that the Government were going to fulfil their pledges. Take the interior elevators established in Alberta and Saskatchewan—at Saskatoon, Moosejaw, and Calgary. I never heard any demands from the people of western Canada for the establishment of those elevators. Certain it is that the Grain Growers' organization of Saskatchewan or the United Farmers of Alberta never asked for the establishment of any interior storage elevators. Experience has proved during the last two years that except when there was an exceedingly big crop, and when the railways took the position they did this year by placing an embargo on the shipment of grain east of certain points, the interior elevators are of little use, because the people will not use them. In the Calgary elevator, in January, there was something over 200,000 bushels. In Moosejaw a very small percentage of the space was filled at that time and the same situation existed in Saskatoon, although to a lesser degree, because there was a little more grain in that elevator in January and February than in the other two. But the people will not use these elevators unless they are forced to do so. They were forced to do so this winter on account of the exceedingly large crop, and on account of the fact that the railways could not haul out the grain because they would not accept shipments for eastern points. But I venture the opinion that in an ordinary year the interior elevators would be of very little, if any, use. Take the terminal elevator at the city of Vancouver. I wonder if the minister imagines that that elevator is of any use at the present time. I have not information as to how much grain there is in it at present, but only a very small percentage of the space was filled in January and February of this year, according to the information I have. I am informed by men who know traffic conditions of the Pacific that there will have to be an entirely new class of boat constructed for Pacific traffic through the Panama canal before you can handle any grain through the Vancouver elevator. I am informed that no boats of the type that carry grain on the Atlantic now exist on the Pacific. If that is the case I do not believe, and I do not believe that the minister believes, that the Vancouver elevator will be of any practical use for the next ten or fifteen years. I say it was built simply on the system that goes in this country, the system of party patronage, which the minister so eloquently condemned in this House a short time ago, and I agree with everything he said on that occasion. The only reason for the construction of the Pacific coast elevator was the demand of the Conservative party in Vancouver. That is the opinion generally expressed throughout the West. We have had an absolute about-face on the part of the Government on this question since the days when they were in opposition. All the western Conservative members, especially those from Manitoba, have simply turned their coats on this question of terminal elevators. They were, one and all, in favour of the Government operation of terminal elevators, just as we used to hear the Solicitor General championing the rights of the western farmer with respect to a lower tariff in this county—yet at every oppor-

tunity since this Government came into power the tariff has been increased, and the Solicitor General has on each occasion been one of the first to champion the increase. Instead of being the champion of the western farmer now, he has lost sympathy with the western people in general, because not only the western farmer but the western resident in general is interested in these matters. The Solicitor General and other Conservative members of Parliament from western Canada in this House, since they came into power and got near the treasury benches, have simply turned their coats on this question which so largely affects the people of the West.

The commandeering of wheat has been so ably discussed by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that I hesitate to take up the time of the House, and particularly of the Government, by dealing with it at further length. I agree with what was stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia about the present situation in Parliament. I have been trying to find out what we have been here for since the Easter holidays.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTIN: I am glad that the Minister of Trade and Commerce agrees. If he would get his colleagues together and get them to agree to some kind of railway legislation, so that we could have it before us and know what we were doing, we might be out of here in two or three days. As it is we may be here for two or three weeks. There was no reason for our coming back here after the Easter holidays. The Minister of Trade and Commerce or any other member on that side of the House may attempt, if he likes, to blame the Opposition for the present condition of affairs. I say that the Government of this country is responsible for what goes on in this House. We are waiting to-day for a line of Government policy in regard to the railway situation, a very serious situation, but we have heard nothing of such a policy. Is it possible that the Government cannot agree on this question and place something before the House which we may consider and then get back to our homes, where we ought to be.

In regard to the commandeering of wheat, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as he has stated to-day, was convinced that there was an urgent need—and no doubt there was an urgent need—for this grain among some of the allied nations, particularly Italy. If the people of Italy were in dire need at that time, they must be either starving or starved to-day, if they are still waiting for the Canadian grain. It appears to me that before the wheat was commandeered in this country, two conditions should have existed. One, I think, existed according to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that was the condition of dire need. The other circumstance that should have existed was transportation facilities for the carriage of the grain. Otherwise there was no reason for adopting such a high-handed method to get a sufficient quantity of grain to satisfy the Allies. Why did not the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the Government find out if these means of transportation existed? The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) says it was the business of the British Government and the allied powers to see that the boats were there; that it was none of our business; that all we had to do was to grab so much wheat and say: Now it is there, come and get it. I say that before the Government took such high-handed action and went aside from the ordinary channels of business, they should have satisfied themselves first of the condition of dire need, and secondly, that the means of transportation were available to take the grain for the Allies' Commission. The second condition certainly did not exist and yet the Government commandeered some 13,000,000 bushels of wheat. That, to my mind, is the case in a nutshell. And what is the condition of affairs to-day? According to what has been stated by the minister to-night, some 7,000,000 bushels of the commandeered grain has actually gone across the Atlantic. The other 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 bushels is still in some elevators in Canada. The minister says it does not follow that because it has not all gone out of the country it is still at Fort William. It may be that the men who borrowed the grain have not yet seen fit to fulfil their obligations and return it to the Government, as the minister said, in ten days. I have not heard the minister say that that is the case; I am only suggesting that possibly they have not returned the grain which they borrowed from the Government. In so far as this question relates to the price of wheat, nobody in this House, nobody in this country, believes for one minute that the commandeering or purchasing of 13,000,000 bushels of grain in a market of 300,000,000 bushels

had any effect whatever on the price. I suppose that if the price had gone down, the Government would have said to the farmers in the West: Your wheat was needed and you have got an increased price anyway. But the commandeering had no effect on the market. The price did go up, but not half as much as it did a year ago. The Government says it increased the price of wheat. No person imagines that the purchase of a very small quantity of the total wheat crop of western Canada would have a cent's worth effect on the price of the whole production. The Solicitor General says that before they decided to commandeer the wheat they consulted a good many grain men, but the hon. member for Assiniboia has pointed out that three of those men, who apparently were consulted, have stated that they advised against it. I presume that they advised that the grain might be procured by the ordinary methods of business, by having somebody purchase it. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that there were three ways by which the grain might have been procured. First, it might have been purchased directly from the farmer; secondly, it might have been procured through a broker, and, thirdly, it might be commandeered. I think there is another method by which it might have been secured, namely, by making use of the Grain Commission, which is a very efficient body, or through some person associated with the Grain Commission. If I am not seriously mistaken the Grain Commission with its staff of officers could have procured that grain without the payment of one cent to a middleman. That would of course have satisfied the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). When I listened to the discussion this afternoon, it seemed to me that there was a great difference between the method adopted by the Government, and the reasons given for its adoption, and the method adopted in the purchase of seed grain for the farmers in the West during the season of 1915. To-day, the Government says it was very anxious to save commission to the middleman. It is all anxiety on behalf of the prospective purchaser. It was not the Minister of Trade and Commerce who purchased the seed grain; if he had had to do with it I am confident that it would have been handled in a much more efficient and economical manner than it was. I contend that it was done in a most wasteful manner. In 1915 it was the vendor of the seed grain that the Government was anxious about, the man from whom the Government would select 200 or 300 bushels out of perhaps 3,000 bushels. That was the man about whom the Government was anxious, the vendor of the grain, and not the prospective purchaser, who, in the spring of 1915, had to pay $1.50 for his seed grain. In the session of 1915, after I had investigated the grain market prices during the months of January, February, and March, 1915, and of November and December, 1914—I got the prices from Fort William, and the average price paid by the Government in each one of those months for the seed of the western farmer—and I proved that the average price paid by the Government in each of those months was higher than the ordinary price at Fort William, after making allowance for transportation charges, by from ten cents to twenty-six cents per bushel. It was not the prospective purchaser then whom the Government was anxious about, but, as I have said, the vendor. I am very glad that the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not employ the same officials, or the same class of men, to purchase the grain commandeered for the allied countries as were employed in purchasing the seed grain for the western farmers in 1915.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): I want to deal with a matter concerning the province of Alberta, particularly the southern part of that province. It is in regard to the location of the internal storage elevator at the city of Calgary. I happened to deal with this matter when I spoke on the Budget, but the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was not in the House at the time, and I would like to repeat some of the observations I made then. My contention is that the location of the elevator at Calgary was absolutely unwarranted. The explanation offered by the minister, in reply to a question I asked earlier in the session, was that the Calgary elevator was not intended to be, and is not, favourably situated for shipping grain east to Fort William. There is no question that it is not favourably situated for shipping grain east to Fort William. I maintain that the expenditure of money on an elevator in the province of Alberta could have been made to serve both western and eastern shipments of grain if the elevator had been located further south, on the Crow's Nest branch of the Canadian Pacific rail-

way, and I will try to offer to the minister what I think are substantial grounds for that argument. Calgary, as the minister knows, is practically on the border of the wheat-raising area of the province of Alberta. From Calgary north, the farming is practically of a mixed character. From Calgary west it is ranching, and from Calgary east there is a considerable amount of grain grown. In the southern part of Alberta there is a great proportion of the wheat-raising section of the province. Any farmer east of Calgary shipping to the head of the lakes, and desiring to use an internal storage elevator would, if shipping by the main line, use the elevator at Moosejaw. If a farmer shipped along the Goose Lake branch of the Canadian Northern railway, he would use the elevator at Saskatoon, but in the extreme southern part of the province, shipping east, he would also have to go to Moosejaw and use the elevator there if he so desired, because it means a back haul to ship to Calgary.

I understand that the minister maintains that the elevator at Calgary was intended solely for shipments westward, that is by the Pacific. If that was the reason, an elevator could have been located at the city of Lethbridge, which would have served the shipments east to Fort William, and, at the same time, have served shipments west by the Pacific. But the Government insisted on having that elevator for the province of Alberta located at Calgary where it could not possibly serve for some time shipments to the Pacific coast. That elevator was constructed and placed in operation before the Panama route was opened, before it was even declared feasible for grain shipments. It was placed there solely for the purpose of handling shipments by the Pacific when there was no guarantee that shipments could be made by that particular route. I think that the Government can be charged with making a fatal error in the location of that elevator in the province of Alberta. I am going to use the name of my own city not for selfish reasons, but because I believe that the location of that elevator at Lethbridge would have served shipments east and shipments west. The city of Lethbridge is practically the centre of the wheat growing area in the extreme southern part of the province of Alberta, and in that extreme southern part I think it can be safely said that 80 per cent of the wheat raised in Alberta is produced. All the railroads run into Lethbridge. The farmers could have shipped their grain there and used the internal elevator at Lethbridge, and it would not have meant a back haul, whereas, to use the elevator at Calgary, under ordinary conditions, means a back haul for the farmers of a great proportion of the wheat-growing section of the province of Alberta. I asked how much grain the Calgary elevator had handled from the date of the opening till December 31, 1915, and the answer was that the total amount, including all grains, was 185,455 bushels. Then I asked how much the elevator had handled from 1st January to the 14th January in this year, and the answer was that the total amount handled was 248,367 bushels. This elevator has a capacity, according to the minister, of 2,500,000 bushels. That was all the grain that was sent to the elevator up to the 14th January. I admit that since that time there has been a considerably larger amount of grain going into the Calgary elevator. This was not because the location of the elevator warranted the grain going there, but because the rates were reduced at the elevator—practically removed—the Canadian Pacific also made a reduction in rates in order to get the grain into the elevator, and an embargo was placed upon grain going out of Alberta to eastern points. All of these things forced the grain into the Calgary elevator. But that was an unnatural condition, due to the action of the railways and to that of the Grain Commission in reducing rates. My charge against the Government is that this elevator was located at a most undesirable place with reference to the wheat-raising area of Alberta when it was placed at Calgary. It should have been placed in the extreme southern part of the province, and it might then have served 80 per cent of the grain-raising parts of the province for shipments east and west. The elevator was placed at Calgary, I believe, against the best judgment of the Grain Commission. I believe it was placed there for purely political reasons, and on account of the patronage system which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has condemned, and which I condemn. I believe that if the constituency which I represent had been represented by a supporter of the Government the elevator would have been placed in that constituency. An argument can be presented in favour of the location of an elevator in that constituency, but there can be no argument in favour of the location of such an elevator at Calgary, except on the theory that it is intended to serve the western

route. But the western route is not in existence at the present time. I would like the minister to state to-night how much grain has been shipped by the western route during the last twelve months. The shipments are going east and will go east until the conditions warrant them going west, or until it is established that the Panama route can be used, or until we have a market in the far East. I think the minister has learned of the opinion of the farmers in Alberta. I asked a question later on this session as to whether he had received any representation from farmers in Alberta about another elevator in that province. The minister stated that he had received a great many petitions signed by farmers asking that an elevator be placed at the city of Lethbridge in the southern part of Alberta. He knows that the opinion of the farmers is that an elevator should be placed there. I doubt very much whether the Government ever had representations of any kind from any organization of farmers, or from any individual farmers, in favour of locating the elevator at Calgary. I think I have given good reasons why the elevator should have been placed in the southern part of the province, and in support of my argument that it was a mistake to locate the elevator at Calgary. If the minister has any other reasons for the decision of the Government to place the elevator at Calgary, I would like to hear them during the course of this discussion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friends from the West who are interested particularly in the question are through, I do not want to do them the discourtesy, nor myself the disadvantage, of not replying to some of the points that were raised by each. Two of the most ingenious things I have heard put forward to-night were put forward by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). He evolved an absolutely new idea—I do not know whether he has patented it or not—as to why we were talking about the commandeering of grain and about western grain conditions in the House to-night, and the brilliant conclusion at which he arrived was that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was anxious to kill time—so he brought this up. I do not think I have to do more than to mention that to show the extreme ingenuity of my hon. friend and to indicate on what very slight grounds he can build such a substantial structure as he has set up. Then again, he was still more ingenious, if possible, in another way. In spite of the arguments that he had brought forward, he felt still that his case was weak and so he made it as strong as possible by his final argument along that line. He said that we would do nothing for the farmers, we would not give them back their wheat, and then he thought it a brilliant idea to couple the Ontario millers with the western farmers' wheat. We would not do anything for these small millers he said, but we would fill up the elevators of the big millers in Ontario. I may tell my hon. friend that if he will come to my office to-morrow morning I will be very pleased to show him a list of the mills in Ontario, under exactly the conditions that he has spoken of this afternoon, which required very small amounts of grain to keep them going. The large portion of the grain that was released to the millers of Ontario was released to the men who wanted 10,000, 20,000 or 40,000 bushels to keep their mills going to bread their districts and carry out the obligations they had entered into to deliver flour to their clientele from week to week and month to month. That disposes, I think, pretty well of the two famous arguments of my hon. friend which he evolved like an Egyptian wizard out of nothingness, so to speak. But then he had another idea. If a man receives a definite, positive order, to buy wheat to a certain extent, to be delivered at a certain time, that time being as early in December or even in November as possible, then, instead of buying it on that order, he should go into the option business and buy options for the succeeding months. In that way he might get the wheat a little cheaper and do something for his clients. But the unfortunate part of the argument is that the client did not want a December or a January option bought. The client wanted wheat bought at a certain time and in certain quantities. My hon. friend knows that if you buy a December option, the possibilities are that you will not get your wheat until the very last day of December. You run that risk anyway, and a man takes advantage of his option with the idea that he may make something by carrying it to the very last day. Suppose we had bought December options and that at the end of December we had 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 bushels, how would we have brought that out and where would it have been at the present time? I do not think that my hon. friend's suggestion was a very good one.

The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) made certain remarks. If my hon. friend had been here when I made my remarks immediately after we went into Supply, he would quite well have understood that I did not claim for myself as minister of the department, nor for the Government, all the credit or even a very large part of the credit, for the enactments which now form the Canada Grain Act. If my hon. friend will read Hansard when it comes out to-morrow, he will find that I expressly mentioned the preceding legislation and what had been done, and stated that the legislation of 1912 was a re-construction or re-affirmation, with certain added features, of the legislation which had already been on the statute book or prepared for enactment. I was not trying to take the credit for that Act in its entirety or even in great part to the present Government; I did not pursue the argument along that line. What I did say was that some new features were introduced that were important, and I then went on to point them out.

My hon. friend from Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin) stated that the Vancouver elevator was placed there absolutely as a matter of party patronage. I probably know as much about the Vancouver elevator as my hon. friend does, and, if I had listened particularly to the voice of party patronage, mighty strongly impressed upon me, the elevator would probably not have been at Vancouver to-day, but at some other place. There was, from beginning to end, no thought of party patronage in the placing of that elevator. Rightly or wrongly, we started out with the idea that when the Panama canal was constructed there would be a very available route open all the year round for the passage of the increased production of wheat and other grain in the Northwest by Vancouver, through that canal, and so on to Europe. And so I believe it will come. I have faith in that route, or I would not have helped to have an elevator placed either at Calgary or at Vancouver. I believe that will be a great grain route in the future. It has this advantage, that where one side of Canada is blocked, so far as ocean traffic conditions are concerned, for a large part of the year, there you have an outlet to the Pacific ocean for whatever may develop in the far East and for the Panama canal trade, and that outlet is open every day in the year. The Vancouver elevator was placed where it is as the complement of that policy which we had designed and which we were carrying out. That policy may have been a wrong policy or may not, but the Vancouver elevator went as a sequence of that policy, and as an attachment, as it were, to the Calgary elevator.

A suggestion was made that maybe the trouble with reference to the grain arose because it had not been returned either by the parties who had borrowed it or by the parties to whom it had been released or who were exporting wheat to the Old Country. I think I stated this afternoon that every bushel of that grain had been returned, and it was returned absolutely on time as stipulated, in some cases earlier than the time stipulated, so that there was nothing that took place in those two transactions that was not according to the conditions that were imposed and honourably carried out. Furthermore, there is not a bushel of that grain now in western elevators; all of it is in the East waiting for the vessels that are to take it out.

My hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Buchanan) had something to say with reference to the location of the elevator as between Calgary and Lethbridge. In so far as he gave the facts with regard to petitions and to grain production, he stated them exactly as they are. Lethbridge is a large grain centre. A wonderful transformation has taken place in southern Alberta; that country, which a few years ago, it was supposed, was not worth five cents for grain, and would all have to go to grazing and cattle and stock raising, suddenly developed into a great grain-producing district that astonished even the people of Lethbridge and of that part of Alberta, and for the last few years at least has produced large quantities of grain. My hon. friend is exactly right when he says that the southern part of Alberta would find Lethbridge very much in its line for shipments east; but it also finds Moosejaw in its line for shipments east, the elevator at Moosejaw being available for that purpose. For shipments east it has little, if any, use for the Calgary elevator. But that elevator was meant for shipments west, not for shipments east, and was built partly as a feeder to the transfer elevator which was afterwards to be erected at Vancouver.

At least two of my hon. friends have broken out into the strongest arguments against internal storage elevators generally. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver)

said that instead of spending the money for one or any or all of these internal storage elevators, the money should have been expended to put up elevators at St. John, Halifax and Quebec, and he developed his argument that if we only had had elevators there last year, great good would have been accomplished. I think I made it as plain as could be when I spoke here a day or two ago, and I think I made it plain again to-day; but, if not, I will make it plain now, that if you had had all the storage capacity of the three elevators at Moosejaw, Saskatoon and Calgary, down either in Quebec or St. John or Halifax, or distributed between them, you would not have got one bushel more of western wheat on to the markets and into consumption in Europe than you have this year without those storage elevators there. I do not want to be misunderstood in that. I believe that a port like Montreal should have pretty large storage facilities, and a port like Quebec should also have good storage facilities, because they are both transfer positions; but there is an advantage to have at those two points, in readiness for the spring opening of transport out by the Atlantic, large storage facilities, so that whatever can be carried down of the surplus of wheat during the winter season by the railways will find a resting place there and be ready for the spring opening. The conditions, however, this year were such with regard to transport by the ocean that no amount of storage at those ports would have helped the Atlantic situation to any extent. Do not let us be too hard on those storage elevators in the West. They were not built for one year or two years; they were built for permanent use. Things are in their growing condition in the West. Closer farming conditions, greater additions to the wheat-producing area, will be constantly going on in the West, and I believe that these storage elevators perform a good office at the present time and will more and more come to commend themselves and prove beneficial to the wheat-growing interests in their districts, but even up to the present time they have not done so badly. I ask the attention of my hon. friend to the Calgary elevator. He has stated—and it is to some extent true—that extraordinary conditions this year have drawn more wheat into Calgary than might come under different conditions. The Calgary elevator, up to a late date, had received 1,729,916 bushels, and shipped 352,720 bushels—a movement of a little over two million bushels. The Saskatoon elevator has received 6,841,874 bushels of grain, and has shipped out 4,274,000 bushels—over eleven million bushels have passed in and out of that elevator this year, and the work is still going on. As to Moosejaw, unfortunately I have not the exact figures, but I think it has had a movement of close upon eight millions of bushels of grain this season up to the present time. True, this is an abnormal year. But it is well to have some provision for abnormal years. This year has been abnormal in the greatness of production, but we had an abnormal year once when bad weather and other unfavourable conditions caused a deterioration of a vast amount of grain. In times like either of these, these elevators will save millions of dollars to the grain-producing interests of the West. So, even if they have to depend for full action upon abnormal conditions yet, year in and year out, they will satisfy, I am sure, a certain want in that country, and will prove very useful in their day—and I hope their day will be a long one. Other remarks were made by my hon. friend, but I am sure that both of us are pretty well agreed that we have talked long enough and killed enough time on this particular phase of the discussion.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I understood the minister to state that if the Alberta elevator had been located at Lethbridge it would have served shipments east only, meaning that it would not have served shipments west. And he said that the elevator at Calgary is of no service for shipments east, meaning that it was intended only for shipments west. But I contend that if the elevator had been located at Lethbridge it would have served shipments west even better than at Calgary, and at the same time would have served shipments east, which the Calgary elevator cannot do. Lethbridge is on the Crowsnest branch of the Canadian Pacific. The company has constructed a branch from the Crowsnest line through the Windermere valley to Golden, on the Canadian Pacific, reducing both the grade and the mileage, and giving a through route by the Crowsnest Pass and the Windermere valley to Vancouver and other Pacific ports. With such a location Lethbridge would have been a better place for the elevator as a means of serving western shipments than Calgary, and it would have been in a position to serve shipments east also. Another thing

to be remembered is that the Canadian Pacific is building practically another through line from Winnipeg and Lethbridge to the coast, known as the Lethbridge-Weyburn line, opening a large country in the southern part of Alberta. All the grain could go west if desired, and if shipment east was desired it could go as well by that route as by the main line. Besides that, Lethbridge is in the heart of the wheat growing section of Alberta. When you go north to Calgary you are in an area where mixed farming almost wholly prevails, and from which hardly any shipments of grain are made. South of Calgary it is almost purely wheat raising country. I think the minister is wrong in stating that the Alberta elevator if located at Lethbridge would have served the east almost wholly. It would serve the west as well as Calgary, but would have served both, and not the west only.

Mr. OLIVER: The day before yesterday I was in the beginning of asking the minister for information in regard to the grain situation: first, in relation to the 11,000,000 bushels transported over the Transcontinental, and then, generally, the situation of the grain in the country—how much of the total crop was sold in the country and where it was located, and how much had gone across the ocean? I think the minister said that the question might well have been discussed at that time, but that he would be ready on another occasion when the item was under discussion to give the information. If he has the information, I shall be glad if he will give it to me.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As to the 11,000,000 bushels hauled over the Transcontinental, I am not able to give my hon. friend the information as to where that lies or how it was distributed. But I have not forgotten that I said I would try to get that information, and I will get it if the Minister of Railways, who also promised the information, does not get it. At any rate, we will have the information here on Monday. As to the other, speaking generally, if my memory serves me well a bulletin was issued last week by the statistical branch of my department which gave about the location, within a very short time, of the grain in the country. I cannot remember exactly the quantities, but I think that at the head of the lakes——

Mr. OLIVER: I remember, there were 50,000,000 bushels of all grains at the head of the lakes on the 14th of April.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have information here that is rather interesting bearing somewhat on the subject referred to. The Dominion elevator at Port Arthur received this season 19,600,000 bushels, and made shipments of 16,619,000, up to April 14, 1916. That is, it handled, in and out, about 36,000,000 bushels of grain. The terminals at Fort William had receipts of 228,000,000 bushels of grain, and handled out 190,000,000 bushels of grain.

Mr. OLIVER: Grain or wheat?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is all grains. Wheat was shipped from Fort William to United States lake ports, 77,800,000 bushels to Buffalo and 20,700,000 to the other United States ports on the lake, making altogether 98,500,000. To the Canadian lake ports 41,800,000 bushels were shipped, and to Montreal 823,271, a total of 42,600,000 bushels. That is to say, during the last season 70 per cent of the grain went out via Buffalo and nearby United States ports, according to that calculation. I find that 63 per cent of the 183,365 cars that were inspected, embracing a little over 300,000,000 bushels, graded No. 1 northern and better, and 80 per cent graded No. 3 northern and better. That was an extraordinary showing for the crop of wheat in the West this year. This year, with its quality as well as its quantity, the grain of Canada, particularly that of the Northwest, has made a name throughout Europe, especially among the allied nations, that will be very beneficial in future transactions. The British, French and Italian Governments have all been pleased with the quality of the grain that they have got. As I mentioned in the committee once before, it is vastly superior to the quality of the wheat from the United States. I do not mean to say that they have not a quantity of very superior wheat, but the quality of their wheat this year does not in excellence grade up to ours.

10 p.m.

Mr. OLIVER: The fact is—without desiring to give the hon. minister information in regard to his own business—that the United States does not export its best wheat, while Canada does.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It exports some of its best wheat

Mr. OLIVER: That is why they want free trade.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am afraid I have not the particular information that my hon. friend asks for, but I will be sure to get it.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the estimated total production of wheat in the three Prairie Provinces last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Up to the end of October 15, 1915, the total production for Canada was estimated at 336,258,000 bushels, of which the Northwest Provinces produced 304,200,000 bushels. Of oats, the total for Canada was 480,000,000, in round figures; the Northwest Provinces produced 305,000,000. Of barley, the total for Canada was 50,800,000; the North-west produced 33,000,000. Of flax, the total for Canada was 12,604,700, of which the Northwest Provinces produced 12,537,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Of this total production of 304,000,000, only 139,000,000 bushels are accounted for as having passed east of Fort William?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My impression just now is that the estimates that passed through my office the other day gave about 80,000,000 as still in the farmers' hands.

Mr. OLIVER: Of courses, there is a good deal in the interior elevators.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Then my figure is correct, is it not; 97,000,000 to United States points and 42,000,000 to Canadian points makes 139,000,000 in all?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is about what it was.

Mr. OLIVER: That would leave a little over half the crop, more than 150,000,000 bushels still west of the lakes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The estimate might be a little large now; it is coming out pretty rapidly.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there any estimate of the amount required for local seed and feed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not the estimate here, and I would not like to make the calculation. I will send my hon. friend the information.

Mr. OLIVER: I find, according to my account here, that over 160,000,000 bushels were still west of the lakes on the 14th of April. Deducting 20,000,000 for seed and bread, that leaves 140,000,000 still for export. Of the 142,000,000 that went forward east, 97,000,000 went to United States ports. Of the 42,000,000 that went forward to eastern ports, how much crossed the ocean during the period from October 15 to April 14?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will have a statement made out and see that my hon. friend gets it. I am not able to give it to-night.

Mr. OLIVER: What I want to know is how much wheat passing through Canadian ports has crossed the ocean since the first of October, 1915, in order that one may judge approximately what the prospects are for getting tonnage to carry the balance of our export surplus, which we desire to dispose of before our next crop becomes available.

Mr. TURRIFF: As against the $725,000 expended in connection with the running of the whole grain business, what were the receipts from inspections and general revenue under the Grain Act?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The revenue that is derived, as my hon. friend knows, comes from the car inspection fee of 50 cents for each car; the weighing fee of 30 cents for each car; the in-registration fee, when the car goes into the elevator of 4 cents; and the cancellation fee of 4 cents. Those added together amount to 88 cents. That is what might be called the actual fees in connection with the administration of the Act. The other revenue is really earnings, that is for service given, such as might be given by a private elevator owner. At the terminal elevator at Port Arthur, for instance, there are the following items: storage, $159,518; cleaning, $4,994; drying, $8,299; bulkheads, a small amount; sale of screenings, $24,000. Then there are some other smaller items. You must add to or subtract from that revenue the overage or shortage at the end of the year. In our own elevator we had an overage in flax to the value of $26,816. I made particular inquiry as to how we came to have that overage, and the commission informed me that that overage in flax is due to the very fine methods employed in screening it and getting out from what is in other elevators waste, real value. At the Saskatoon elevator some of the items of revenue were: storage, $46,575; cleaning, $20,604; drying, a small amount; screenings, $1,000; grinding screenings, $2,686; packing

for the seed grain, $12,268. The total revenue from that particular elevator was $91,453.

Mr. TURRIFF: If my hon. friend would give me the total revenues.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not them made up. That, however, gives the sources of the earnings.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Has the minister any record of shipments of wheat by the western ports last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think there were any large shipments of grain via Vancouver. Some grain did go west for Japan and South America, and there may have been some other for the far East, but it was a small quantity .A considerable shipment was put through for New Zealand. A portion of the grain purchased for New Zealand was shipped via Vancouver and went through, having been sacked at our elevator at Moosejaw. As my hon. friend knows, not only was traffic through the Panama canal disorganized by the war, but the Panama canal itself has been closed for months on account of land slides.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Does the minister know whether it will be possible to ship grain via the Panama canal without sacking at Vancouver?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Of course you can never be positive about anything until you have made the experiment, but if grain can be shipped from the Argentine to London, passing through the tropical belt without harm, I do not see why the short passage through the Panama canal should injure grain in good condition. That is the impression of some of the best grain men.

Mr. OLIVER: Could the minister give me the annual consumption and production of wheat in Canada east of the Lakes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not the figures here, but I can send my hon. friend the whole statement in print. I would refer my hon. friend to the monthly bulletin of statistics published by the department.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think that the figures I have asked for are contained in the very interesting statistics published in the bulletin.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I suppose we can never get at the exact consumption of grain in the East or West. You have to make an estimate, and generally it is estimated that about six bushels to the head is a generous consumption.

Mr. OLIVER: The situation as to general transportation seems to me to be very serious. About 42,000,000 bushels of grain has come to eastern Canadian ports. A large proportion of that will necessarily be for local consumption. If one-quarter of it was for local consumption, that would leave us with 30,000,000 bushels seeking ocean transport, and the information the minister has given to the House is to the effect that it has not been able to secure ocean transport. If that is the result of the transport business for six months, what is going to happen to us when we have to get rid of 140,000,000 bushels in the succeeding six months?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Of course, a great deal of the wheat that went via Fort William to Buffalo and the other lake ports, that is 95,000,000 bushels, has, I suppose, found its way by this time to ocean ports, and a large proportion of it probably has gone over.

Mr. BURNHAM: Would the minister express his opinion of what the future of agriculture with regard to the cultivation of wheat is likely to be, in view of the fact, expressed in print, as coming from those best able to judge, that last year 20 per cent more wheat was raised in the world than was needed for consumption?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member has put a very large question to me, but there is one method of solution; let us try, all of us, to do the best we can to raise as many more mouths as possible to take care of the extra consumption.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The minister has been giving us lots of information to-night, and I would like some more before we arise. Is it the intention of the Government to establish more than one storage elevator in the province of Alberta? That is all I ask; I will not ask where it is to be placed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will tell my hon. friend this: I have had a great number of petitions, and a good deal of correspondence, and I have taken the position that the elevators that we have already built—at Saskatoon and Moosejaw—in connection with the east, and the Hudson bay transfer elevator on the northern route, when it is opened, together with the terminal elevator at the head of the lakes, complete what was in our minds at the time when the policy was laid down.

Then the Calgary elevator, with the transfer elevator at Vancouver, completes that end of the policy. It was not part of that policy that we should erect interior storage elevators in the West wherever they might be useful. I know that that is quite an easy road for the man who wants storage to travel on. He says: Here is a district which has much more production than storage capacity; you have a storage elevator at Moosejaw; why do you not put a storage elevator down here. We are trying to keep on the track of linking up all the storage elevators with the transfer elevators at the ports, and along that line the policy at the present time has been carried out as far as we had anticipated. Even supposing that it was not war time, it would scarcely seem possible for us to anticipate a further expenditure of money for storage facilities, leaving that to corporate and private capital to take up. The Transcontinental railway with the Intercolonial railway having a great service, has to supply certain storage facilities, and more storage facilities are necessary in connection with that road than exist at the present time, so that there will be an extension of Government building—to what extent I do not yet know—in connection with railway transportation. But I suppose that when we cease to hope we cease to live, or to put it the other way, hope on as long as you live.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir George Foster, the House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

Monday, May 1, 1916.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORT.

Annual report of the Topographical Surveys Branch for the year ended March 31, 1915.—Mr. Roche.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILL.

Bill No. 96, for the relief of David Whimster Rhodes.—Mr. Boys.

MOUNT ROYAL TUNNEL AND TERMINAL COMPANY.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the first reading of Bill No 95, respecting rentals payable to the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.

[Sir. George Foster.]

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a Government Bill; will some one on the Government side explain?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As I understand it, this is really a declaratory Bill to make perfectly plain the provisions of an Act passed about two years ago, and as to which some legal point has been taken.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE SOLDIERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence that Private Wallace, whose case was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) has received his discharge, being under age. With regard to another matter which was mentioned, the case of Private Dougall Curry, there has been received a further telegram dated 26th April, and addressed to the Adjutant General from the General Officer Commanding the Military District. The telegram reads as follows:

> Reference headquarter telegram of 24th Capt. Calder states delay in seeing Dougall Curry caused by not getting word from hospital until noon following day. Impossible to say what person or persons are exactly responsible for this delay. Formerly one of hospital staff always notified him when military patient was admitted. In this case nurses say they did not know whom to notify. Captain Munro states he was unable to get St. Joseph Hospital by telephone till 11 a.m. following day owing to the line being out of order.

With regard to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles), I am informed by the Deputy Minister of Militia that a telegram has been sent to the commanding officer requesting an immediate investigation and report by wire. I am also informed, with regard to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), that an investigation has been ordered and is now in progress.

Mr. KNOWLES: I presume the officer to whom the telegram was sent in the matter to which I referred was an officer at Winnipeg?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really could not say at the moment.

Mr. KNOWLES: Surely not the officer who was implicated, in case the rumour is correct?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The report that came to me was that an investigation in the ordinary course had been ordered. I shall ascertain as to the character of the investigation and the person by whom it is to be made.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Prime Minister said that a wire had been sent to the officer asking for a report. I presume it goes without saying that the report will not be made by the officer upon whom I have made my observations.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If I remember the memorandum I had before me, it spoke not only of a report but of an investigation.

EMPLOYEES OF SOULANGES CANAL—CHARGE OF PARTISANSHIP.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am informed from the county of Soulanges that at the convention which took place last week for the selection of a Conservative candidate in the pending provincial election, the superintendent of the canal, his whole staff, and the employees of the canal, attended the convention and took part in it. I have always understood that the policy of this Government was that there should be no offensive partisanship on the part of employees of the Government, and I call the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the matter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will direct the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals to it at once.

EXTENSION OF TERM OF PARLIAMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM: On Friday last, in the absence of the Prime Minister, I inquired what had become of the joint resolution of the two Houses of Parliament praying that an amendment be made to the British North America Act providing for the extension of the life of Parliament. Would the Prime Minister give us some information with regard to that matter?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was sent forward at once by the Governor General. I also wrote Sir George Perley, enclosing copies of the debates on the subject that had taken place in this House and in the Senate, that he might be afforded any necessary information as to the grounds upon which the resolution had proceeded. I understand that it is in progress over there, but I do not know what progress has been made. Everything that was necessary to be done, as far as the Government is concerned, has been done.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTY.

Mr. BOIVIN: I wish to ask the hon. Acting Minister of Militia and Defence if applications for the Fenian Raid bounty will be considered if made prior to the expiry of the delay fixed by the Government, which, I think, was on the 31st July last, but from persons who were unable, before that date, to make the required proof.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I cannot give my hon. friend an answer at the moment, but I will make inquiry of the deputy minister as to what the policy of the department has been, and give an answer as soon as possible.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

TRANSLATORS IN SECRETARY OF STATE'S DEPARTMENT.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. How many persons are employed by the Secretary of State's Department as translators, apart from the official and permanent staff?
2. What are their names, occupations, residences and salaries?
3. Is one Arthur Sauvé so employed as a special or other translator?
4. If so, is the said Arthur Sauvé the member for the county of Two Mountains in the Quebec Legislature?
5. Who recommended him as translator, and on what date?
6. What is the character of the documents that have been sent to the said Arthur Sauvé for translation at his home?
7. What amount has such translation cost, and how much has the said Arthur Sauvé received to date on account of such translation?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. There are no persons employed in the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada as translators.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Arthur Sauve is not employed by the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada.
4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 3.

ENLISTED CIVIL SERVANTS—SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

Mr. PARDEE:

Do the wives of civil servants who have enlisted, whether as privates or officers, receive a separation allowance?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, unless the civil service foregoes his Civil Government salary, in which case he would draw all military pay and allowances.

WAR SUPPLIES—PURCHASES IN ALBERTA.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Who were the persons employed in purchasing horses, hay and oats in Alberta for the Department of Militia?
2. How much were they paid in each case?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Lieut.-Colonel A. D. McRae.
2. Pay of rank and expenses.

NEW RICHMOND WEST POST OFFICE.

Mr. MARCIL:

Has the Postmaster General decided to reopen the New Richmond West post office? If not, why not?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The question of the reopening of the New Richmond West post-office has been under consideration. As far as can be at present ascertained, there does not appear to be any urgent necessity for reopening this office. The department has obtained the opinion of 86 householders, the majority of whom are in favour of rural mail delivery. Fifteen families located on range 5 have not yet been visited. They are, however, said to be in favour of rural mail delivery since they are far from any post office at all. The former patrons of the New Richmond West post office ask that the office may be reopened to be served by special courier from New Richmond as heretofore. They do not accept as satisfactory any supply thereof by the rural mail delivery courier. All the patrons of the New Richmond West post office, with the exception of 10, though residing immediately on as well as being within the scope of letter carrier delivery, could easily subscribe for boxes if they are so disposed.

EMPLOYMENT OF ROBERT E. STEDMAN.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Was Robert E. Stedman employed by the Army Service Corps at Regina at any time since the commencement of the war? If so, in what capacity was he employed?
2. What wages did the said Robert E. Stedman receive, and what were his duties in such employment?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Yes, as private in No. 20 company, Canadian Army Service Corps.
2. $1.10 per diem pay and 75c subsistence.

LEVIS DRILL HALL.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. How much per toise did the stone used for the military drill hall sidewalk at Lévis cost?
2. By whom was such stone supplied, and what amount was paid therefor?
3. How many toise of stone were supplied for the said sidewalk?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. No price asked for per toise.
2. Jos. St. Pierre; amount paid, $862.50.
3. No price per toise, but price per cubic yard obtained from Jos. St. Pierre was $1.50.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Oliver.—For a return showing all transactions entered into by the Government of Canada to clear up squatter's rights to the Banff Hot Springs; together with a statement of payments made on such account, and to whom paid.

Mr. McCrea.—For a copy of all Orders in Council, departmental orders, and of all correspondence in respect of the embargo on the export of tan bark from Canada to United States.

Mr. Graham.—For a copy of the lease made by the Militia Department, or other department of the Government, with Lindsay and McCluskey, for a building situated in the town of North Bay.

Mr. Michaud.—For a copy of all correspondence between the Minister of Justice, the mayor of the town of Edmundston, N.B., the police magistrate of the said town, and others, in reference to one Antoine Levesque.

Mr. Buchanan.—For a copy of all papers, telegrams, letters and other documents in connection with the decision to locate an interior storage elevator at Calgary, Alberta.

Mr. Buchanan.—For a copy of all correspondence and papers relating to the change in the location of the post office at Roseberg, Alta.

Mr. Devlin.—For a copy of all papers, correspondence, documents, petitions and communications between the Post Office Department and the postmaster, or any other person, in connection with the Aylmer, Quebec, post office, received or sent by the department since October, 1911, relating to complaints, changes or dismissals and appointments to the said post office.

Mr. Ethier.—For a return showing the names of the tenderers for the different mail carrying contracts in connection with the rural mail delivery recently established in the county of Two Mountains; the amount of each of such tenders, the name of each tenderer to whom a contract has been granted, and the price to be paid to him; if there were any contracts given without tender; if so, to whom, for how much, and on whose recommendation; if any indemnity has been allowed to mail conductors for the transportation of rural mail boxes; if so,

to whom, and for what amount; if any indemnity was allowed to any mail conductors who had discontinued the service before the expiration of the three months' notice required by the contracts for the carrying of mails. if so, to whom, and for what amount?

WAR LOAN—$250,000,000.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden (Acting Minister of Militia), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair:

1. That it is expedient to provide that a sum not exceeding two hundred and fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) be granted to His Majesty towards defraying any expenses that may be incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1917, for:
   (a) The defence and security of Canada;
   (b) The conduct of naval or military operations in or beyond Canada;
   (c) Promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risk or otherwise;
   (d) The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war; and
   (e) Payments made for the said purposes during the fiscal years ending respectively the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and fifteen and the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and sixteen, in excess of the amounts authorized by the War Appropriation Act, 1914, and the War Appropriation Act, 1915.
2. That the Governor in Council be empowered to raise by way of loan, temporary or otherwise, such sums of money as are required for the purpose of making any payment authorized by any Act founded on these resolutions.
3. That the principal raised by way of loan under this Act and the interest thereon shall be chargeable on the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before the consideration of this resolution is taken up in the ordinary way, it is desirable that I should give some explanations which may naturally be expected at this stage. In the first place I desire to point out that the work of the Department of Militia and Defence before the war began was of an insignificant character and volume, as compared with the work it has been called upon to undertake since August, 1914, and particularly during the past year, when our forces have been so greatly augmented. Before the war the organization of that department was designed for dealing with a permanent force of about 3,000, which was under arms during the whole period of the year, and the training of from 50,000 to 60,000 men, for varying periods, usually from twelve to sixteen days during the year. The organization was adequate for that purpose; and the Headquarters Staff was organized for dealing with a somewhat larger force in case of war. The organization, however, was entirely inadequate in the first instance for the tremendous strain which was thrown upon it by the events of the war. We all recall that within six weeks after the war broke out a force of 33,000 men was mobilized at Valcartier camp, organized, trained, and equipped ready for active service. It went overseas early in October, 1914, with a surplus of guns and ammunition which were placed at the service of the Imperial Government.

The necessities of the war have, from time to time, called for very large increases in our forces, and as the Orders in Council authorizing these increases have been laid on the table of the House in printed form, and are available to hon. gentlemen, I need not recount them. The enlistments have proceeded upon a scale far beyond what any of us had in mind in August, 1914. Up to the 15th of April of the present year the total number of men enlisted was 309,616, of whom 102,455 joined the colours between the 1st day of January and the 15th day of April.

If we compare the organization which the Department of Militia and Defence has been thus called upon to undertake, with the military organization of the whole Empire before the war broke out, we shall have some adequate idea of the burden and the responsibility imposed upon the Government of this country, and especially upon the Minister of Militia and Defence, and the officers of his department. For example, the establishment of the British regular army, according to a statement which has been handed to me by General Gwatkin, Chief of the General Staff, amounted, before the war, to 127,368 men in Great Britain; in India (including only British troops) 77,317 men and distributed in different parts of the Empire other than the British Isles and India, 49,076, or a total of 253,762.

That constituted the regular army of the United Kingdom; but to that of course must be added the establishment of native troops in India. Excluding the native troops in India, it will be seen that the total forces of the Empire, as organized in the United Kingdom, were some 60,000 less than the number of troops which have been enlisted in Canada for active service overseas and otherwise, since

the commencement of this war. The annual military expenditure of the British Government before the war amounted to £28,200,000, or roughly, $140,000,000. The military expenditure of India amounted to £21,000,000, or about $100,000,000. Hon. members will thus understand that the Department of Militia and Defence has been called upon to undertake in recent months the recruiting, organization, equipment, and arming, and the transport from time to time overseas, of a military force which very considerably exceeds the total military force of the United Kingdom at the outbreak of the war. It is difficult, perhaps, to impress upon any hon. gentleman, who has not been brought closely in touch with the organization which this involves, the tremendous labours which have been entailed, especially upon the Minister of Militia and Defence and the officers of his department by reason of that very great undertaking. In many cases, absolutely new organizations had to be established. More than that, the men who were called upon to establish these new organizations were, in some cases, without training adequate for the purpose and had to grope, as it were, at first, in undertaking what became necessary during the war. After they had learned the needs of the situation themselves, they were called upon to instruct and train others in the constantly increasing organization of the department. It might be worth while to make hon. gentlemen acquainted, to some extent at least, with the character of the organization thus established which is based, of course, upon the organization that previously existed.

The Chief of the General Staff, General Gwatkin, is the first military member of the Militia Council, and has under his direction and control some fifteen or sixteen services all of which I need not name but to some of which I should refer. In the first place he has under his direction, through the Director of Military Operations, all offensive and defensive operations and plans therefor; the strategical distribution of military forces; the collection, compilation, and distribution of intelligence; and the administration of the corps of guides. Through the Director of Training and Staff Duties, he has control of local defence schemes and plans of concentration; training of all arms; military attachés; organization, administration and instruction of the general staff, including appointments thereto; supervision of instruction at schools of instructions; courses of military training at universities. Through the Director General of Musketry, he has charge of musketry training of the militia, and organization and administration of rifle associations. Through the Assistant Director of Signalling he has charge and control of signalling instruction in all its branches.

The Adjutant General's branch is of course a very important service, in connection with the raising of the very large forces that have been mobilized during the last eighteen months. Under the Adjutant General is, in the first place, the Director General of mobilization, who controlled a very small establishment before the war broke out. Under the direction of Colonel R. J. Gwynne, Director General of mobilization, are a great many different services, to some of which I may refer. They include war organization; preparation of war establishments; mobilization, including the general consideration of administrative action necessary to give effect to the approved policy regarding mobilization, co-ordination of military arrangements regarding mobilization, and of orders regulating such arrangements; localization of units; formation and disbandment of units and corps, and executive action in connection therewith; allotment of units to formations on mobilization; all matters relating to drafts; estimating and preparing drafts of all arms; and placing units and drafts of all arms under orders for embarkation.

The Adjutant General's staff has been enlarged by the appointment of an Assistant Adjutant General No. 1, and an Assistant Adjutant General No. 2. The duties which come particularly under the direction of Adjutant General No. 1, Lieut.-Col. C. S. McInnes, are, among others; the appointment of recruiting officers; allotment of recruiting areas in conjunction with mobilization; dealing with requests and recommendations for recruiting expenditures; recruiting problems generally in connection with officers commanding military districts who are authorized so far as possible to organize their districts in accordance with local conditions and requirements; preparation of enlistment regulations and all matters relating to attestations, etc. It is to be observed also, in connection with the duties of this officer, that, owing to the large number of new units authorized from time to time, and owing to the creation of special units, such as pioneer battalions, tunnelling companies, foresters, etc., numerous applications are made from time to time in all parts of Canada. A general regula-

tion has been established against transfers, but the exceptional cases are necessarily numerous and for various reasons. This officer has also under his immediate charge the active militia and Canadian expeditionary force employed on guard duty in Canada. Guards are being employed during war time for internment camps, for garrisons, for certain munitions plants, armouries, etc. At one time, the active militia called out on active service for such duties numbered upwards of 13,000. This has now been reduced, with considerable effort, to less than 10,000, and it is hoped that a further reduction may yet be made in the number of the active militia so employed. Returned soldiers are employed wherever possible, and the Canadian expeditionary force troops are also used to some extent when this does not conflict with the necessary training for overseas. Questions relating to the employment and withdrawal of such guards are continually arising, and are dealt with in conjunction with the branch of the Chief of General Staff where garrisons are concerned, with the Master General of Ordnance in connection with munitions plants, and with the General Officer Commanding internment operations as to internment camps. There are also, in so large a force, numerous questions continually arising with regard to discharges for medical unfitness, inefficiency, and for special reasons. These questions are required to be referred to headquarters. The work has been decentralized as far as possible in order to enable discharges to be carried out and pay to cease at the earliest possible date without the delay formerly involved by a reference to headquarters in all cases.

At the same time, considerable work is still involved in connection with many matters, such as the discharge of minors and American citizens, the bringing back of non-commissioned officers and men from England to Canada for discharge to take commissions, etc. The administrative arrangements in connection with the discharge depots at Quebec and St. John, which have been established for dealing with members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force returning from England, are dealt with by the Assistant Adjutant-General, No. 1. A large amount of new work has also arisen in connection with this department in co-ordination with the branch of the accountant and paymaster general, with the director general of medical services and with the Military Hospitals Commission. As the soldiers who go to such homes are still kept on pay and subject to military discipline, this branch is interested and involved in work relating to them until their final discharge from the service.

This department has charge also of a very important matter in respect of returns which must be prepared, consisting not only of parade states of the permanent force, as heretofore, but also of full details of the strength and location of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in Canada from time to time, and returns of recruiting, discharges and transfers. All matters of discipline are also dealt with by this department, not only those relating to officers, but those relating also to non-commissioned officers and men; also courts martial, courts of inquiry in connection with the Judge Advocate General, as well as questions relating to fraudulent enlistments and deserters. This department has charge also of the organization and administration of those schools or gymnasia which have recently been established since the commencement of the war, which include instruction in bayonet fighting and physical training. The administration and control of the corps of Military Staff Clerks and Staff Orderly Service is also in charge of this department. The personnel in this service has more than doubled since the commencement of the war. This department takes charge also of administrative arrangements relating to camps and camp staff, in conjunction with other branches interested. It has also control of billeting arrangements of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, which it takes up in conjunction with the Director General of Supply and Transport. A considerable amount of work has arisen in connection with the billeting of men during the winter months in the places where recruited. This branch has charge also of all questions relating to furlough of non-commissioned officers and men, whether in Canada or returned from England, and the inspection of such men; also the preparation of records dealing with regulations governing furlough for harvesting, seeding, or other agricultural work. It is also concerned with garrison and regimental institutes and canteens, and has control through a special inspector appointed to investigate the same.

Many other subjects are referred to in the memorandum placed in my hands at my request, but it is not necessary to bring them to the attention of the committee at the moment. I may add, however, that

steps have been taken and machinery has been provided for the purpose of co-ordinating the work of this branch of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in Canada with similar work which is necessarily carried on in Great Britain and in France.

I now take up the work of the Assistant Adjutant General No. 2, Lieut.-Col. Palmer. The memorandum that I have before me contains the information that since the war no change has been made in the organization of this division, but it has been expanded to meet requirements as far as possible. The work has been increased by the provisional appointments of officers to units of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and by the large number of new appointments to the Canadian Militia, as all officers before joining a unit of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, if they do not already belong to the Canadian Militia, are appointed to some unit thereof. There are now some 11,000 or 12,000 officers in the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The Assistant Adjutant General No. 2 has himself dealt with all provisional appointments, promotions and retirement of officers in the Canadian Expeditionary Force and all correspondence relating thereto. As units of the Canadian Expeditionary Force sail for England, lists of officers are mailed in duplicate to His Royal Highness the Governor General; the Secretary of the War Office, London, England; the General Officer Commanding Canadians, Shorncliffe; the Officer in charge, Canadian Records, London, Eng.; the Director of Recruiting and Organiation, Folkestone.

The next part of the organization to which I direct attention is the administration of the medical branch. It is not necessary to advert to what that organization was in time of peace. The general organization remains practically the same throughout Canada. The Central Army Medical School has been discontinued, as well as the Central Laboratory of Hygiene, the work carried out by these organizations being now dealt with in military districts. Civil hospitals have been largely utilized throughout Canada for the care of the sick, as the military hospitals available were not sufficient for the sick in troops mobilized. The Central Medical Stores remain in operation, and all technical medical equipment for overseas units is supplied through them. The arrangements for the purchase of medical supplies generally has been somewhat changed, as the War Purchasing Commission now carries out all such purchases.

The Permanent Army Medical Corps has sent overseas most of its officers and nursing sisters and a number of non-commissioned officers and men, leaving, for the most part, the carrying out of the medical services in Canada to the Army Medical Corps.

The organization of the Army Medical Corps remains the same, with the exception that the dental surgeons are now no longer a part of the Army Medical Corps, but are a special corps.

All medical officers are now appointed to the Army Medical Corps, and are not of the regimental service. Medical units of the active militia have been kept on foot, but increased efforts have been given to securing personnel for overseas medical units.

Voluntary aid detachments have been formed and registered as applied for.

The general scheme of the organization has provided sufficient machinery to carry on the medical services in Canada, but a great deal of inconvenience has been experienced owing to the medical officers most experienced in military matters having been sent overseas with the earliest contingents. Newly appointed officers have been called upon to fill posts for which they have had little training.

Training depots for the Army Medical Corps, to provide reinforcements for the overseas Canadian Army Medical Corps have been established in military districts 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 13. In addition to providing reinforcements, they assist in carrying on the medical services, especially in places where a medical officer of the Army Medical Corps is not available.

Civilian medical practitioners have in many cases been utilized to carry out the medical examination of recruits. There has been no lack of officers, nursing sisters, and men for this branch of the service.

The establishing of the Military Hospitals' Commission really creates a new division of the medical service, and had this not been established the Medical Service would have had, to a large extent, to carry on the work which that Commission is now performing. The organization of the medical services was such that the securing of sufficient personnel and alloting them to various duties has been more necessary than the establishing of special new divisions.

The duties of medical officers, as far as

Canada is concerned, compared with the duties of medical officers in time of peace, have been very greatly increased, and with special reference to the care of troops on active service.

The selection of officers for various duties has been made with due regard to their special qualifications and experience, but, in most cases, personnel of all ranks has had to be trained for the duties to be performed.

In speaking of the co-ordination of the Service in Canada with the services overseas, the following observations are to be made from the report which I hold in my hand:

The machinery at present utilized to co-ordinate the work of the medical services in Canada with that overseas has been the medium of letters, cables, reports, etc., passed between the office of the Director General of Medical Services and the Director of Medical Services, Canadian Expeditionary Force. In every case where problems arising in Canada appear to have any bearing on those overseas, the Director of Medical Services, Canadian Expeditionary Force, is communicated with.

I shall now allude briefly to the report regarding the Canadian Army Dental Corps.

The Canadian Army Dental Corps service is divided into two branches, the one dealing with the services necessary to the recruit on enlistment and the soldier in training; the other with the casualty branch or that dealing with the returned, wounded, and invalided soldier.

I have been informed, not only from this report but during my visit overseas last summer, that the value of the work of this corps can hardly be over estimated. It is a service I believe, to which not very great attention was given in the British establishment before the outbreak of the war, and I am informed that there is less attention paid to this subject by the British military authorities than has been thought desirable in this country. The report goes on to observe:

In the early months of the Corps' existence its time was largely taken up wth the first branch, viz., treatment of recruits and soldiers in training, but, as is inevitable in a war of this kind, the casualty branch has been increased by leaps and bounds, while the former service has not been lessened in the smallest degree.

With regard to the evolution and development of this corps, the report continues:

With the proportion of men rejected on enlistment, greater, for dental defects, than for any other cause, the need for just such a unit as the Canadian Army Dental Corps impressed itself on the authorities. So important have been its services that the disability existing at first, in regard to enlistment, has been entirely removed and tens of thousands of men are serving in the trenches to-day who owe their presence there to these very services.

The personnel of the Corps has increased from the modest beginnings of 57 to the number of almost 1,000 to-day. New divisions have been created overseas and a corresponding increase in our Corps takes place with each new division. The total personnel for each new division is 96. The duties cover dental services to every unit in the service, wherever permission can be obtained to post Canadian Army Dental Corps officers.

No provision had been made at the inception of the Corps for its services to be utilized in Canada, and this has been since done, and the Canadian force now consists of nearly 400 all told.

Practically all the administrative work falls on the office of the Corps Headquarters, Ottawa, and the difficulties of administration in a unit whose territory extends from Victoria, B.C., to Great Britain, France, Cairo in Egypt, and Salonika are easily discernible.

Dental history sheets have been provided so that where a man goes overseas before having his work completed, the uncompleted portion is carried out on his arrival over there.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the right hon. gentleman give us some information about the transfer to the Government of France of Canadian hospitals in France? I saw by a newspaper report the other day that Sir George Perley, the High Commissioner for Canada, had gone to France to be present at the ceremony of transferring these hospitals.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In the answer I am about to give I shall not speak of the hospitals which form part of the regular establishment of an army in the field. We have, of course, hospitals of
4 p.m. that character, which have been established in France from the first. I saw no fewer than five of them when I was in France last summer, and nearly all, at that time, were near Boulogne. But in addition to that we have three hospitals to which probably my hon. friend alludes. One of them, under the command of Colonel Mignault, is at St. Cloud, and that hospital has been placed entirely at the disposal of the French Government. It is true that Sir George Perley went to France to be present at the opening of the hospital, and I think that occasion was also honoured by the presence of the President of the French Republic. That hospital has been placed entirely at the disposal of the French Government to be used for French soldiers who have been wounded at the front and require hospital care.

Mr. MARCIL: The Canadian staff is retained?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Oh yes. The staff is entirely Canadian; in fact entirely French Canadian.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that not the gift of the Canadian Government to the French Government?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, that is the gift of the Canadian Government to the French Government. The arrangements were made for it last summer while I was overseas.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there not also another hospital at Dinard?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is also another hospital at Boulogne and one at Dinard. Of the three hospitals, the one at St. Cloud is a French-Canadian hospital, as I have explained. The officers, surgeons, every one connected with it, are from the province of Quebec. That hospital has been accepted by the French Government and is maintained by the Government of Canada. There are two others to which my hon. friend perhaps alludes, at Boulogne and Dinard. One of these is a hospital which was organized by the University of McGill, and the other one is a French-Canadian hospital, organized somewhat along the line, I suppose, of the hospital at St. Cloud. So there are these three hospitals, in addition to the regular establishment of military hospitals necessary for the purposes of an army in the field. I am very glad indeed that they have been established. I am sure that not only the British Government but the French Government as well have received their establishment with a great deal of appreciation, and I am also confident that their work will be up to the highest standard, and will reflect credit not only upon those who are responsible for their management but upon this country as a whole.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The reason I mentioned Dinard is that I have received letters from a French friend, who is also a friend of Canada, being a large investor in the West, and he speaks most highly of the Canadian hospital at Dinard. He says it is a most creditable institution.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My experience of the Canadian hospitals that I had the honour to visit while I was overseas, corresponds entirely with what my hon. friend has just said. I do not know that there are anywhere in Europe to-day hospitals better organized or better equipped than the hospitals established by Canada, including the three I have alluded to.

The next branch to which I shall refer is the Record Office. I have very voluminous reports here with regard to that branch. It is difficult to appreciate the enormous amount of work which devolves upon that particular office unless one is brought closely in touch with it. In time of peace the Record office itself has an establishment of four clerks. It has now an establishment of 360 clerks. The separation allowance branch had no organization before the war; that branch has now a staff of 270. To illustrate the amount of work that some of these departments have to perform, I was informed to-day by the Accountant and Paymaster General that in connection with the assigned pay and separation allowances, no less than 5,000 cheques have to be issued daily, while 1,000 letters have to be written daily. Then there is the Contracts Branch. In time of peace it consisted of a personnel of 30; this has been increased to 250, all of whom are working very hard, as I am informed. The Accountant's Branch in time of peace had a personnel of 35; to-day is has a personnel of 108. The Superintendent of Stationery Branch in time of peace had a personnel of 10; to-day it has a personnel of 24. At the outbreak of war all these branches had a personnel of 79. To-day they number 1,042. In many of these branches, a great deal of the work has to be done at all hours of the day and night. For example, the separation and assigned pay branch is obliged to work in three shifts of eight hours each; because the work has to proceed during the whole 24 hours.

However, I was going to speak of the work of the Record Branch more particularly. I must omit the greater part of the report which I have received, but there are a few details to which attention should be directed. The staff works in two shifts; the day staff from 8.30 a.m. to 5 p.m., and the night staff from 5.30 p.m. till midnight, and often later, when the work of the office requires it. Each section is in charge of a clerk specially selected to supervise its work, who is assisted, when necessary, by other senior clerks.

It is further observed that when the troops proceeded to France and the casualties commenced to come in, it became necessary to engage a special staff of typists for night work, owing to the fact that practically all cablegrams reporting casualties

reached the department after 6 p.m. The next of kin in each case are informed of the casualty by telegram, and an arrangement has been arrived at with both telegraph companies to report to the Record Office when delivery had been made, thus ensuring that no information relating to any casualty is communicated to the public press until the next of kin has received notification. For some months the work of the Record Office was carried on under great difficulties, owing to the fact that the available space in the department was very limited, and this handicap was felt severely when some 6,000 casualties were reported at the battles of St. Julien and Langemarck. Notwithstanding this, however, by working until between 3 and 4 a.m. each day, they were handled at the rate of not less than 500 per day. The particulars on each attestation paper are recorded on a card, so as to render the information readily accessible, not only for the purpose of furnishing information to the next of kin, but also to enable inquiries from all parts of the Dominion, which average 150 per day, to be promptly answered. At the present time over 200,000 index cards have been written and filed in alphabetical order.

The discharge documents of men who have been returned to Canada as medically unfit, undesirable, etc., are recorded and filed alphabetically. The particulars in each case are recorded on a card as well as entered on a form specially drawn up for the purpose, which is placed on each man's file, so that the necessary information is readily available for any one who deals with the case. Lists of men discharged in the different districts are received at headquarters daily. These lists are carefully checked and compiled, and a copy is furnished each day to the Military Hospitals Commission, to several branches of the Canadian Patriotic Fund, and to different large firms and companies who are retaining their employees on their pay rolls whilst overseas. A cable is received each week from England giving the names and classifications of all men who are to be returned to Canada as medically unfit, undesirable, or for other cause. Copies have to be made and forwarded to the different officers commanding military districts, to the Military Hospitals Commission, to discharge depots, and to several branches of the Canadian Patriotic Fund, as well as to various staff officers at headquarters. As the number of men enlisted increases, and casualties increase, so does the work in this section increase correspondingly. At present the average number of letters sent out daily is 300, and this number is considerably augmented after each important engagement in which Canadian troops have taken part.

With regard to personal effects and wills, up to a month ago, that is, prior to the organization of the Estates Branch, all questions relating to personal effects, wills, etc., including the distribution of property, were dealt with in the Record Office. An arrangement was made with all express companies operating in the Dominion, to transport in Canada, free of charge, the personal effects of deceased soldiers. There is now, however, a special branch which deals with the estates of deceased soldiers, and which is carried on by competent men and under adequate supervision.

With regard to missing men: at the present time the Record Office is dealing with the cases of men who have been missing for a period of six months or over. The number reported missing, whose next of kin reside in Canada, is about 500. A letter has been written to the next of kin, in each case, asking if any information has been received, from any source, which would lead to the belief that the soldier is still alive. In addition to the letter to each next of kin, a communication is addressed to the officer in charge of records, England, with the view of obtaining like information. From time to time lists of men who are prisoners of war have been prepared and issued to different societies formed especially to look after their welfare. We have taken upon ourselves the responsibility of arranging, through Sir George Perley, that any supplies of necessaries, which may be required by prisoners of war or persons interned in enemy countries, shall be provided for them, and we have received many grateful letters from these unfortunate persons acknowledging the excellence of this arrangement.

Inquiries from insurance companies are very numerous and they include the furnishing of death certificates and certified copies of attestation papers. Extracts have to be made from burial reports, giving the exact date and place of burial and particulars as to the location of the grave, and forwarded to all concerned.

I also have a memorandum in regard to the Pensions and Claims Board, but as that subject is under consideration by a committee of the House I do not think it

necessary to go into it more fully at the moment.

I shall allude very briefly to the duties of the Quartermaster General. The Quartermaster General is responsible for a great number of services among which are the following:

(1) The organization, administration and technical training of all transport, remount, railway supply, barrack, ordnance and veterinary services.

(2) Settling the reserves of food, clothing, equipment, general stores and material to be held in depots, garrisons or mobilization stores, and the scales of such articles to be in the possession of the troops.

(3) The patterns of clothing, equipment and ordnance stores.

(4) Holding and issuing all military stores.

(5) Compensation for injuries to animals or material.

(6) Selection of officers for employment in the above services.

(7) Arrangements for postal services.

(8) Advising and assisting the Deputy Minister, Militia and Defence, in making arrangements for contracts for the above services.

(9) Preparation, jointly with the Finance Minister of estimates for the above services.

There is a statement in this report as to the personnel of the staff which I need not read. The duties of the various administrative heads who are connected with this branch may be briefly referred to. For example, the Director General of Supplies and Transports, among 19 different administrative duties, of which he is in charge, deals with the following:

Appropration and occupation of barracks, hospitals, offices, armouries, drill halls, etc.

Supplies of food, forage, paillasse straw, fuel and disenfectants. Questions as to the amount of water or light allowed in barracks, and of the supply of oil, carbide, etc., for the production of light in barracks and camps.

Supply arrangements in connection with mobilization and defence schemes.

All questions in connection with transport and conveyance of stores.

Provision, repair and administration of transport vessels.

Arrangements for the execution of postal services in war, and in camps (when necessary).

This branch is represented in each district by an assistant director of supplies and transports, who is, in most instances, an officer of the Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps, and who is in charge of the above services in his district. He is assisted, wherever possible, by a small detachment of officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps. The Assistant Director of Supplies and Transports also commands and administers the Active Militia companies of the Army Service Corps in his district who are employed in the annual training camps in carrying out the necessary administrative services. There is also a statement of the other officers connected with the service whom I need not specifically mention at the moment. In addition to the duties already enumerated, this director has performed all work in connection with the chartering of ships for the conveyance of troops overseas and the passing of the accounts in connection therewith.

There is a Director of Supplies and Transport in England, whose duties there are analogous to those of the Director of Supplies and Transport here, viz.: The feeding and transportation of the Canadian troops in England. He has also charge of the Army Service Corps reinforcements sent from Canada from time to time from which the wastage both in officers and men at the front is supplied. This officer is attached to and comes under the control of the General Officer Commanding Overseas Canadians.

There is also associated with the Quartermaster General's department the general directorship of clothing and equipment. The Director General has charge of some twelve administrative matters but there are only three of them that I need mention:

All questions in connection with clothing and necessaries, such as mobilization reserves, thefts, losses and scales of issues.

Preparation of estimates for clothing and necessaries.

Disposal of worn-out colours, clothing, etc.

Then there is the Principal Ordnance Officer who has charge of ten services, only three of which need be referred to:

The administration, distribution and corps training of the Canadian Ordnance Corps, and inspection of the same.

Preparation of War Office requisitions and contract demands for all clothing and necessaries.

The maintenance of reserves of stores and of mobilization stores.

The principal duties of the Canadian Ordnance Corps are the receiving, storing, accounting for and distribution of all clothing, necessaries, stores, guns, ammunition, vehicles and all other warlike stores except those of a technical medical nature. The corps is also charged with the maintenance and repair of the above stores, etc.

The director of stores has charge of eight different services, to only three of which I shall allude:

The preparation of annual and other estimates for all equipment and general stores required for the militia during time of peace and

for the Canadian Expeditionary Force during war. The provision of all such equipment and stores, e.g., personal equipment of soldiers, camp equipment, harness and saddlery, tools, signalling equipment, and materials, barrack and hospital stores, miscellaneous stores, etc.

To arrange for the selection, approval and sealing as standards of all patterns to govern future supplies and to provide specifications for same.

Preparation of mobilization store tables and the revision from time to time to govern issues of equipment to units in the field; and the compilation of tables and other regulations governing issues of equipment and stores to the permanent and non-permanent militia, Rifle Associations and Cadet Corps.

There are also the duties of the Headquarters Branch of the Mechanical Transport Section, Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps. It has charge of twelve services to only a few of which I shall allude:

Administration of Headquarters Detachment, Mechanical Transport Section C.P.A.S.C., including the Mechanical Transport School of Instruction.

Inspection of motor trucks, cars, ambulances, motorcycles, bicycles and spare parts for same.

Motor trucks. The chasses, tires, bodies, cowls, tool boxes, etc., are received from the various manufacturers and are assembled into complete motor trucks for shipment overseas.

Local transport. In conjunction with the testing of motor trucks for overseas, an average of 150 tons per day departmental stores are handled by this branch between the various railroads, inspection rooms and Ordnance stores.

School of Mechanical Transport instruction for officers being sent overseas, previously carried on by the training depot at Toronto, is now directly under this branch and carried on at the Victoria garage.

That gives a very rough and imperfect estimate of the work that is being carried on under the direction of the Quartermaster General.

I next come to the work of the Master General of the Ordnance. The organization of this branch resolves itself into two divisions or directorates, supervised by (1) Director of Artillery, (2) Director General of Engineer Services. In regard to the organization since the war I have the following observations in a report from Brigadier General Elliott:

No changes in the organization have been made since the commencement of the war, except that the Master General of the Ordnance also performs the duties of the Director of Artillery, the latter officer being on service in France. An Inspector of Artillery Stores, with an assistant, has been added to the branch. The work has increased enormously but the present staff has so far been able to cope with it by working much longer hours.

The development that has taken place since the commencement of the war is divided into two main branches: (1) the mobilization and training of the various units and drafts of engineers for overseas; (2) Engineer Services—construction and maintenance of military works and buildings as in peace time, with the addition of housing of troops mobilized in Canada in winter, and fitting up their training areas in summer, as, for example, at Valcartier and the various training camps in Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

The total trained and sent overseas amounts to 322 officers and 6,321 non-commissioned officers and men. For this purpose an Engineer Training Depot was organized in Ottawa, where all non-commissioned officers and men were sent from districts to be trained before proceeding overseas. The officers are drawn from the existing peace units of engineer and regimental lists.

In addition, a School of Signals is attached to the Training Depot to train and provide the signal units and drafts.

In addition to the duties carried out by the Engineer Services in peace time, much extra work has been entailed in the arranging for housing of troops in winter, fitting up large training camps, which continue for about five months, and the construction of certain fortifications, defence lights and munition buildings not otherwise provided for. To co-ordinate the work of this branch in England and in France in its relation to the Canadian Expeditionary Force, an Engineer Training Depot has also been organized at Shorncliffe, England, to further train and make up the engineer units for the front.

Owing to the immense drain on engineer personnel, the staffs have been reduced to a minimum, and this entails a greatly increased amount of work at Militia Headquarters. Nevertheless, the difficult and responsible duties have been satisfactorily carried out by all ranks, more especially that of housing of the troops.

Then there is a Small Arms Inspection Branch at Quebec, charged with the duties of inspection of all materials for the manufacture of small arms and ammunition, also machine guns, instructional and other stores. They have the custody of sealed patterns, specifications, samples, standard gauges, drawings, and models of all stores to be inspected. They conduct firing proofs of small arms and small arms ammunition. Inspections are also carried out at factories.

So far as the Dominion arsenal at

Quebec is concerned, the personnel consists of a superintendent, one assistant superintendent, and one medical officer; also a supernumerary staff consisting of chemist and staff, including laboratory foreman, and foremen of the different departments of the arsenal. Since the commencement of the war, in addition to the work devolving upon it in time of peace, the arsenal has manufactured a greatly increased quantity of field gun ammunition and stores in connection with the inspection and proof of War Office ammunition; also material for the training of the Expeditionary Force. On account of the large amount of additional work devolving upon it the supernumerary staff has had to be increased.

With regard to the work of the Accountant and Paymaster General, there are now five divisions in this branch. The following table shows the number employed in each on three different dates, viz.: August 1, 1914; January 1, 1915; and April 1, 1916:

	August 1, 1914.	January 1, 1915.	April 1, 1916.
Accounts division... ..	14	25	50
Pay audit division.....	10	25	70
Separation allowance and assigned pay division..	..	42	250
Stores audit division...	11	13	15
Pension division.. ..	..	..	7
Total	35	105	392

At the outbreak of war in August, 1914, there was a Permanent Force of 3,000 troops, and the total Militia expenditure was at the rate of nearly $12,000,000 a year. There are at present 300,000 troops in the field, and the expenditure has increased to $250,000,000 a year.

There were no radical changes to be made in the system of carrying on the work, but rather a quick expansion of the one in operation; and the great difficulty at first was to find trained men. There were but few of these to be found, and the only solution was to get the best available, and train them.

Regimental paymasters have been a source of trouble from the start, and still are, but as we have now a number of trained and experienced paymasters we are using some of these as instructors and inspectors, and in this way the situation is improving, as inefficient regimental paymasters are soon discovered and either given instruction or relieved of their duties altogether.

The chief paymaster, Canadian Expeditionary Force, London, England, is treated the same as a district paymaster in Canada. He is provided with funds through the High Commissioner, but reports to the Paymaster General, and accounts directly to him for all expenditure.

One or two observations as to the very great stress that has been imposed upon the officers of the department might be useful at the moment. A pretty full memorandum on this subject was prepared in December last. It is very lengthy, and when a copy of it has been prepared, I shall be glad to lay it on the table of the House, but there are one or two extracts I might read to the committee. The Director of Contracts, speaking of the very urgent work of great magnitude that was imposed upon his branch at the outbreak of war in connection with the hurried despatch of the first contingent, says:

> All this work for the first contingent was therefore disposed of by the ordinary staff, with some additional inspectors and half a dozen additional junior clerks. Of necessity the usual methods, the ordinary safeguards and precautions were not always practicable. In peace time goods were bought usually after competitive tenders had first been obtained, unless the purchase was under a previously made contract still in force. In the early days of the war competitive tenders took much valuable time; sometimes they were got by telephone, occasionally they had to be disposed with. In general, every possible short cut was taken to ensure the prime object—delivery of the goods in time. The hours of work were extended to the uttermost—the working day varied from 10 to 20 hours, and the average must have been at least 70 hours weekly for many months. The continuous strain of working at long tension under great pressure and with the knowledge that the time was far too short to allow proper attention to be given any transaction, even the most important, taxed the nervous and physical strength of all to the limit. Under these circumstances some irregularities were unavoidable, and it is surprising that so few occurred.

He goes on:

> The months of February, March and April (of last year) were times of absolute paralysis and congestion. The various parliamentary and other committees of inquiry and investigation absorbed practically all my time and that of the most valuable of my assistants, either in attendance thereon, or in preparation of papers and information called for. The work of the branch remained, perforce, at a standstill; although the necessity for it continued unabated. The arrears thus accumulated took months to overtake, after work was resumed and the staff had been enlarged.

To give an idea of what had been imposed upon his branch at the first, the following partial list of clothing, etc., purchased since August 1, 1914, will serve to

give some idea of the magnitude of the business:

Greatcoats, 229,100; cloaks, 70,500; serge jackets, 401,500; serge trousers, 298,000; flannel shirts, 650,000; suits underwear, 732,000; service shirts, 278,000; service trousers, 205,700; sweaters, 398,225; socks, 1,969,100; forage caps, 313,000; puttees, 474,800; caps, comforter, 515,000; blankets, 746,500; boots, 670,000.

These fifteen items alone have an approximate value of $15,929,845. For the making of uniform clothing, 9,566,000 yards of various materials have been bought, received, inspected, and re-shipped to the various manufacturers of clothing. These are only a few items amongst thousands dealt with. The value of warlike and other stores bought, as distinguished from clothing, is as great or greater than the clothing; and their range and variety is much greater.

He goes on to deal with the subject of British and foreign contracts. Between August 1, 1914, and May 1, 1915, stores and equipment for British and foreign Governments were bought to a total amount of $11,563,180. A very considerable part of this was for the French, while $1,450,000 was for the Russian, and the balance for the British Government. The contracts in all cases were made in the branch; the supplies inspected and the accounts certified for payment. It will be observed that the foreign business alone was in value three times as great as the ordinary ante-bellum work of the branch for the same time. His summing up is as follows:

The war suddenly increased the work from ten to fifteen times; and this had to be disposed of by a staff absolutely undermanned at first and never large enough during the whole period now under review, and hampered by lack of time, lack of space, and many other hindrances to prompt and satisfactory despatch of business.

There are one or two observations I would read from the report made by the Accountant and Paymaster General:

To the layman the work of paying an army may seem a simple task, and it would be simple if it consisted merely of paying men a fixed rate once a month as in the case of large corporations. Owing to the fact, however, that the Government assumes a sort of paternal charge over the soldier, clothes, feeds, houses, and pays him, and also in a way provides for his family, the work is not so simple as it might appear; and where desertions and discharges are extremely numerous, as was the case for the first few months, and regimental officers, including the paymaster are more or less inexperienced in their duties, there is bound to be care and worry for those in charge of the work. Add to this the difficulties resulting from having to issue part of the soldier's pay in Ottawa to his dependents and the balance to the soldier himself in England and France, and the work becomes extremely complicated and the correspondence enormous as the pay officers at Ottawa and London have to keep each other advised of the state of each soldier's account. For this purpose it is necessary to open a ledger account with each soldier and also one with each dependent. Some idea of the work may be had from the number of cheques issued from the pay office at Ottawa which total now eighty thousand a month.

This report was made in December last. I stated the number at 125,000 a moment ago; that is the number now.

As already stated a great deal of difficulty has been experienced as a result of having to employ inexperienced regimental paymasters. Until these officers become trained in their work and attend to it properly there is bound to be trouble for all concerned. Not only must the paymaster be efficient but the regimental officers must be efficient as well and give him their co-operation. This is often lacking in the early stages of the organization of a regiment, and, as a rule, some months elapse before the work goes smoothly. Naturally pay work is not considered the most important by regimental officers in a crisis like the present, when the great object is to make the regiment fit for the firing line; hence, at first, there is more or less lack of attention to pay matters and men are discharged or allowed to desert without notifying headquarters of the fact.

So it may happen that cheques are sent to men who may have been discharged or may have deserted, or their dependents may receive cheques, because proper information has not been given.

These cases, however are becoming more rare and every means is being taken to obtain at Ottawa speedy notification of discharges and desertions. The old method of paying the men in cash has, as regards the troops in Canada, been discontinued, and cheques are now issued instead twice a month. While this system is somewhat cumbersome and entails more work than the other, yet it prevents irregularities and enables headquarters to keep a perfect check on paymasters. These latter are not allowed to draw cash from the bank, and the cheques issued to them do not go back to them from the bank but are sent to headquarters.

There is a great deal more information of a similar character with regard to all branches of the Department of Militia and Defence, but I have given enough to make hon. members realize the very great magnitude of the task which has devolved upon the Government in connection with the organization required by the war.

Now, with regard to the distribution and strength of the forces that have already been raised. Overseas, elsewhere than in Great Britain, there are approximately 65,000 men. It is understood that we have at the front three divisions, which include all lines of communication units, includ-

ing hospital depots. We have in Great Britain at the present time approximately 70,000 men. I would like to say in this connection that there has been very earnest effort on the part of the Minister of Militia during the past four or five months, and an equally earnest effort on my own part, since I have been acting in the department, to procure the consent of the War Office to sending our men forward more rapidly than in the past. As a result, I believe that we have despatched during the months of March and April about 30,000 men. And, in reply to a communication which I myself sent to the War Office on Thursday or Friday last, to which I requested very earnestly an answer as early as possible, I have now received permission to increase the number of battalions in Great Britain to fifty-two. This will involve the despatch to the other side of a very considerable additional number of battalions in the early future. I have not been unmindful of the fact that there seemed a discrepancy between the number of men we were keeping here in Canada and the number we have in Great Britain and the number we have actually fighting at the front. As has already been explained more than once the Government of Canada was subject to certain limitations in connection with forwarding men to Great Britain and. from there to the front. In the first place, we desired to have our men equipped, as far as possible, before they went forward, and it was absolutely necessary that they should first receive a certain amount of training. During the past three or four months there has been some difficulty in providing accommodation for the troops in Great Britain, and, then again, there has been delay in sending troops forward on account of not always being able to secure transports when required. However, the best has been made of the situation, and I am convinced that in the future troops will go forward more regularly and in greater numbers than during the first three months of the present year. It should be borne in mind that during the last nine months of 1915 our forces did go across at the rate of about 2,000 per week, if I remember correctly. That average, however, was not maintained during the first three months of the present year. Then, besides that, we have in Canada, let us say, about 135,000 men, or a total of effectives of 270,000. I set down for non-effectives, casualties, wastage, etc., about 30,000, and I set down for the militia in Canada, doing garrison and outpost duty, about 10,000. This brings the total to the 310,000 men which I mentioned as having been enlisted. I may say that the troops in Great Britain at the present time are being inspected by General Lessard. He had been at the front on leave of absence and before returning to Canada it was thought desirable that he should make inspection of troops over there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I had understood that General Lessard had obtained leave of absence, but that he was not officially connected with the department over there. I understand from the right hon. gentleman that General Lessard has been inspecting the troops?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He is now engaged in that work in Great Britain.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Since when?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Since about ten days, I think.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thank the new Minister of Militia for what he did.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The arrangement for the inspection was made after consultation with the Minister of Militia and with his entire concurrence. In fact he thought it a very desirable thing that the inspection should be made by General Lessard.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear. The news will be hailed with pleasure by all Canadians.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A difficulty has arisen in connection with the supply of drafts and reinforcements; I think hon. gentlemen will understand at once what it is. When it is proposed to organize a battalion at any point in Canada, the most capable officers are selected—men, if possible, with initiative and a good deal of energy, who will throw themselves wholeheartedly into the work of recruiting the battalion, and be likely to bring it up to its full strength as soon as possible. As the officers are selected and the battalion organized, associations spring up between the officers and the men through the fact that the men are usually recruited from one particular locality, and there is a most natural desire on the part of the officers and men that the battalion shall go to the front as a unit and not be used for drafts or reinforcements. The result is that when it is necessary to fill the ranks at the front after an engagement, or to supply drafts

to fill up battalions in Great Britain which have been much depleted, there has been a great deal of reluctance and more or less murmuring on the part of the officers and men at being separated from each other and allocated to other battalions. Some arrangement by which difficulties of that kind will be obviated altogether, or at least reduced, is now under consideration in the department, and I hope that eventually we may arrive at some scheme which will make the difficulties less in the future than they have been up to the present time.

I have procured from the Deputy Minister of Finance a statement of expenditures up to the present time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that a battalion is made up of 1,100 men?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: About 1,140 or 1,160 men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Including the officers. What is the proportion of drafts to be levied after a battalion has left and who looks after the drafts? I understand that each battalion must have its drafts in Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not quite sure of the precise method that is adopted in Great Britain. I suppose that the officer at the front, after his battalion has been depleted, applies to the officer commanding the Canadian forces in Great Britain for the number of men necessary to bring his battalion up to strength again. Many battalions have been raised in different parts of Canada which have recruited 200 to 500 men above full strength. These men have gone forward to Great Britain, and, as I understand, have been used to make good the depletion in the ranks of Canadian reserve battalions in England, according as drafts have gone to the front.

I was proceeding to say that the war appropriation was not to be used solely for the Department of Militia and Defence. It was an appropriation couched in practically the same language as that which is now on the Order Paper. There have been payments to several departments of the Government out of the war appropriation, and the books of the Finance Department up to April 30 show the following results:

Militia and Defence, $146,679,117.38; Justice Department, $1,142,250.36. (Chiefly in connection with internment prisoners.)	
Dominion Police. (Additional police engaged and work in connection with intelligence, and precautions against damage apprehended in this country from alien enemies coming from some other country)..	$ 199,859 24
External Affairs..	10,228 62
Public Works..	94,414 04
Naval Service	4,132,201 74
Railways and Canals..	204,529 20
Indian Affairs..	1,901 21
Secretary of State	21,119 75
Governor General's Secretary's office..	8,399 34
Privy Council..	17,319 08
Inland Revenue..	1,970 00
Trade and Commerce..	11,257 60
War Purchasing Commission.	24,118 58
Finance Department..	73,671 16
Auditor General's office..	5,109 46
Labour Department..	1,071 19
	$152,628,537 95
Less Agriculture Department..	433 32
	$152,628,104 63

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is to April 1?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: To April 30.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is 13 months.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is of course desirable to reduce in every possible way the very great expenditure which is necessitated by the war, and I have asked the various heads of branches in the Department of Militia and Defence for a report upon that subject. The major part of the expenditure naturally consists of the pay and subsistence of the men, and the provision of uniforms and equipment and stores of various kinds which are necessary for the purposes of the war. So far as these are concerned, and they form the vastly greater part of the expenditure, we could not expect to reduce the expenditure very much, but there may be some minor matters in respect of which reductions can be accomplished. If there is any such possibility we shall not fail to avail ourselves of it.

With regard to recruiting, representations have been made to us from various quarters urging the necessity of some further system. We have received a delegation which very strongly pressed upon the Government the necessity of a complete registration of the manhood of Canada, and eventually of conscription. We have not had an opportunity of giving adequate consideration to this proposal, but the Department of Militia and Defence has endeavoured, particularly during the past six or nine months, so to guide recruiting that the agricultural, commercial and industrial strength of Canada shall not be unduly weakened. It is, of

course, impossible for a country like Canada to raise 310,000 men without any inconvenience to the various industries, such as agriculture, manufacturing, and the various commercial activities of the country, but we have endeavoured to arrange with recruiting officers that where a very large number of men have been taken from a district which is a centre of a particular industry of importance to the country, recruiting in that particular place shall be so directed that the industry in question shall not be unduly hampered. So far as agriculture is concerned, a general order was passed by the Department of Militia giving permission to the men enlisted in all parts of Canada to engage in agriculture during a certain period this spring, to assist in ploughing and seeding. Representations were made to us, on behalf of some agricultural interests, that in some parts of the country this permission was not being availed of to a very large extent. So, upon my suggestion to the Deputy Minister of Militia, an instruction was sent out to the officers commanding the various battalions directing them to encourage and even to urge the men to assist in this work, which is of the highest possible importance, as we all agree that agricultural production should, during this war, as indeed at all
5 p.m. times, be brought up to its highest limit. We have endeavoured to relieve the situation, so far as possible, by such means.

I have detained the committee at very considerable length, but I think not without some advantage, in making members of the House acquainted with the very great magnitude of the work which is being carried on and with the very valuable services which have been rendered to this country by the officers of the Department of Militia and Defence. I have found them inspired throughout by a splendid spirit of earnestness and devotion to the public interest. It is almost impossible for hon. members of this House who have not been brought closely in touch with the activities of the department, to realize the enormous burdens of responsibility and of work which have been undertaken by the officers of the department, which have been assumed by them without a murmur or complaint, and which have been carried out, I believe, in a manner which reflects credit not only upon them but upon the administration of public affairs in this country. In common with all the people of this country, they have been called upon for a certain sacrifice, and they have made that sacrifice cheerfully and patriotically.

The spirit of our people has been so splendid that no words of mine are needed in commendation of it. Who would have imagined, in August, 1914, that in less than 18 months more than 300,000 men in Canada would have flocked to the colours? The difficulty has been not to obtain enlistments, but to provide uniforms, equipment, arms, and all the necessaries for war. But more than that, we in Canada, in common with all the citizens of the Empire, can congratulate ourselves upon the splendid courage and endurance which our men have displayed at the front. It was a supreme test to which they were subjected. They had not been trained to arms as had the forces of the enemy whom they went to encounter. Few of them had had any military training before the outbreak of war. They went to the front and they met the very best troops that Europe could produce. They met the forces of the enemy, in the first instance, under the most trying conditions that could be imagined.

It would be impossible, I believe, for any man now within the sound of my voice to realize the test to which the Canadian troops were subjected on the 22nd April, 1915. I have said before that only those who have seen in the hospitals, men still suffering, months afterwards, from the effects of that gas attack, could realize what it meant to the Canadian forces who were subjected to it. They not only endured that, they remained in the trenches and held them, held them not only in the face of that attack, but in the face of overwhelming numbers, and they did not retire, not a man of them, until they received orders to do so, and some of them did not retire even then. To-day the men at the front, unless I am misinformed, are holding one of the most important and perilous portions of the line in France or in Belgium. We can rest assured, from the spirit which was shown a year ago, that the Canadian troops who hold that line will hold it to the end, and, while we mourn the casualities which bring sorrow to so many homes, we know that in the outcome the Canadian troops at the front can be relied upon to do their duty. We are all conscious of the sacrifice which this struggle for liberty and the preservation of our institutions demands, and although Canada is conscious, from the Atlantic to

the Pacific, of that tremendous sacrifice of life and of resources, she faces the future with undaunted eye and with a firm heart.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): I desire to ask the Prime Minister a few questions for information, as I did not wish to interrupt him in the course of his remarks. I am sure that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will cordially endorse the appreciation, just delivered by the Prime Minister, of the Canadian forces. I quite agree with the right hon. gentleman when he stated that considering the fact that our soldiers were inexperienced in the art of war they have accomplished great deeds, and have reflected great credit upon our country. I am sure that Canadians all look forward to a continuance, during the balance of the war, of the same courage and distinction on the part of the Canadian troops as we have witnessed in the past.

The right hon. gentleman has given us a very great deal of information this afternoon, which I am sure the House will receive with pleasure, and which will be valuable to the country. I quite appreciate the fact also, that the Department of Militia had very suddenly thrust upon it a vast amount of labour, and I agree with the Prime Minister in saying that a great deal of credit is due to that branch of the public service for its splendid work during the past 18 months or more. Sometimes, however, I feel that there has been such an amount of extra work pressed upon that particular department that possibly there has been, in regard to details, a lack of organization, that has not been to the advantage of the country. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister state that he had asked the various heads of the branches of the Militia Department for a statement showing where, if possible, they could minimize expenditures on the war credit vote. I think that this matter might very well engage the serious consideration of the Government. I do not think that the country would be too critical as to small details of war expenditure, but, in the main, they will expect from the Government an oversight and direction in respect to war expenditures that will make them feel that their interests are being protected.

As was pointed out last year, a special responsibility rests upon the Government, as a body, in respect to war expenditures that does not attach to them in connection with expenditures by departments. In the latter case, ministers come to Parliament and designate in the Supply Bill the various detailed amounts which they ask Parliament to vote, but in the case of the resolution before the committee, a flat vote of $250,000,000 is asked for as a war credit vote. There are no details given, Parliament surrenders to the Government its control over the expenditure, and expects it to exercise that oversight as to detail which Parliaments usually exercise in respect to supply votes to the various departments of Government. The expenditures made by the Militia Department, or by any department, in connection with the war, are therefore under the responsibility of the Government as a body, and that responsibility does not rest upon any one particular minister, or upon any one particular department. Last session of Parliament, on the occasion of the consideration of a resolution similar to this, I gave to the committee a statement, or a minute of council of the Lords of the Treasury in England as to the system that should be followed in respect to war expenditures, and I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether that system is followed rigidly, as we were promised last year. The principle there laid down is that in the absence of estimates, or details of general war expenditure, each department should furnish to the Treasury Board, or to the Government, a detailed statement of probable expenditure during the forthcoming year, and that no expenditures should be made by any department without the authorization by Order in Council of the Treasury Board or of the Government. I should like to have some information from the Prime Minister as to whether that system is followed. Further, under the terms of the minute of the British Treasury Board, it was ordained that, not only the war credit vote, but the ordinary war and naval credits also should be expended in that manner. The reason is obvious. It is almost impossible to distinguish between expenditures made by the Militia Department, or the Naval Department, as to what are ordinary, or peace, expenditures, and what are war expenditures. I would say that all expenditures made by the Naval branch have reference, in some degree or other, to the war. Therefore, I think it would be a very wise course for the Government in the future, if it has not done so in the past, to insist that these ordinary militia and naval expenditures be authorized by the Government, or by a committee of the Govern-

ment, or by some proper authority, whatever that may be. I do not wish to elaborate this point as I discussed it fully last year. I think we had the assurance of the Government that it would not shirk its responsibility in respect to the oversight of all war expenditures and that nothing should be left to the entire initiative of any department. It is true that war expenditures must be initiated by some department, but before the authorization is made they should be considered by the Government, and before any expenditure is actually made, it should be seen that the authorization has also been duly made. I said that there is a distinction between a credit vote and the ordinary parliamentary vote in the form of the Supply Bill. Inasmuch as Parliament surrenders its control absolutely over the $250,000,000 that is to be voted by this resolution, it is only fair that Parliament should receive all possible information from the Government before the resolution is passed.

It is needless for me to say that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will unhesitatingly vote the amount asked for by this resolution and accelerate its passing. We are as much interested in it as are the members of the Government and therefore I venture the suggestion, and the request, that the committee should be furnished with a statement showing the probable nature of the expenditures to be made out of the amount mentioned in the resolution. At page 49 of the printed memorandum, No. 2, which has been placed before Parliament, I find a detailed statement of the expenditures since the beginning of the war down to December 31, 1915. I think it would be well if the Prime Minister would submit to the committee a statement on that basis showing the particulars, as far as they can be obtained, of the proposed war expenditure of this year. I think that not only the Militia Department should furnish this information to the Government to transmit to Parliament but that the other departments ought to do the same thing. I should like to say, because it is possible I omitted to do so before, that other departments, such as the Department of Justice and the Department of Trade and Commerce, which are expending war moneys should also have from the Government an authorization before engaging in any expenditure. I also think that they, as well as the Department of Militia and Defence should, as far as they can, furnish us with particulars of the expenditures which they propose to make during the year.

That is all I have to say in a general way regarding these expenditures. There are a few questions I should like to ask the Prime Minister, and the information can be given later in the day. I, of course, wish to reiterate, in case I have not already made myself clear, that the committee should be furnished by the minister with a statement showing the particulars of the proposed expenditure for this year. There is one matter upon which I should like some information and that is the operations of the War Purchasing Commission. I understand that that body makes pretty nearly all the purchases required for the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with the war. I would like to know if in all cases the system of tender and contract is carried out by that body. I understood the right hon. gentleman to say this afternoon that such was the practice. Before the Public Accounts Committee a few weeks ago a statement was made by the Director of Contracts that there was a patronage list in connection with purchases made by that commission. I was somewhat astounded to hear that statement, because I had hoped that such was not the condition of affairs. If there is an occasion when we should be delivered from a system of patronage it is in connection with the spending of public money for the prosecution of the war. If it is true, as stated by the Director of Contracts, that a patronage list exists in the Militia Department, and is used by the War Purchasing Commission, then I say that such condition should not exist and that such patronage list should be immediately abolished. The public should have that assurance from the Government. I may be making an argument that may be very easily answered, because I rather gather from the expression of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government that he is under the impression that my remarks are hardly apropos, because the Purchasing Commission does not use a patronage list. However, I should like to have a statement from him as to what is the practice of the commission, because we have the statement of the Director of Contracts that such a list does exist.

Further, statements have been made during the present session by many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House indicating the introduction of partisanship and patronage into war expenditures in some localities in Canada at least. I am sure it was not gratifying to members of Parliament or to

the country to learn of these facts. I do not propose saying anything further upon that point other than to emphasize the fact that if any portion of these war expenditures is made upon the basis of patronage it is absolutely indefensible and the country is entitled to an assurance from the Government who are collectively responsible for the proper expenditure of this amount that no such things did occur in the past and that they shall not occur in the future.

I noticed in the press recently that there was a surplusage of officers in the Canadian Overseas Forces. I have also been informed that the officers training schools throughout Canada are to be suspended very shortly, on May 1st, I think, owing to the fact that we have now more officers than we actually require. I am referring to this particularly because, rightly or wrongly, I am under the impression that there is an unnecessary expenditure in this direction. There are in England to-day many Canadian officers who went overseas with their regiments, and there is now apparently no service for them to perform. Again, we have had returned to Canada officers who went overseas but who were discharged, or at all events, returned to Canada, on the ground that they were incompetent or unnecessary in the overseas' forces; and in many cases I believe these officers are still retained by the department and, I suppose, still receive their pay. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister say that the Government and Parliament should make an effort to minimize war expenses as much as possible, for we all realize that our expenses on account of the war are mounting rapidly, and fast assuming such proportions that we shall be faced with a serious financial responsibility in the future. I therefore venture to suggest that a very great saving might possibly be made by the reduction of these officers in the Canadian forces, if they really are not necessary. I would make this further suggestion: better judgment and discretion should be exercised in the selection of officers than has been the case in the past. I know that in Canada there have been placed at the head of regiments men who were never militia officers and who had never taken an officer's training course—men who had never evidenced any capacity for leadership, and who, in the judgment of the public who know them, were unfitted for the positions which they held. If there is a surplusage of officers—and that objection should be removed if it does exist—surely we must have some men who have had either some experience at the front or some militia experience, and I think these should be given the preference in the selection of officers. I do not make these remarks in any censorious spirit, on the contrary I want to pay my tribute to the man who dons the uniform in this great crisis, and who is willing to make the sacrifice of going overseas and doing the very best he can. I feel that way myself, because it will not be my privilege to offer myself for service in this great war. Notwithstanding my admiration for their self-sacrifice, I have no hesitation in making these observations in respect to officers for the overseas force, particularly if I am correct in believing that a large number of them are unable to perform any service because there is no service for them to perform. I have no hesitation whatever in urging upon the Government, or the department responsible for the selection of the officers commanding regiments that it is proposed to send overseas, that only men who have had some experience or have some natural capacity for the position should be placed in command of regiments.

There is just one other matter to which I wish to refer before taking my seat, and that will be in the nature of a question to the Prime Minister. I should like to know whether war expenditures are submitted in detail to the Government periodically. On page 35 of the printed memorandum No. 2, the monthly expenditures since the beginning of the war are shown. Possibly they have been prepared just recently for the information of Parliament. Is it the practice of the spending departments to submit to the Government monthly statements of their expenses, and an estimate or requisition giving details of any expenditures they propose to make?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As regards my hon. friend's question relating to the requirements of each departmeent, I have given him a statement of what has been spent during the past year, and I can get the information in detail as to the requirements of the different departments for the coming year. That can be given to the committee, a little later on. As regards patronage lists in connection with the War Puchasing Commission I had never heard of any until my hon. friend mentioned it to-day and I do not believe that any such lists exist. I sent out just now for the chairman of the War Purchasing Commission, but I find that he is not in town.

When he returns I shall ask him to give full information on this subject.

As far as the surplusage of officers is concerned I cabled for some information on this subject a few days ago and I shall be glad to give it to the committee when I receive it. The Canadian establishment is, I believe, somewhat different from the British establishment by which our men are governed when they go to the front. Where a regiment in Great Britain becomes practically broken up through the necessity of sending drafts to the front, a surplusage of officers may occur from time to time. As regards officers in Great Britain, I understand from the deputy minister that although there may be a surplusage so far as the regular authorized establishment is concerned, all the officers are employed in someway while in Great Britain. In fact I remember seeing a telegram in response to an inquiry a few days ago, to the effect that there were only two officers in Great Britain who were not attached to some unit there. Although the number may be above the recognized establishment, if the information which I have given just now is correct, all those officers are employed and made useful in some way.

My hon. friend speaks of sending to the front only officers of experience and capacity. I hope no one thinks that we have enough officers of military experience for these three hundred thousand men.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I intended to make reference entirely to regiments recruiting in Canada.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We do not possess in Canada men of military experience according to the standard my hon. friend has set up. The best we have been able to do is to take men who are inspired by a patriotic desire to serve in this war—some of them have had a little military experience in training camps, perhaps, some of them have had none at all, but they come forward—and we judge of their capacity as best we can. It is absolutely impossible for any man, my hon. friend or any other, to know just to what extent any officer, when he is put in command of a regiment, or brigade, or division, at the front, is going to develop the qualities of leadership and capacity which are necessary for the command of such units. Men comparatively inexperienced are necessarily sent to the front after such training as may be possible in this country and in Great Britain. It ought to be a source of very great pride to all of us that, with very few exceptions indeed, the men who have had to contend with the difficulties arising from inexperience have made good, as they have made good, during the past eighteen months. Some of them have come back through physical unfitness to stand the awful strain imposed upon them at the front. A great many have come back invalided through wounds received or diseases contracted. The men who have come back have been utilized, as far as possible, for the training of units in Canada, so that these units may have the advantage of the knowledge and experience gained by officers who have been at the front.

So far as the war expenditures and the Government's control over those expenditures are concerned, nothing has been paid out of the war appropriations granted by this Parliament—except in the early months of the war as to which I gave an explanation last year—that has not been previously directly authorized by by Order in Council. No department of Government has this appropriation at its command; the appropriation was not so granted by Parliament; it was not granted to any minister, but to the Government as a whole. Therefore, a minister, whether the Minister of Militia and Defence, the Minister of Naval Service, or the Minister of Justice—with reference to internment operations—must come to the Government, and the reports of Council show why payment from the war appropriation is asked and for what purpose. That is done in every case. We have passed thousands of Orders in Council of this kind during the past eighteen months. That was not absolutely the case in the first two months of the war. As I explained last year, some payments were made without previous authority of Council by the Department of Militia and Defence. With regard to these payments, we had them all collected and put in a report, which was submitted to the Treasury Board. The Treasury Board spent days upon them and went over them carefully, and finally an Order in Council was passed giving subsequent authority for payments already contracted, and which had to be contracted unless we were disposed to greatly delay the desptch of the first contingent.

The Minister of Justice, for example, may desire that a further sum of money shall be placed at the disposal of Major General Sir William Otter in respect of internment operations; he submits a statement, not absolutely in

detail, but of a general character, showing for what purposes the last appropriation has been paid—so much for food, so much for clothing, so much for other things, the money having been paid out under the supervision of Major General Otter—and showing that, from the experience of the past, there will be required for the next three months a certain sum of money. An Order in Council is passed placing a certain sum at his disposal, and stating in explicit terms that, so far as supplies are concerned, they must be purchased under the War Purchasing Commission, and under the Order in Council establishing that commission. The same is true of the Department of Naval Service, or of the Department of Militia and Defence. I trust I have made myself clear. I shall be glad to answer any other question.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: In the session of 1914 we in this House, irrespective of party, voted the $50,000,000 asked for the purposes of carrying on Canada's part in the war. In the session of 1915, we voted $100,000,000 just as readily. We are now called upon to vote $250,000,000 and this we intend to vote in just as generous a manner as on the previous occasion. I wish to refer briefly to one or two matters and first to recruiting. I am not able, perhaps, to give any suggestions to the Government that would assist in stimulating recruiting, and possibly for that reason the minister may think that I have not much to say, but I have observed one or two things about recruiting the knowledge of which by the House, I think, would do no harm. I am afraid that throughout the part of the country in which I live no system is followed in connection with recruiting. It may be that the Government has found difficulty—no doubt it has—in mapping out a general plan to cover the whole of Canada. Recruiting appears to be left entirely to each community and the city in which I live handles it for that part of the country. We have a recruiting committee and the same plan exists, I suppose, in many other places both in western and eastern Canada. I believe these local committees look after recruiting very well. Another feature that occurred to me is the scattering of recruits in small batches in small towns which I do not think is in the best interests of the recruits. When I was coming down to Ottawa on the Canadian Pacific railway a few days ago, I saw at the divisional points on the north shore of Lake Superior, a few recruits at every station. On inquiry I found that these were some of the towns where twenty-five men had been recruited and were stationed. These men cannot possibly get the training they would be given in a larger centre or at some concentration camp. I venture to believe that they should not be scattered in this way, but rather that they should be sent to some place where a large number of them would be collected and where they would be given the training they ought to have before they cross the water. In these small places there is not the equipment for efficient training, nor can the Government maintain in every one of these places an efficient training officer who can train two hundred men as easily as he can train twenty-five.

Another question raised in my part of the country is whether or not the recruits taken out are all physically fit. The information I have is only general, and I can not give specific instances, but that information is to the effect that, in the anxiety of officers to fill up a battalion, a large number of men are being recruited who are not physically fit and who, in the last resort, when they get across the water, or perhaps even before they leave Canada, will have to be rejected. I think it is a mistake to take men into a battalion if they are not physically fit, because their places will have to be filled later, when, perhaps, it will be too late to give the new men the proper training. There is another matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the minister—and I do so with a good deal of hesitancy. I doubt very much whether some of our militia officers in certain parts of the country have the feeling of responsibility that they should have when put in charge of such a large number of men. The 1,100 men forming a battalion are really wards of their officers; the officers occupy the same position towards them for the time being, at least, as the schoolmaster or teacher in a college does to the boys who are put under his charge. I question very much whether on all occasions the officers do have the sense of responsibility that they ought to have in regard to the men who are put under their charge. I know an instance that occurred in the city of Regina. A young boy named Darrach enlisted with the 68th battalion there. The boy's home was in the city of Regina; his parents lived there. He was at home over Sunday; on Monday he became ill. Al-

though the distance from the barracks where he was stationed to his father's office was not more than a mile or a mile and a half, no word was sent to the parents. On Tuesday he became worse; on Wednesday he was put in the hospital, and still no word was sent to his parents. On Friday, just a few minutes before the boy died, the parents were communicated with by some person in the hospital, but before the father could reach the hospital the boy had died. Naturally the parents in their bereavement, not having been advised of the boy's illness, felt very bitterly towards some of the people in charge of militia matters in the city of Regina, and one cannot blame them very much for feeling the way they did. I mention this matter largely for the purpose of indicating that the officers on that occasion should have taken some little precaution to advise the parents of the boy's illness. Occurrences of that kind will not stimulate recruiting in any community. Parents will not allow their boys eighteen, nineteen and twenty years of age to enlist if they think that the boys will not get proper care. I do not know whether the boy got proper medical attendance or not; I assume that he must have got proper medical attendance when he was in the hospital. The point where the military men were apparently at fault—I heard no defence of the matter at all—was that no communication was sent to the parents. As I have said, I hesitate a good deal to mention these circumstances to-day, largely on account of the fact that the 68th battalion, of which this boy was a member, very recently went to the front, and any person who might be able to make a defence of this case is not here to do so.

I wish to emphasize the point brought up by the junior member for Halifax with regard to the question of patronage. I have heard it stated in the House by the Minister of Militia that there was no patronage list in the Department of Militia. Well, I can only say this: The Militia Department and the Government have allowed the matter of patronage in connection with militia supplies to drift into the hands of local patronage committees. Although all persons, Liberals and Conservatives alike, are doing their share in the matter of enlisting and recruiting, sending their sons to the front—both parties in equal degree, I think—and contributing to patriotic and Red Cross funds, no person but one who is on a certain side of politics in parts of the country with which I am familiar can get anything to do at all. Surely, when all the people of the country are spending all the money they can afford and doing all they can in the interests of Canada's part in this war, it is time to instruct these local patronage committees to leave party patronage alone and deal with matters on a business basis.

Mr. BURNHAM: With regard to one observation that the hon. gentleman made, I am quite convinced that he is entirely wrong. When men enlist they must be taken out in green squads and handled by non-commissioned officers. They cannot be taken out in large numbers; they are taken out in green squads whether at headquarters or in the outlying villages, and they have to spend a certain time there until they are licked into shape before they can be taken to Barriefield or some other place and put into a large body such as a battalion or brigade for the purposes of manoeuvres. The reason this plan was adopted, I am quite sure, is that squad drill is the beginning; it is the only possible way that a green man can learn anything. Non-commissioned officers, such as sergeants and corporals, are scattered throughout the country for that purpose. You could not take a great mob of green men and put them together at some large centre and go through large manoeuvres right off—it would be ridiculous; it could not be done. With regard to patronage, I was somewhat interested in that question, because Canadians—I do not know whether they do so more than any other people—have to fight against a tendency in the country to look to the loaves and fishes. Some people are inordinately green; we all know that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: They have to be fought against by both parties. They are without shame and entirely shameless. We have seen lots of them. They are only too eager to cut your throat if they can possibly do it. They do not make their objections in connection with those things that could be freely and openly and effectively answered; they always take up something by which they can stab you in the back. Our only answer to these people is to give them a good kicking. They are not worthy of being fought in the good old British way, with the fists; they should be simply spanked. Intellectually, and especially

morally, they are children. As a matter of fact, some people—I am not speaking of my own locality, you may rest assured—have more or less criminal instincts.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Where did you get your experience?

Mr. BURNHAM: I was out West two or three years ago.

Mr. MARTIN: You have some political friends out there.

Mr. BURNHAM: However, it is not necessary to enlarge upon the point; we know that it is a fact. Out of curiosity, I endeavoured to find out if there was any patronage in the war purchasing and other departments, and I found out that there was not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KYTE: Where did you look?

Mr. BURNHAM: There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that there is only one way of doing business, and that is the business way. Tenders should be called for, and the public should be notified; then every thing is above board. If that has not been done, I have been unable to find out the contrary. I quite agree that if it has not been done, most certainly it ought to have been done.

Mr. TURRIFF: I wish to refer to the matter brought up by the member for Regina with regard to the men being taken into the different battalions who are absolutely unfit. Men are taken in for some reason or other, in many cases because certain officers are anxious to get their company or battalion recruited to full strength in order that this may be to their credit and that they may secure permanent appointments. There are many cases where men are recruited and given uniforms, although they could not possibly pass the usual rigid examination that a man is called upon to undergo before he goes to the firing line. The result has been that in many cases men have been enlisted and trained for six months or a year, and then, on a more rigid examination before being sent to the front, have been rejected. This involves a tremendous and useless expense to the country. I knew that this was taking place, and my own knowledge was confirmed by the statement of a gentleman who went over with the first contingent as a junior officer and returned as a lieutenant colonel a year ago. He said that in some cases men who were suffering from some physical disabilities concealed those disabilities when enlisting, that they were not discovered by the medical examiners, and that, becoming tired of trench life after one or two months, these men made known their physical disabilities, and so were relieved of duty and sent home. In many cases these men had some injury, or had suffered from illness through their exposure in the trenches, and so they will become charges upon the people of Canada so long as they live. I would urge that the examination at enlistment be made much more rigid.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I think the hon. member will find that the present system is to examine the men very closely on enlistment, and not to examine them again. I know that to be the practice in my district.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am aware that there has always been an examination of the men on enlistment, but in some cases where commanding officers are anxious to fill up their regiments men are accepted who are absolutely unfit physically, and who could not pass a rigid examination. While there has undoubtedly been some improvement, there is still room for further effort and further improvement along that line.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is the hon. member aware that the regulations call for all of those things? The fault must lie with the examining officer.

Mr. TURRIFF: That may be. I have no doubt that if all the regulations were lived up to things would be better. I am not bringing this matter up with any intention of complaining, but I am anxious to effect improvement and to save money. Could the Prime Minister, after eight o'clock, give us any idea of the cost per man of the maintenance of our army in the field, including supplies, munitions and everything?

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): The terms of this resolution, as has already been stated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, will be received without opposition; in fact, will be received with full accord in pursuance of the policy which has been adopted by men of all parties since the beginning of the war, of uniting, irrespective of political affiliations, to do all we can to help the Mother Country. In this connection, I would like to take

exception to a statement made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister this afternoon as to there having been some wonderment, or doubt, before the war began as to whether Canada would be able to contribute as many men as she has contributed to the fighting forces. I do not pretend to be a prophet in any sense, but I always felt that there could never be any doubt whatever as to the attitude of the Canadian people when the interests of the Empire were at stake. Those of us who come from people who have lived for two or three generations in Canada know that among the Canadian people there has always been the feeling that the little island which constitutes the seat of Empire was the home land, and although our patriotism may not have been very demonstrative, there was always the certainty that, under the conditions which prevail in Canada, under our democracy, and with the full realization of the issues of this war, there would be a response on the part of the people to whatever extent might be necessary to aid the Empire. I therefore assert that there need never have been any doubt whatever as to what Canada's response would be. There was certain to be a recognition of the conditions, and a gathering round the banner with that enthusiasm which we have seen manifested in all parts of this country. When it is said that it is a matter of particular wonderment that within three months of the outbreak of war, 30,000 men rushed to the colours, I would like to point out that no man and no party is entitled to any particular credit, and that the wonderment has no justification whatever. The response simply proved the latent patriotism of the people of this land and was an expression of the realization of the tremendous issues at stake and of the people's attachment to our constitutional fabric. They rushed to the standard, just as their forefathers did in the days of yore, as a matter of course. They responded to the call of the Empire, and the proposition of sending them overseas was a mere matter of detail which could be worked out, as a matter of detail by any Administration or by any minister capable of attending to the business of the country.

I do not make that remark in any harsh or complaining spirit, but I think it is only right in the Parliament of this country we should have a full recognition of the fact that the Canadian people, with their aspirations and ambitions, were there, ready for the call; that they came of their own free will, that they went to the front, and are going and will go, to whatever extent the necessities of the situation demand. Recognizing these facts, realizing that the Government had to take the responsibility of administering the affairs of this country in war time, I say that the same spirit which actuated the men who volunteered, actuates hon. gentlemen in this House on both sides, without difference and without question. Hence it is that, with a free hand, we have given to the Government everything that they have asked for in the way of financial aid, and now this resolution comes to us and is received in the same spirit. While that is so, however, it is only right to say that the Canadian people expect from the Government a special regard for wise economy in the administration of affairs, and an honest administration in dealing with the expenditures which are committed to its care. Though a strict accounting is not looked for at this stage, the Government may rest assured that the time will come, and perhaps come speedily, when war's alarms are over, when a strict accounting will be demanded.

With regard to such questions as relate to the administration of affairs, and more particularly to the preparations for war, an idea was expressed to me recently with reference to the mobilization of troops, which, though it may be too late for the Government to seize, might, I think, have been recognized earlier. All through this country, from one end to the other, we had a militia organization built up. In some districts there was a very strong interest and an intense local spirit manifested, and it seems to me that it is one of the unfortunate things connected with the mobilization of our troops that we have absolutely destroyed, so far as this war is concerned, if not forever, any spirit of enthusiasm in the ranks of the militia corps in this country. The men who have gone to fight cannot come back and say that they went from the 28th, the 38th, or 78th Militia Corps, and when, in the days to come, we seek to perpetuate, as we must perpetuate in this country, a system of militia organization, there will be an entire lack of that enthusiasm for the old militia associations from which the men went to fight, because these militia corps have lost their identity altogether in the battalions that have been formed. We have heard references this afternoon to the number of officers who have qualified, and as to their selection for the particular corps in which they have served or are serving. The idea

which I am putting forth now, came to me from a gentleman in the Prime Minister's own constituency. Only a week ago a man who had been a very prominent militia officer pointed out that in the constituency of my right hon. friend there were a number of militia regiments which had existed for a great number of years, and included in them were a number of men who were anxious to go to the front. These regiments were employed on garrison duty in the old city of Halifax, and are still so employed. Would it not be much better, he said, in order that the future interests of the militia in this country might be preserved, to have used those regiments and their officers as a recruiting corps from which could have been gathered the men from whom drafts could be made, or to have used them in connection with the mobilization of the first contingent that went over. As it is to-day, with the tremendous number of casualities that are taking place on the other side, we are reaching the point when we will have to supply the gaps by further drafts, and the situation is that the identity of the old militia regiments has been absolutely lost. It may be that there were military necessities which required that battalions should be formed in the way that they were formed, but one would suppose that a militia regiment, with its corps of officers, who, by previous association and by training in militia camps or otherwise, are qualified, would naturally be the first men to be called to go to the front. Though the hon. gentleman, who has been the Minister of Militia, has always claimed to be a special friend of the Canadian militia, he has absolutely disregarded those conditions. It may not have been possible for all the officers of a militia regiment to go, but as many as could go should have been taken, and their places filled by volunteers. Then you would have had an esprit de corps, and a condition in which interest in the militia would have been preserved, an interest, which, as I said, has been entirely lost.

With regard to the system of recruiting that has been adopted, I desire to call attention to the situation in the province of Nova Scotia. The right hon. gentleman knows of a member of his own family, Colonel Borden, whose unique and special efforts with regard to recruiting in Nova Scotia deserve special mention in this Parliament. I doubt if the personal influence of any man in this whole Dominion has been exercised in any sphere with such success and to such a degree as has the influence of Colonel Borden in our province. During the winter, on account of the marvellous rapidity with which men flocked to the banner of the 85th Regiment, those who were interested in recruiting in our province conceived the idea of using this eloquent and trained officer as a man who would be able to make an appeal to our citizens, and to organize what would be known as the Highland Brigade, the 85th Regiment being distinctively a Highland regiment. He went up and down our province with the fiery cross, and, as the Highland chieftains did in days of old, called the clansmen to the banner. But he would have to organize, in starting this brigade, three other regiments, the idea in the minds of many of our people being that in conjunction with the 85th, we would have a Highland brigade representing our province at the front under Colonel Borden. In some way or other, through the mysterious sinuosities that characterize the Militia Department, the boys who had come with the enthusiasm which had been engendered by his leadership, were told there is not going to be any Highland brigade; the 85th is going over alone. I am not going to say anything harsh or explicit about the personnel of the commanding officers of any of the other associated regiments. It is not necessary that I should do so, but I do say to my right hon. friend that the boys of Scotch blood, and of other kindred nationalities in our province, who were called to the standard as a result of the enthusiasm engendered by Colonel Borden, believed that they were to form part of a Highland brigade which was to go from our province, and my right hon. friend should see to it, in view of the local situation, that there should be a Highland brigade sent from Nova Scotia. Mark you, Sir, we have not had the most favourable conditions in Nova Scotia to call out enthusiasm for recruiting. I am not going to dilate upon the unfortunate episode which was discussed here last winter with regard to the 17th Battalion; I need not do so, and my right hon. friend knows it. There are other incidents in connection with regiments which have gone over from Nova Scotia that have not been calculated to arouse the pride or enthusiasm of our people, but the young men, having come out with enthusiasm and loyalty and gathered around Colonel Borden with the idea that the four regi-

ments were to go over as a Highland brigade, I say to the Prime Minister, now that he is Acting Minister of Militia and Defence, that he should see that all obstacles to their going are removed and that a Highland brigade be formed, because, unless he does so, he will find that it will create a sense of disappointment throughout the province and a lack of enthusiasm when the call comes again, if it does come, for more recruits.

I do think that there ought to be a more intimate connection between the Militia Department and the people who are engaged in recruiting. In one of the recruiting efforts that took place in our province, we were told that although the band of a certain regiment, accompanied by its commanding officer, was going out to look after men, the few recruiting agents in that province would not undertake to pay the travelling expenses of that band. Local people were asked to contribute towards that purpose, even to feed them when they were on tour. That occurred to my knowledge in my own constituency. Of course, that is a matter of detail, but at the same time it means that somewhere in this marvellous organization, about which we have heard so much, and about which so much credit is claimed, not with any right, on account of the reasons I gave at the beginning of my remarks, there is something wrong. This sort of thing naturally chills the enthusiasm of our people. If we are going to have recruiting, let us have it looked after in a proper manner. Such absurd conditions as that ought not to be permitted. It may be, of course, that an incident of that kind arises from the action of some subordinate but more care should be exercised in the matter of recruiting. Everybody in this country who is interested in the war, and who is anxious to see its successful completion, and to see Canada playing her part, must realize that if you are going to interfere with the highest ideals of the men who are going to this war as volunteers you are simply hampering the cause that you want to succeed. You can go into any part of the Dominion and tell men to forget the smaller issues of life and rise to an appreciation of their higher duty and the possibility of the greatest sacrifice, but if you are going to complicate that with conditions which absolutely explode any thought of idealism in regard to the matter the result will be unsatisfactory. That applies in regard to recruiting. It also applies in regard to the question of patronage. My hon. friend told us to-night that there was no patronage in the War Purchasing Commission. I will tell him how it works out. You have a proposition to recruit men and billet them in a certain locality. The quartermaster of the particular regiment is told in some mysterious way that when he goes into a particular section he must consult the man who has the patronage and therefore, when he goes to that district, he parcels out the supplies among men who are dictated by the man who has the patronage. This is not perhaps of great importance but it grates harshly on the sensibilities of the man who is actuated by idealism. I have had it occur in my own constituency where no attempt whatever has been made to call for local tenders. What difference does it make after all who sells the sugar, or the meat, having regard to the higher conditions, but when you go into a small locality where people are making their living out of this business and where a man is made to realize that because he happens to be a Liberal he must be kept out of the opportunity of tendering for supplies, how much enthusiasm, how much idealism are you apt to get from him? I will tell what occurred in my own constituency. A company was billeted in my own town. An officer of the 106th Regiment goes to the gentleman who has the patronage and proceeds to parcel out these things without asking anybody to submit tenders. I called the attention of the Acting Minister of Militia to it, not for any purpose of my own, but because the matter was remarked about among the people, and he promised to call for tenders. He did so eventually. Why was it necessary for me to have done that? Why should not he, in the first instance, have issued instructions that it was the duty of the officer, on going into any locality, to post up notices inviting tenders? It seems to be a small matter and personally it does not make any difference to me, but my right hon. friend knows that when you are dealing in high ideals and you bring in small, tu'penny ha'penny politics, you cannot continue on the higher plane and that is where the shoe pinches. The same thing occurred in another constituency just as it has occurred all over Nova Scotia. The way in which patronage in regard to militia matters has been handled in the county of Cape Breton is a disgrace to the Administration and I ask my right hon. friend to look into it.

A matter was called to my attention within the last two days which I wish to bring to the attention of the right hon. gentleman. This is not a matter possibly that has to do with militia business but it is in reference to the question of hospitals. The gentleman who has the patronage there was going around to find out if this Government was going to take charge of the hospitals so that he would be able to dictate the men who should be employed in these institutions. I would ask my right hon. friend, for the credit of our province, to make some inquiries in regard to the gentleman who has the patronage in the county of Cape Breton and see whether or not this is the kind of idealism to hold out before the Canadian people.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What kind of hospital was it?

Mr. MACDONALD: It was under the Hospital Commission, and this gentleman was inquiring whether or not this hospital was going to be taken over by the Government, with a view to making recommendations as to the people to look after it. The conduct of the gentleman who has the patronage in Cape Breton county is known all over the province of Nova Scotia, and my right hon. friend had better inquire into it.

There have also been cases of ill treatment of soldiers, and I wish to call my right hon. friend's attention to the case of Pte. Chapman in my own constituency. He was one of a company of the 106th Regiment in charge of the Nova Scotia Steel Works, and on account of being absent without leave, was strung up by the hands under the direction of the commanding officer of the company. This fact became known to the men in the works, which are in close proximity, and they went in a body and demanded that the man be taken down. He was taken down; otherwise there would have been a very unpleasant time. An investigation has been held locally by the people interested. I can see no reason why any Canadian should be treated in that way when he is under military discipline in any of our towns. I know that in the face of the enemy drastic measures can be taken to punish a man, but when the men are in our cities in Canada the most refractory case can always be given in charge; there is always recourse to imprisonment. But to string a man up by his hands for such an offence as being absent without leave, is something the people of this country will not stand for, and one very unfortunate thing about it is that it has a most injurious effect upon recruiting.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is that the same case mentioned by the hon. member for Guysborough?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, Pte. Chapman, of a company of the 106th Regiment in charge of the Nova Scotia Steel Works. I happened to be in my county the other day and heard of the case, and I am calling these matters to the attention of my right hon. friend because this affords an opportunity we have not had hitherto.

My right hon. friend has referred to the giving of commissions, which was brought up by the hon. member for Halifax. Of course, I know it is difficult to deal with these commissions altogether apart from favoritism. The party in power will, of course, listen to the requests made by its political friends; I can see that it is difficult to evade that. But in some constituencies the process of log rolling to get commissions is going on continually. I do not suppose my right hon. friend, with his burdens of office, has any occasion to deal with these matters at first hand, but I can give him instances of this sort of thing. I should prefer to do it privately, however, as there is no necessity for doing it in open Parliament. But my right hon. friend must realize that there have been abuses of that kind, and the hon. member for Halifax was perfectly justified in mentioning the matter. There is no question about it. Men suddenly become patriotic Canadians, and develop into paymasters, quartermasters, and holders of other non-combatant positions of every other kind, and the only evidence that you can possibly find why they should have been appointed is that somebody had pull and got them there. Nobody ever charged these men with exhibiting any great enthusiasm in the past for the body politic or for the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people. Their sudden appearance in positions of this kind, which do not call for personal exposure on the battlefield in the face of the enemy, indicates a public spirit that has developed a little too rapidly to be considered entirely honest. A certain amount of that kind of thing, I suppose, cannot be helped, but if it can be helped, it ought to be. I am speaking from the highest possible motives, and not with a desire to be partisan in my criticism. I know the gentleman who

has the patronage in my county has gone to certain gentlemen and said: I can get you made a major, or colonel, or something else. I have known men, particularly this gentleman from Cape Breton that I have referred to, trying to remove men who were politically dangerous to him, by offering them commissions of one rank or another. So long as it is possible for that kind of thing to be done, what is the use of talking idealism to our people, or asking a man to come out and fight for liberty! Men are being granted commissions in exactly the same way as postmasters, or mail-carriers are being appointed—bringing the thing down to absolutely common clay. Surely this matter is deserving of some attention, and should be looked into.

The weakness of the medical officers is a thing I have had occasion to call attention to before. This, in our province, is largely a matter of political patronage pure and simple. I know an order was issued by the Militia Department not long ago changing the system, but it all rests with the colonel of the regiment as to who shall examine the men. A young man in Nova Scotia with a good old Scotch name, Findlay MacMillan—

Mr. BURNHAM: Have you any Canadians down there, or do the people down there all come from other countries?

Mr. MACDONALD: They are a good deal better than my hon. friend from Peterborough.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT: He has enlisted.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend from Peterborough belongs to the Paymaster Brigade, sitting down here in uniform and not doing a bit of work. I like to see men in uniform go out with their corps. We are all getting tired of my hon. friend's diatribes. This young man Findlay MacMillan was very anxious to serve his country. After being examined by the local doctor in New Glasgow, who passed him and told him he would have no difficulty in getting to the front, this young man sold his farm and everything belonging to him, and was sent down to Halifax to join the regiment. The doctor at Halifax discovered that his was a case of what is known as flat feet; that is, his instep had fallen. The doctor said he could not be taken, and the young man was ordered to return home. But he had sold his farm and everything he had, and had no place to go to. My attention was called to the matter to-day in a letter from a friend of his, who described the situation as most unfortunate. There is evidence of incomplete medical inspection. Then there are cases of men who have been sent overseas and have had to be sent back from England. This young man, Findlay MacMillan, was told by the doctor that he was all right, and he joined the army at considerable material loss to himself. He has now lost his ambition to go to the war, because he would not be allowed to go, and he is compelled to stay at home, with his occupation gone and with no home life. I do not know what remedy to suggest in this particular case, but I can give my right hon. friend all the facts, and I think they are worth inquiring into. I do not mean to say that the medical officer deliberately passed him in the first place, knowing he had flat feet, but that is just one example of improper medical inspection in the first instance.

Another thing I would take the liberty of asking my right hon. friend is that he should tell the House frankly what the attitude of the Government is in regard to returning money subscribed for machine guns. I think the House and the country are entitled to a full explanation of how that matter came before the people. Every one was startled at the announcement made by Senator Lougheed, then in charge of the Department of Militia and Defence, calling upon the people to contribute money to provide machine guns. Parliament had voted $150,000,000 for the very purpose of providing equipment, clothing, and other things including machine guns. For the moment I was at a loss, so far as my own constituency is concerned, to understand why the Government was asking the people to come to their relief in this matter. The newspapers, in the enthusiasm of the moment, called upon every one who was a patriot to subscribe to this fund. But what did Parliament vote $150,000,000 for if the people were to be appealed to to put their hands in their pockets for the purpose of providing machine guns?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: To what appeal does the hon. gentleman allude?

Mr. MACDONALD: To the appeal made in the Halifax Herald, for instance, my right hon. friend's own paper, asking all the people to contribute to this fund, and indicating those who did not contribute were unpatriotic and disloyal.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: An appeal made by the Government?

Mr. MACDONALD: Senator Lougheed who was then, I think, acting Minister of Militia, had written a letter, which was published in that paper, calling upon the people to respond to this appeal. That appeal was made throughout our province, and certain municipalities passed resolutions in view of the demands made, appropriating money for this purpose. Patriotic organizations and individuals also contributed. I think we are entitled to know whether the Government intends to return the money thus obtained. I put a question on the Order Paper asking a statement of the Government policy in regard to this matter. The Prime Minister answered me that he had given an answer to the question. I looked up Hansard, to which he referred me, and got very little satisfaction. What we want to know is whether the Government will return to the municipalities and individuals this money which should never have been taken from them. And right here let me say a word in regard to this matter of people going up and down the country getting up subscriptions for this, that, and the other thing. The Government, through the Department of Militia, or some other department, should exercise supervision with regard to this. I was asked by some very estimable gentleman to join a delegation to wait upon the Minister of the Naval Service to ask the Government to give a subscription to the Seamen's Fund of Great Britain. I said at once that I would do nothing of the kind, for coming from one of the provinces by the sea I knew something of the conditions, and I knew that this was not a war fund at all. There does not exist in Great Britain such machinery as we have, to provide marine hospitals and to care for sailors. Some well-intentioned person had started this propaganda by which everybody in Canada was to be asked to contribute to this fund and the Government was to be asked to make a special contribution; but the fund is purely local in its character and is dealt with entirely by people on the other side of the water. I was glad to find that my hon. friend the Minister of the Naval Service (Mr. Hazen), in discussing this matter before the Pension Committee, agreed absolutely with the position I had taken. This is an illustration of the kind of appeals that are being made all over Canada today. I feel that it is the duty of the Government to have some supervision over these appeals, which, no doubt, are made by well-intentioned people, to the generosity of our folks who, thinking they are contributing to some good cause, give a lot of money to objects some of which ultimately turn out to be of no value. Take, for instance, the appeal made at the beginning of the war for a hospital ship, which movement was started in Toronto. Those who understood these matters knew there was no real advantage in that movement, and yet over $100,000 was raised. And so it goes on. I ask that those municipalities and individuals who so wish should be refunded the money they contributed toward the purchase of machine guns. It would be just as reasonable to start a public subscription to buy rifles, or clothing, for the troops. It is a regrettable thing that these subscriptions should have been asked for apparently under official sanction.

In connection with this war vote, I wish to call the Prime Minister's attention to a situation which exists in our province with reference to what might properly be called a naval matter, the commandeering of ships. Newfoundland has made the very strongest representations to the Mother Country with regard to what they allege to have been discrimination in the commandeering of ships, and these representations, I understand, have had some effect. Here in Canada what is the result of this commandeering? In regard to our coal companies, the total number of ships engaged in the coal trade between Nova Scotia and Montreal have been commandeered, and yet, you can go out and charter vessels at enormous rates which sail under the British flag. Why should that be? Why should this coal industry in our province be seriously interfered with; why should the city of Montreal be put to a disadvantage through not being able to get coal from Nova Scotia, and why should the American coal people be given a chance to get a foothold in the Montreal market, by the removal of the ships engaged in the coal trade while there are ships flying the British flag which can be chartered at very high rates?

Canada is doing her level best in this war. The very best of our men have gone to the front. And in discussing this matter, we should never forget the splendid enthusiasm exhibited by the women of Canada, which is even greater than that of the men. The women have been called upon to make great sacrifices in giving up sons and husbands and dear ones—and the son is generally dearer to the mother than to the father. The devotion of our women

will never be forgotten. The people of Canada have made marvellous sacrifices, and are prepared to make more. But we must realize that, as far as possible, we should keep our house in order, we should keep an eye to the future. If there is, as I say there is, a condition under which one of our greatest industries is being paralyzed for want of ships, if there are other vessels available which could be commandeered, those other vessels ought to be taken first.

This resolution provides for expenditures in the Naval Department. I am sorry to see that the hon. Minister of the Naval Service (Mr. Hazen) is not here. I am sure that I voice the sentiment of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House when I say that our hearts go out to him in sympathy on account of the death of his boy. Such an event as that saddens every one and stills the voice of faction. I am sure that every hon. member in the House extends to my hon. friend the deepest sympathy in the great loss he has sustained.

I was proceeding to refer to the Naval Service. I am glad to see that within the last week or two we have been getting evidence of the truth of the statement which I made earlier in the session; that Great Britain needed men upon the sea. I was told in this Parliament since the House opened this session that Great Britain did not need men upon the sea. I know the facts, and I knew that I was correct. We have been glad to see men wearing the blue uniform of the navy amongst us; it is evidence that Great Britain does desire men on the sea, and these naval men are recruiting for that purpose. If the Minister of Naval Service were here I would ask him at the earliest possible date to make a statement, as to the kind and number of men that Great Britain wants from us, so that the facts may be placed properly before those who are in a position to respond to the call. I am quite sure that that call for men for the navy will be responded to by our hardy and brave sea-faring Canadians in as great degree as the call for men to serve the Empire on land.

I noticed the other day an advertisement in some of the local papers which purported to come from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, encouraging the people to patriotism and production and embodying some other propaganda. It is a desirable thing, of course, to patronize the press of the country, but I would like to know from my right hon. friend whether or not expenditures in that line and in connection with the pamphlets we have seen in regard to the subject come out of this vote? I am quite sure that the people who live on the farms need no incentive to produce all they can, and that there will be no lack of response from all classes of our people in regard to this question of production. One of the strange features of the war is that the agriculturists of Canada are able to get higher prices than they ever got before for all staple lines of production. So it is with most of the other things that enter into the necessaries of life. These things wil be produced, and I do not know that it is evidence of economy that there should be any special publication of books to call forth the most ordinary business efforts from the agriculturists or from any other class of people in our country. The idea that has been promulgated, that the people of Canada were not ready to assist the Empire in this war in every possible way, is a delusion. While Canada was not playing a brass band at the front door before the war, shouting her patriotism as some other colonies or nations were, she was ready to assist the Old Land whenever necessity arose. No pumping up of enthusiasm was necessary; no political efforts were required in order to get a response. Freely and generously from every province of this great Dominion the boys came forth and have gone to fight. The same feeling of devotion exists in connection with our industrial and agricultural life, and I am quite sure that everything that is necessary will be forthcoming, to the extent of our resources, and that it will come without any particular pumping or fostering or unnecessary expenditure.

I have endeavoured to bring to the attention of my right hon. friend some matters that seem to be of importance in connection with this resolution, and I submit them with the hope that they will receive his fullest consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. member for Pictou has just mentioned the fact that officers of the British Navy are here recruiting for the British Admiralty. I am very pleased to hear that. In connection with the Navy, I wish to inform my right hon. friend that I clipped from one of the New York papers a few days ago the following:

San Francisco, April, 27.—According to unconfirmed advices received at the Mare Island Navy Yard today, the American power schooner Oregon, owned by the Crowley Launch and Tugboat Company of San Francisco, has been

seized by the British cruiser Rainbow in the Gulf of California.

The Oregon sailed from San Francisco last June, under charter to the German firm of Linga and Company of Mazatlan. At that time she carried a cargo of lumber. It was understood the vessel was to be used in the west coast trade. Nothing is known here of her recent movements.

I would like to ask my right hon. friend if that report is confirmed? If it is, it is one other exploit on the part of the much despised Canadian navy. As one of the fathers of that navy, I rejoice greatly that the Rainbow and the Niobe are proving true to their fathers.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): I wish to say a few words upon the resolution now before the committee, and particularly with regard to my own province. I am under the impression that the percentage of recruiting in the province of Prince Edward is not as large as in some of the western provinces of Canada, but the reason is very easily understood. The province being purely agricultural, the young men, as soon as they come to manhood, go either to the United States or to western Canada in large numbers, leaving just enough men at home to work the farms. Consequently, those of military age and ability are not as numerous there as they are in some of the other provinces, particularly in the West, where they get the young and the healthy, the strong and the energetic from the other provinces and from the Old Country as well. Notwithstanding that fact, however, I believe that the percentage of recruiting in the province of Prince Edward Island is very good. Moreover, the people subscribed liberally to every appeal that was made to them. In that connection I wish to refer to the appeal that was made on behalf of the fund that was needed to buy machine guns. When it was stated that the troops at the front were handicapped to a very great extent by not having a sufficient number of machine guns, the people thought that if they would subscribe money to that fund the defect could be remedied. An appeal went out at that time, from the Acting Minister of Militia, Senator Lougheed, that it would be very acceptable to the Government and the Militia Department if money should be obtained for that purpose. To show how that appeal was received in the province and even in the town from which I come, the people of the town provided money to purchase three guns. One man subscribed enough to purchase a machine gun; he happened to be in a position to do so easily. Another citizen in very moderate circumstances, feeling the necessity of doing everything he could, subscribed for another gun. Then the town provided another, and this citizen who, as I say, is in very moderate circumstances, gave $300 more for the second gun. Everybody subscribed, even the school children, who offered their small savings of fifty, sixty, or seventy cents, or a dollar. In a very short time sufficient money was subscribed for three machine guns. It has been the same with every other fund, the Belgian relief, the Red Cross, the Patriotic fund, the Field Army Service fund, every fund was subscribed to generously. I think that, instead of showing organization in the Militia Department, the appeal for funds to purchase machine guns shows a lack of organization. It should not have been necessary for the department to appeal to the patriotic impulses of the people in order to provide money to purchase one of the most necessary articles for troops at the front.

With regard to the patronage list, to which the Prime Minister referred this afternoon, the right hon. gentleman no doubt thinks he is stating the facts. But, as a matter of fact, he is far astray; he is misinformed, because so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and I presume conditions are very similar in other provinces, there is nothing but a patronage list. A Liberal has no more chance of providing any supplies for the troops stationed at local headquarters than if he were a man belonging to a foreign country. I have now a question on the Order Paper, and if it is answered satisfactorily and truthfully I shall be able to give names that I am sure will satisfy the Prime Minister of the accuracy of my statements. I say truthfully, because I find that questions which I put on the Order Paper and which were answered earlier in the season were not answered correctly, and I have the proof under my hand. On February 3, this question was answered by the Minister of Militia and Defence:

Mr. J. J. Hughes:

1. What procedure is followed to obtain supplies for the troops at local headquarters?

2. Are tenders asked for by public advertisement, or is there a patronage list, and are the parties whose names are on the patronage list asked to submit offers?

3. Is there a patronage list for Prince Edward Island?

4. If so, who prepared the list for the Government, what are the names and addresses of the parties on the list, and who recommended these names to the Government or the purchasing committee?

Sir Sam Hughes:

1. The practice followed in making contracts for supplies to the troops at the various mobilization centres throughout Canada varies according to circumstances. If there is time enough before the supplies are required, tenders are called for by public advertisement, usually by posters put up in and about the town where the troops are to be stationed. When the time is too short to allow this to be done, tenders are obtained by circular letter or telegram from Ottawa, addressed to dealers of the locality concerned. Names of dealers are supplied by War Purchasing Committee. In some cases where the time is very short, the officer commanding the district is authorized to procure tenders from local concerns and transmit them, by mail or telegraph, to Ottawa for approval. No application from responsible parties for permission to tender is refused; and tender forms and necessary information are supplied to all such applicants. In all cases, the lowest tenders received are accepted.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

That is a very satisfactory explanation; but, strange to say, according to letters I have received from reputable people, not a Liberal has been found to provide any supplies in the carrying out of this arrangement. Let me come down to a concrete case. I shall take the article of milk. On the 16th of February this question was answered:

Mr. Hughes:

1. Where is the milk obtained that is supplied to the troops at Charlottetown, P.E.I.?

2. Is it fluid or powder milk, and what price is paid for it?

3. How is powder milk made, and is there any cream in it?

Sir Sam Hughes:

1. From J. Tobin & Co., Halifax, N.S.

2. (a) Powder milk. (b) 14½ cents per pound.

3. (a) By a superheated process . (b) Powder milk which is the solids of milk with the water evaporated containing 23.8 per cent of fat which returns to its original element by the addition of water.

Parties who obtained some of that powdered milk had it analysed in Charlottetown and found that it contained no fat at all, although this answer says it contained 23 per cent. I had a sample of it analysed here at Ottawa by Mr. C. H. Robinson. His report was as follows:

9 p.m.

Central Experimental Farm,
Ottawa, March 16, 1916.

J. J. Hughes, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In the absence of Dr. Shutt I beg to hand you my report on the sample of milk powder forwarded by you on the 6th instant.

[Mr. J. J. Hughes.]

	Analysis.
Moisture	2.86
Fat	2.44
Protein	35.09
Ash	7.44

The undertermined consists almost entirely of milk sugar.

The analysis corresponds to that of powder made from skim or separated milk. One pound of this milk powder added to nine pounds of water would give a milk closely approximating in composition to that of skim or separated milk obtained from dairymen.

Yours respectfully,
C. H. Robinson,
Assistant Chemist.

There is a factory in Charlottetown that manufactures condensed milk.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Where did the hon. member get that report?

Mr. HUGHES: From Mr. C. H. Robinson, assistant chemist at the experimental farm.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You should have got Borden's condensed milk.

Mr. HUGHES: This factory at Charlottetown makes condensed milk which is sold all over Canada, and is used in construction, mining and lumber camps. It is whole milk and is sold at from 10 to 11 cents a pound, yet that factory could not supply a pound of milk to the troops at Charlottetown, while the department were buying skimmed milk in Halifax at 14½ cents a pound. They were not personæ gratæ to the Patronage Committee. I am informed by reputable people that hardly a Liberal in Charlottetown is supplying anything to the troops, and I understand that the same condition prevails at Summerside.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Was there not a public call for tenders?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know about that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the Deputy Minister of Militia that there was a public call for tenders.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know what the tenders call for. I saw one of the forms of tender, and it called for powdered milk. I do not know whether that was the form used in this case or not; if it was, of course, that factory could not supply it, because it does not deal in that class of article. It deals in a much better article, and could supply it at a lower price, at, as I have said, from 10 to 11 cents per pound. At the town of Souris, where 150 soldiers are located, I understand that the officers in charge made some inquiries of different

people with regard to supplies, and, as a matter of fact, Conservatives are supplying the articles. I am told—I cannot state positively whether this is correct or not, although I have the information from a reputable source—that it has been found that the supplies are about 20 per cent short of weight, and if that can be done—and I am given to understand that a somewhat similar condition exists in other parts of the province—and favoured parties can supply short weights of course they can put in low tenders.

Mr. MORRIS: Can you give us the names of any parties who supplied short weights?

Mr. GRAHAM: They must have been among the men supplying the goods.

Mr. HUGHES: I wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister—

Mr. MORRIS: I have asked the hon. gentleman a question; I have asked whether he can give us the names of any of those farmers who are supplying short weights.

Mr. HUGHES: I have a question on the Order Paper asking for that information, and as soon as I get it I will give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. McKENZIE: Appoint a commission.

Mr. HUGHES: In connection with the Militia Department, advertisements have been published asking for students for the Militia College at Kingston. This is in connection with the war and I have here a particular instance of a Liberal newspaper published in Charlottetown which was not allowed to publish that advertisement. That paper, I know, took an active part in promoting everything connected with the war, publishing freely notices calling meetings for recruiting purposes, and notices in connection with subscription funds, and doing everything that every other newspaper in the province did. In fact, there were no party lines drawn, so far as the people were concerned. Liberals and Conservatives alike have been eager and anxious to do their bit all over the Dominion, and it is the same in the province of Prince Edward Island as in other provinces. And yet this advertisement, calling for young men to attend the Military College, which is supported by the people, for the purpose of qualifying themselves to defend their country in case of need, was withheld from this newspaper. I can give the names in this instance, but I presume the officers of the Milita Department are well aware that I am stating a fact.

In regard to the medical officers employed in connection with the Army Service, I have this to say: A medical man in Charlottetown, who held a position in the active militia, and whose son or nephew has already given up his life in defence of his country, has not been allowed to examine a single recruit for active service. He has been turned down, although he was an officer in the active militia before the war broke out. These are some of the things that are being done all over the country.

Something has been said here to-day with regard to the surplus of officers in the Old Country and in Canada. I have information to the effect that there are about 600 officers now in Great Britain who are not employed. I might as well state how I came by that information. Just a few days ago, in the Queen Hotel in Halifax, I happened to be sitting at a table when two officers were discussing the matter. They put it in this way: They said that there were 600 Canadian officers "canned" in Great Britain, 600 officers who had nothing to do. They appeared to know what they were talking about. They also said that there were enough officers in the Dominion of Canada to supply an army of one million men, many of them striplings, some of them boys of from 18 to 20 years of age, who would have nothing to do, and for whom there was no possibility of employment; mere boys who could not be placed in charge of troops. A peculiar condition of things, in this connection exists even in this Parliament where we see men in khaki who evidently are not going to the front. Early in this session I myself had an invitation to become an officer. Now, there would be no more chance of my going to the front, or of being of any use as an officer, than of taking a trip to the moon.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES: I would be just as qualified as some men who sit in this House in khaki, and who are in receipt of pay as officers as well as of their indemnity as members. According to a return brought down, their wives are also in receipt of a separation allowance. That is a matter which should receive some consideration. Is there any limit to the demands that are to be made upon the war appropriation fund? If there are 500 or 600 officers in Great Britain who are on the pay roll and

who are doing nothing there; if there are enough officers in Canada to supply an army of a million men, all of whom are on the pay roll, and if there are men sitting in this Parliament who will never by any possibility go to the front, who know they will not go, who never expected to go, and who are in receipt of pay while their wives receive a separation allowance, is it reasonable to suppose that when the people know these things they will be as generous with their subscriptions to the war funds as they would be if these matters were conducted properly and honestly and economically as they ought to be. Taken individually, these things are perhaps small, but in the aggregate they amount to a good deal.

There are things that ought to be looked into. I am going to give you concrete cases. The Prime Minister is not well informed when he states there is no patronage list in this country. He stated this afternoon that as far as he knew there was no patronage list, and in that he may be correct, but I say again that he is not well informed, because every man who reads that statement will know that it is not correct. The patronage list, in so far as the war is concerned, is just as active as it is in regard to any civil matter in the Government service. It is so in the province from which I come, and I presume it is so in other provinces.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps not. Well, so much the better. The patronage system should not prevail in any province. The whole of the people of Canada are doing all in their power to win this great war. Liberals just as well as Conservatives, are volunteering, going to the front, they are willing to shed their blood, willing to sacrifice their lives, willing to do everything in their power, and patronage should have no place in a matter of this kind. Now that the Prime Minister is taking a more active part in the expenditure of the money appropriated for war purposes than he has done heretofore, we will probably have a better condition of affairs. I heard that a paymaster at one of the headquarters in Ontario, whose accounts were examined and found not to be correct, was sent to Great Britain as a paymaster at a greatly increased salary.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Who was he?

Mr. HUGHES: The information will come a little later.

[Mr. J. J. Hughes.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HUGHES: I understand he is a member of a family that is near to the Minister of Militia and Defence. These are conditions which are existing in the country. It is time for a change, it is time that an improvement should be made, because every person in my province knows that I am stating facts. I regret to have to state them. We will look for better things if the Prime Minister pays more attention to these matters than he has been able to pay in the past.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): I do not intend to take up very much time of the committee, but I would like to say a few words in regard to the resolution that is now before the House to provide for the war appropriation for the coming year. In doing so I do not desire to assume the role of a critic or to say anything that would seem harsh or unnecessary in regard to the carrying on of our part of the war. But I do want to draw the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), who is now looking after the Department of Militia and Defence, to some matters that I think are of interest to the people as a whole, and which are of interest to the Government of which he has the honour to be the head. Much has been said this afternoon, while this resolution has been under discussion, in regard to matters that have come to the attention of hon. members in different parts of the Dominion concerning the carrying on of the war insofar as Canada is concerned. One particular criticism was brought to the attention of the committee to-night of which I heartily approve, and that was in regard to the officers that are being appointed to carry on recruiting and to train and control the men in the regiments —I will not say throughout Canada, because I do not know if this criticism will apply to all parts of the country—but I will say down near my own home in the Maritime Provinces. We all know that a very large number of men have been appointed to responsible positions in connection with the training of recruits and the raising of battalions, without due regard to their military qualifications. These men are selected—I do not want to say without any regard to their fitness for the position—but I do know of many instances where men have been selected and placed in charge of battalions who have not had the slightest military experience before they

put on the King's uniform, and have been made captains and quartermasters in different battalions in the Maritime Provinces. I do not say this because I have any personal feeling against these men. They may be imbued with the most patriotic sentiments, but while that may be true it does not impress the country; it does not impress the young men; it does not impress the men whom we are seeking to enlist in the Canadian army that officers should be selected from people of this class. They are selected from three standpoints, and three standpoints alone—social influence, financial influence and political influence. That is the way selections are made of officers in the Maritime Provinces very largely.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In which category are those which you refer to?

Mr. COPP: Pardon me?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I thought you spoke of a number of Italians having been appointed.

Mr. COPP: No, I said "in raising battalions." I did not say that any Italians had been appointed. I doubt very much if the Italians would have sufficient social or political influence to warrant their appointment to these positions in any battalions or any other place.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I understand that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has a son who is an officer in a Nova Scotia battalion. To which class of influence does he owe his position?

Mr. COPP: I do not know to which class, but I understand that that young man had been in the militia for a number of years, that he had had considerable experience and that he was qualified for a commission before the war broke out.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: You do make some exceptions?

Mr. COPP: Yes. I am sincere in what I am saying to this committee to-night. I am saying absolutely what I believe to be true and with a proper regard to the spirit in which the war should be carried on. I am not here to say that there have been no Liberals appointed but I am here to complain that there have been a large number of officers appointed in the Maritime Provinces who have not had the slightest experience and who are no more fitted to be majors, captains or quarter-masters than I am, and I have not had the slightest experience in the world. My hon. friends have mentioned a number of things in regard to the treatment of soldiers who have been punished for lapses in conduct. As far as I am personally concerned I admire the man who takes upon himself the duties of citizenship and enlists as one of our soldiers to go forth and do his part in this war. I admire and respect that man. I believe, however, that you cannot carry on a war, or properly train soldiers without a certain amount of discipline. It is absolutely necessary that there should be proper discipline, but while I admire discipline I detest military snobbishness, and there is a great deal of that in this country at the present time. Just because a man happens to be an officer and holds a little higher rank than somebody else has, he has no right to abuse his authority in the way a number of military officers are doing in this country. The punishments that have been meted out to soldiers in the ranks have been reported in the newspapers, and are absolutely true.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What was the character of the punishments?

Mr. COPP: It was spoken of in the House here to-day—a man strung up by the arms for example.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has the hon. gentleman any other instances of that kind?

Mr. COPP: I have no instances of that kind to give. I am not speaking from my own knowledge of the harsh treatment some of the privates receive from their officers. The point I am making is that the privates are very often treated as if they were far below the officers. We are all Canadians, and the private may come from just as good a family and have just as good blood in his veins as the officer who happens to have been chosen through influence; and simply because an officer has that influence is no reason why the private should be abused and trampled upon, as they are in many training camps throughout the country.

With regard to this vote, I am sure there is not a member of this House but who intends to vote it cheerfully. At the same time I think it devolves upon us, as representing the people of this country, to demand that the money shall be honestly and reasonably expended for the purpose for which it is intended. No one, I am sure, could have occupied a seat in this House for even so short a time as I have, and heard the evidence given at meet-

ings of the Public Accounts Committee, without coming to the conclusion that the money that has been voted for war purposes during the last two years has not all been expended with that degree of care that should have been exercised. A number of instances have been given, and to-night I wish to draw the attention of my right hon. friend to an expenditure which has been much talked about in the province of New Brunswick, near my home town. I know the location very well; it is in the constituency of my hon. friend the member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), and I may say that we live very happily together in adjoining towns. If the statements that have been made by a large number of people in that constituency, and that have appeared in the press, in regard to the expenditure of a sum of money last year in the preparation of a building for the billetting of the soldiers in that particular town are true an investigation should certainly be held, to ascertain whether or not this large amount of money was, not to use a harsher term, absolutely wasted. If the reports in regard to the expenditure of that sum of money in the constituency of my hon. friend are true, and if his attitude on patronage is what he publicly stated it to be at the Forum the other night, then I must congratulate him for having had a very sudden change of heart in regard to the patronage system. I hold in my hand a reputable paper published in the province of New Brunswick, which makes very serious charges with regard to the expenditure of public money in the county of Cumberland, for the purpose of fitting up a building to accommodate the soldiers who were in training there in the year 1915. The editor of this paper is a responsible gentleman, both financially and otherwise, and claims to have made a careful personal examination into the matter. Several times he has demanded an investigation, and is prepared to prove his statements. I shall read a few of the charges he makes, but I might first of all say that although we have plenty of lumber close to Cumberland county, while the lumber that was used in this building was purchased some distance away, in the county of Hants, and brought over two railway lines to Amherst. We must not forget that there were already two public buildings in Amherst which could have been used—the armoury and the winter fair building. However, they fitted up these barracks for the soldiers at the extraordinary cost of between $25,000 and $30,000. The soldiers remained in the building only a few months, and last winter it was dismantled, and the soldiers quartered in another place. If this is true it was certainly an extravagant expenditure, to use no harsher term. After the building had been fitted up, then arose the question as to provisions, groceries, meats, and hay and oats, because horses were to be billeted there as well as soldiers. The Prime Minister said this afternoon that he had not heard there were any patronage lists. He did not say there were none; I am sorry he was not able to say that. If he had attended the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee this session he would have heard the Director of Contracts state under oath that there was a patronage list in the Militia Department, and that it had been prepared shortly after the election of 1911, and that the material required by the department was purchased from persons whose names appeared on that list. Whether he was mistaken or not, I cannot say; I do not know anything to the contrary; but I can tell the Prime Minister that if he does not know that there are patronage lists, he is not aware of what takes place in different constituencies throughout the country when supplies and provisions are purchased for the maintenance of the troops. I know what takes place in my portion of the country.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that these supplies are not all purchased subject to public tender?

Mr. COPP: They are not purchased subject to public tender. Further, in certain localities the patronage is not merely confined to the Conservative party, but it is confined to an inner ring of that party, the ordinary Conservatives being excluded, and only a very select few allowed to tender for supplying the troops.

As an illustration, would you be surprised, Mr Chairman, to know that the contract for coal in the town of Amhurst was given to an ice cream and oyster vendor who never handled coal in his life before. That is the charge made by the newspaper which I hold in my hand. Let me read portions of a long article on this subject:

> A resume of the rumours, which are current, not only in Amherst but elsewhere throughout the Maritime Provinces, and which seems to justify the demands for a parliamentary or a special investigation into the facts will be found in the statement contained herein.
>
> * * * * * * * * * * * *

Among the amounts paid were $7,355 for lumber bought from the Brooklyn Lumber Co., of Brooklyn, N.S., of which Company Mr. E. N. Rhodes, M.P. is said to be President and Senator Curry, a Director. This lumber, much of which, it is reported was shaky hemlock, was brought from Brooklyn in Hants county, over the Midland railway to Truro and from there to Amherst over the Intercolonial. It was freighted 75 miles before it reached the boundary line of Cumberland, which is known as a big lumber producing county. Why? Do the names mentioned furnish an answer?

For heating and lighting the buildings, the Canadian Car and Foundry Co. was paid $2,000. For plumbing there was paid $2,360, for cook-ranges $1,380 and incidentally $1,663 was paid to the foreman of the job, who was not a carpenter nor a builder, but a Conservative on the inside. He was only engaged on the work about five or six weeks. No man could get a day's work unless O.Ked by the Tory Patronage Committee.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Public tenders were never called by advertisement it is reported.

There was a farce of private tendering.

Even these forms of tender it is said, were only to be had at one office, and only by those not only of the right political stripe but within the ring.

For instance, a leading hay dealer of Amherst, who happened to be a Liberal, tried to get a chance to tender on the hay (to be provided for the horses.) He was told

That $17 a ton would be highway robbery and anyway he could not get a chance to tender because he was of the wrong political stripe. Within a week the contract for hay was awarded to one of the ring at $21 per ton.

One of the leading meat supply firms of Amherst desired to tender for the beef required. One of the members of this firm was a strong supporter of Mr. Rhodes at the last election, but he was not in the ring and although he made repeated applications for a chance to tender on the beef he failed to get an opportunity of doing so. He was told by one of the ring that beef should be supplied for about eleven cents a pound, but within a few days the contract was awarded to the same man who got the hay contract at the price of fourteen cents per pound. This gentleman made a contract with the Harris Abbatoir Company of Hamilton, Ont., to supply him with beef required at ten and a half cents a pound delivered in Amherst. As there was used between 1,500 and 2,000 pounds per day it can be seen that there was a profit of somewhere between $52,50 and $70 per day in beef alone.

There are several large bakeries in Amherst and although their proprietors had worked hard for Mr. Rhodes at the last election and spent their time and money in his interests they were outside of the ring and were passed by. The contract was given to a wholesale grocer.

The contract for vegetables was given to this same wholesale grocer at an extravagant price (although he was not engaged in the vegetable business) and who sub-let it to a lesser member of the ring.

The contract for coal was given, without tender, to the proprietor of an ice-cream parlor and oyster saloon, who up to that time had never been engaged in the coal business but the price he received was encouraging to say the least.

Now, even suppose that these statements are incorrect, some investigation should be held, for these allegations go forth to the country and if they are incorrect they do a great injustice to those in charge of these matters. But the people are very sensitive in regard to the expenditure of these war appropriations. They might not care for a few dollars in regard to ordinary expenditures; but when they realize that day after day and week after week they are called upon at every street corner to subscribe to good causes in connection with the war—and they are glad to give what they can afford to give—and when they are told that money is being squandered and wasted, not to use a harsher name, in patronage contracts given to friends of the Government, the contrast between the sacrifices they are making and the unjust advantage which others are gaining arouses the keenest dissatisfaction. The people expect a square, honest, careful expenditure of the money voted by this Parliament to the Government for the carrying on of this war. The Prime Minister this afternoon said that he did not know of any patronage list from which provisions were purchased for the Militia Department. Now, saying nothing of the past, however unfortunate it may be that we have been extravagant—for the past is gone—I would ask the Prime Minister to go a step further and say that if there is a patronage list at the present time there should be no patronage list in the future, so far as concerns the expenditure of the money passed under this resolution. I have felt it my duty to call the attention of the committee to instances of what is believed to be extravagance in the expenditure of money voted for the war. I hope that in the future greater care will be exercised and that we shall have a better report in regard to the expenditure of the money now to be voted than we have had in regard to the money voted in former years.

Mr. EDGAR N. RHODES (Cumberland): I could have hoped that my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) who has had some twenty or twenty-five years' experience in public life, off and on, would have had the kindness to advise me of his intention to speak about the way matters have been administered in the constituency of Cumberland which I have the honour to represent, particularly in view of the cir-

cumstance that being chairman of committees I am debarred from taking an active part in the debate. I certainly should not have spoken under ordinary conditions, but I could not sit quietly in the chair and listen to wild, outrageous, and absolutely unfounded assertions as I shall be able to show them to be. I cannot at the moment speak from the documents, for I have not them with me, but I might have had them here had I had notice that I should be called upon to deal with these charges. The hon. member has been entirely misinformed. When troops were first brought to Amherst, there was a certain urgency in the matter of securing tenders as it was supposed that the troops would be brought there at an earlier date than they were. At that time, a supply officer of the Department came and left with me certain tender forms, asking me to submit these to various contractors in my constituency. Now, I wish to state the case exactly as it happened. I made particular inquiry of him as to whether this was the method which had obtained in the department, and he told me it was the method that had obtained for many years. I wish to assume entire responsibility for the manner in which these contract forms were at that time distributed. I took care, having regard to the system which had obtained in this country, that these tenders were handed to my political friends and not to my political opponents. I am not here to defend that system. I deplore the patronage system. I believe that it is a canker which is eating into the body politic of this country and I am willing to assist in every possible way in an attempt to eradicate it. That was the system which obtained, however, and I took care that tender forms were at that time placed in the hands of those who had been my political supporters. That is what hon. gentlemen opposite would do; that is what hon. gentlemen opposite have done; that is what I did, having regard to the circumstances, and knowing that that was the system which had obtained up to that time. But I did not approve of the system—and I have discussed the matter since on various occasions with different responsible officers of the Militia Department. Excepting those contracts which were awarded in the first instance, every contract in the constituency which I have the honour to represent has been awarded on open contract and by competition. As an evidence of that let me say that the very man whom the hon. member for Westmorland referred to a short time ago as not receiving a contract in the first instance is to-day the meat contractor in the town of Amherst, and he was a violent opponent of mine in the last political contest, but I find no fault with that. I have had absolutely nothing whatever to do directly or indirectly, with the awarding of contracts in the constituency of Cumberland since that first and only case. Troops have been quartered in the town of Springhill for several months. I wish to tell the hon. member for Westmorland that I do not know the name of a single contractor in the town who is supplying foodstuffs to the troops. At the request of the War Purchasing Commission, which did not receive a sufficient number of tenders in response to advertisements which were posted in public places in Springhill, I gave the name of every merchant in that town, Liberal and Conservative. The statement that I make in respect of the town of Springhill is absolutely true in respect of the town of Amherst; I do not know who the contractors are in Amherst to-day. I happen to know something about the meat contract because of some peculiar conditions that arose, and in regard to which I made particular inquiries. I was not consulted in any shape or form with respect to the awarding of contracts, and I state my absolute belief that they were awarded after competition and to the lowest tenderer.

My hon. friend drew some evidences of mirth from some hon. gentlemen on his side of the House by stating that a certain coal contract had been awarded to an ice-cream vendor, a man, he said, who had never been in the coal business. This ice-cream vendor, to my certain knowledge, has been in the coal business for at least ten years. He sells coal to the public in the town of Amherst to-day and he has done so in the years gone by. I do not think because a man happens to sell a few quarts of ice-cream or any other commodity that he should be debarred from selling coal. It seems to me that the two important considerations are: Was the coal of good quality, and was it sold at a fair price?

I notice, too, that the hon. member for Westmorland skated on thin ice when he discussed the question of lumber supplies. He did not tell the committee that the company which supplied lumber was one of which I am president and in the stock of which I hold a fifth interest. I do not think that this is a matter to be hidden. As a matter of fact, it is well known that

I am in the lumber business and have been for a great many years. I was very glad indeed to find out, for the first time after the contract had been awarded, that a contract had been given to the company of which I am president. I am in the lumber business and I do not see why, becauses I am a member of Parliament that the company with which I am connected should be debarred from doing a certain amount of legitimate business, provided the company has lumber to sell and sells it at a fair price. I do not purpose going into that matter further than to say that the lumber was, I believe, of fair quality and that it was sold at a fair price. By reason of its being dried in the open air it really had to be purchased from that company at that time, having regard to the fact that a large quantity was required at a season of the year when that quality of lumber could not be purchased from mills which had sold and shipped their whole cut.

I want to make the assertion positively, so that there can be no misunderstanding in respect to it, that so far as the constituency of Cumberland is concerned—I can speak only of that constituency, because I have not been concerned with outside constituencies—every contract for supplies is awarded on open tender and absolutely without respect to a man's political qualifications. I do not think the hon. member for Westmorland would have made the rash statements that he did make if there did not happen to be within the precincts of the building to-night one of the most prominent Liberals in my constituency. The hon. member for Westmorland has probably had a prod from him; that gentleman wished to take home with him some statement that Rhodes was getting a little bit of criticism in the House of Commons. There is in the constituency which I represent a newspaper which was founded solely and entirely for partisan purposes; I refer to the Amherst Guardian an out and out Liberal sheet. That paper, published in my constituency, has not published any such statements as are published in the paper which my hon. friend has read. He reads from a paper which is published in his constituency, some 50 miles from the town in which I live. That paper would not dare publish such statements in the constituency in which I live. The hon. member made an appeal here to-night, as if, perforce, he were being shut off in the matter of investigation. Does he not know that the Prime Minister did something that was never heretofore done in the Dominion of Canada—never done, so far as I know, in any British country before? He established a Royal Commission, with a roving commission, travelling up and down the length and breadth of this country and inviting people to lay charges against the Administration. That commission was in the province of Nova Scotia, and I myself caused an editorial to be published in the Amherst Daily News, a paper which is friendly to myself, inviting any one who had a charge to make in that constituency to bring it before the commission. Did they do so? Not at all. Then, does my my hon. friend forget that there is a Public Accounts Committee in the House of Commons? It is the easiest thing in the world for him to have these various matters investigated, and I may say that I shall be only too happy to assist him. If there is anything wrong in the manner in which this Government business has been conducted in my constituency, I want to know it, not for partisan purposes, but in the public interest, and I am just as anxious to know it as my hon. friend is. I repeat that I shall assist him in full measure if he will cause these matters to be brought before the Public Accounts Committee; I welcome an opportunity of having them investigated.

Troops were brought to Amherst in the first instance, and they were quartered in the building of the Canada Car and Foundry Company. I have no interest in the Canada Car and Foundry Company; I do not own a dollar's worth of stock, nor does any member of my immediate family. I have no interest directly or indirectly in it, except that I happen to be local solicitor for the company—I say that only in passing. I wanted to see troops brought to Amherst because of the peculiar conditions at that time. Following the industrial depression, large buildings suitable for the accommodation of troops were vacant, and the quartering of a regiment in the town at that time would have been of great local benefit. Amherst is strategically located as the geographical centre of the Maritime Provinces; the military authorities at Halifax were only too happy to see the troops brought into Amherst, and I was only too happy to lend my assistance to their being brought there. They were given the use of the buildings of the Canada Car and Foundry Company, without the cost of one dollar by way of charge. The company have asked to be reimbursed for certain expenditures to which they were put, but there has been no charge for rental of the

buildings used by the troops. Insurance rates, which were of a favourable character, were raised, and the Government is being asked to pay the difference between the insurance rate which the company pays in ordinary times and the increased rate which was demanded by reason of the occupation of the building by the troops.

Mr. COPP: Does the hon. member know what it cost to put the building in condition?

Mr. RHODES: I think it was somewhere in the vicinity of $26,000. However, the answer is open to my hon. friend, because this matter has been the subject of various questions by him, and I think others during this and the previous session. But it must be borne in mind that while the winter fair building was available for the use of the troops at that time, the military authorities then decided not to use that building for this reason: Quarters were being fitted up at that time for the 22nd French-Canadian Battalion, which came from Quebec, and also for the 6th Mounted Rifles, and for the use of the 6th Mounted Rifles it was necessary to have a building where 750 horse stalls could be built for the accommodation of their horses. There was not room in the winter fair building for the two regiments. If they had used the winter fair building it could only have been used for one regiment. There was no building within a mile of the winter fair building which could accommodate the horses, and as there were available two buildings within a distance of some 50 or 60 feet, which are part of the works of the Canada Car and Foundry Company, one of those buildings was used for the accommodation of the men and the other for the horses. The military authorities were thus compelled to select the buildings of the Canada Car and Foundry Company at that time. This year the winter fair building has been used, for the reason that no accommodation for horses was required, and it was well adapted as a barracks for the men. Furthermore, it was owned by the town of Amherst, and it was given rent free, with an understanding on the part of the town that it would be available for the uses of the Government until the war is over. The abandonment of the quarters in the buildings of the Canada Car and Foundry Company did not involve any loss; in fact, even with the additional cost of fitting up the winter fair building, the Government will be in pocket, for the reason that the extra insurance and the various incidental charges of watchmen and that sort of thing would make the continued occupation of the Car and Foundry Company's building far more expensive than to pull out the fittings, as was done, and transport them to Aldershot to be used for military purposes. Let me point out that while the cost of the equipment of quarters in the building of the Canada Car and Foundry Company was something like $26,000, that cost included accommodation for one full regiment of infantry, a squadron of cavalry, and in addition, 750 horses; that the buildings that were fitted up this year—that is the winter fair buildings—were fitted up for the accommodation of one infantry regiment alone; and if my hon. friend will look at the returns which he has before him, he will observe that it cost more to fit up the buildings this year for the one regiment of infantry than it cost last year for the regiment of infantry, the squadron or cavalry, and the horses, combined. So he need not draw any comfort from the circumstance that a large sum of money was spent in buildings owned by the Canada Car and Foundry Company.

10 p.m.

I do not know that I have covered all of the ground which has been gone over by my hon. friend, but I wish to do so. I do not wish to avoid any detail, and if there are any questions in connection with the matter which the hon. gentleman wishes to raise, I should be glad if he would do so.

The hon. member criticised the awarding of a contract for hay and fodder. I have only this to say with respect to that contract, that I was responsible for its having been awarded. It was given in the manner I have indicated, being one of the first awarded. I saw that it went to one of the most responsible and honourable farmers in the constituency, a man in whom I have entire confidence. My hon. friend criticised the prices, but he did not tell the committee that the Government did not buy a pound of hay, let alone several hundred tons, with the result that this farmer, on this contract, lost something over $1,000. I have been importuning the Militia Department for nearly a year asking them to compensate this man for his loss on the contract, and I believe that I have them convinced that he has a just claim and that he will be paid at least a portion of his loss. So far from having made any profit on the contract, he made a loss of the amount I

have mentioned. My hon. friend also says that one prominent Liberal was told that he could not get a contract because he was a Liberal. I would like to know who made the statement; I would like to have names.

Mr. COPP: I read it in the newspaper.

Mr. RHODES: Yes, but about three-quarters of what you read in the papers was not true.

Mr. COPP: That may be.

Mr. RHODES: And the other quarter was a very substantial looking structure built out of a very delicate fabric; there was a very small modicum of substance in any of the statements which the hon. gentleman read from the newspaper. I do not know that I need take up the time of the committee at greater length except to say that there is no good purpose to be served by making wild statements in the House. If the hon. gentleman has any ground for believing that anything is wrong in connection with the awarding of contracts, his remedy is open and he can have it out in the Public Accounts Committee to his heart's content, and I for one, just as well as my hon. friend for Westmorland, will welcome the opportunity of seeing these various matters investigated.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend has taken us very fully into his confidence, in regard to the awarding of contracts in Cumberland county. If it was a proper thing to give notice of my intention to bring up this matter, I offer my apologies for not doing so, because I certainly did not know that it was customary on referring to a small matter like this to give any particular notice. I brought it up, not because I had the slightest feeling in regard to the matter. My hon. friend and myself have always been personally very warm friends, and I trust we may remain so. I brought this matter up because it had been brought to my attention, as I said at the outset, by a very reputable and responsible public journal in the countty of Westmorland, in New Brunswick. The editor of this journal is, both financialy and in every way, responsible to answer for any charges that he makes in regard to public matters. I distinctly stated that I was taking my information from the newspaper that had published the statements and I was bringing it to the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister for if it was true it was a disgrace and a shame that the money had been so wasted by extravagance in the carrying on of the work in the adjoining county of Cumberland. I wish to say to my hon. friend that if it was not true it should be cleared up because it was attracting a great deal of attention in that quarter and was being used in a manner very detrimental to the Government as well as to recruiting in that portion of the country. But my hon. friend from Cumberland arose in his place and said that he was going to dissipate this allegation entirely and to show that what I said was absolutely made out of whole cloth and really had no foundation in fact. Let me say to my hon. friend that in the very first words he uttered he admitted the very charge I made.

Mr. RHODES: I will assume that the hon. member wishes to be fair. I said that, following the custom of the Militia Department in the past, contracts over a year ago had been awarded. What is the date of the newspaper from which my hon. friend has read.

Mr. COPP: It is with reference to the billeting of soldiers in 1915.

Mr. RHODES: I have stated that for over a year contracts have been awarded in my constituency upon open tenders. Not a word does my hon. friend say about that.

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend will have patience, I will say a word about that. I want to say a word or two about the statement which he made that what I said was absolutely without foundation. He made the admission that those contracts for the hay, and for the provisioning of the camp, were made by himself in the way in which this paper states they were made, without regard to tender, and given to his own political friends. That is what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. RHODES: The first contract was made by tender and contract, but the tenders were not publicly advertised. They were not given publicity, but the contracts were made upon tender.

Mr. COPP: I will accept my hon. friend's word that it was made on tender, but the only people who were allowed to tender were the political friends of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. RHODES: Yes, in the first instance.

Mr. COPP: That is what I was talking about. That is the charge which is made

in this paper, that it was in the first instance. My hon. friend says that tenders were called for and that contracts were awarded, and he excuses himself on the ground that it had been the practice of the former Government to act in the same way.

Mr. RHODES: I said the practice of the department; I did not mention Government at all.

Mr. COPP: The practice in the department, if my hon. friend wishes to play upon words. Let me point out that when tenders were called for by the department in the past it was in time of peace, and not in time of war. Let me go a little further. If he wants to hide behind the statement that it was the practice followed by the Militia Department under the previous Government, let me ask him if that is a sufficient excuse. He admits that it is wrong; he admits that he has changed it, and, forsooth, because I draw the attention of the committee to the fact, he says I have made a statement that is without foundation in fact. I appeal to this committee; I ask my hon. friend, and I ask the people of this country whether or not the charges made by the newspaper which I have read are not absolutely admitted by the hon. member for the county of Cumberland.

Mr. RHODES: The effect of the hon. member's statement, as it would appear in the press to-morrow, would be that the practice of this Government was not to award contracts by tender and contract or by the publication of tenders, but that it was the practice to award contracts under a system of political patronage, which is entirely and absolutely untrue.

Mr. COPP: I will come to that. I do not want to take the least advantage of my hon. friend, or to allow anything to go out to the public press that is not absolutely correct. I do not wish to do any injustice to my hon. friend. I read extracts from an article in the Moncton Transcript which referred entirely to the billeting of soldiers in the winter of 1915, and my hon. friend admits that at that time the contracts were let upon tenders from his political friends. We are agreed upon that particular phase of the matter. My hon. friend now says that he has changed that practice.

Mr. RHODES: I did not say that I changed it.

Mr. COPP: It has been changed.

[Mr. Copp.]

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. COPP: I presume my hon. friend had something to do with the change. He would recommend it, I suppose. Did he approve or recommend the change?

Mr. RHODES: I thoroughly approve of it.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend will not go so far as to say that he recommended it, but he approves of it. I did not speak of what went on during the past winter. I am glad to have the admission of my hon. friend that in the county of Cumberland the old system is not being followed now. But he must not forget that while he may play a little upon words, facts are stubborn things. When he says that he does not know of a single individual in the town of Springhill who is supplying provisions for the soldiers billeted there, does he mean that his patronage committee do not know?

Mr. RHODES: In the first place I have no patronage committee in Springhill. In the second place, I wish to be frank, it will be news to me if any of my political supporters have influenced the letting of contracts in the town of Springfield in the slightest degree. I know that every man in the town of Springhill, Liberal and Conservative alike, has had equal opportunity to tender for supplies, and I would be very much surprised if the lowest tenderer did not get the contract in every instance.

Mr. COPP: That does not answer my question.

Mr. RHODES: Put it again, and I will try to answer it. I thought I did answer it.

Mr. COPP: You said so far as you know.

Mr. RHODES: I cannot go further than that. What more can I say?

Mr. GRAHAM: He means that your knowledge might go further.

Mr. COPP: The hon. gentleman says he does not know of any case, and I accept his word, but probably there are many things going on in his county of which he does not know. I would like to ask whether he has not a patronage committee in his county?

Mr. RHODES: I have not, and never had a patronage committee in my constituency.

Mr. COPP: Nor any one acting for him?

Mr. RHODES: I consult my friends constantly, daily, with respect to matters

affecting my constituency that are not matters of patronage at all.

Mr. COPP: I would ask whether my hon. friend's law partner did not have something to do with the political patronage in his county?

Mr. RHODES: No doubt he had.

Mr. COPP: Then in common parlance would my hon. friend not say that his partner was a dispenser of patronage when he was not there? I want to be perfectly fair. When my hon. friend tells us that there is no dispenser of patronage in the county of Cumberland—well, I live very close to that county and have been there and have consulted some of the very men who claim to be dispensers of patronage.

Mr. RHODES: Who?

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend's law partner.

Mr. RHODES: Did he claim to be the dispenser of patronage?

Mr. COPP: Yes. Is it not correct? Does my hon. friend claim that he is not the dispenser of patronage?

Mr. RHODES: I do not know that any particular purpoose can be served by catechising me with respect to my relations with the gentleman referred to. In the first place he is not my partner; I presume my hon. friend refers to the gentleman who was at one time my partner.

Mr. COPP: Until very recently.

Mr. RHODES: Until the beginning of the year. I did not consult him any more frequently than I did many other men in my constituency, and I am not aware of his handling patronage in any particular degree. I do not believe that he has been consulted with respect to one of those contracts. I wish to be frank with my hon. friend. The situation is this: The contracts are awarded by the War Purchasing Commission, and I shall be very much surprised if they are consulting anybody with respect to the awarding of those contracts. They have not consulted me, and I think that if they had to consult anybody it would be me. The only contact I have had with the commission was, as I have said, when I gave them a full list of names of the merchants in the town of Springhill for the reason that no sufficient response had been made by the merchants to the public call for tenders.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend has not satisfied me, nor, I think, the committee, as to whether or not this man, or some one else, up till very recently at least, looked after patronage matters.

Mr. RHODES: I tell my hon. friend that I do not believe that Mr. Sterne has been consulted in the slightest degree with respect to the awarding of those contracts.

Mr. COPP: Do not cover up this thing; let us get at the facts. What I have said is based on my knowledge of Cumberland County and upon information that I have. I have had business relations with Mr. Sterne. Surely my hon. friend would not attempt to make us believe that he had not some one in the county of Cumberland to look after the dispensing of patronage

Mr. RHODES: We were discussing the question of purchases by the Militia Department. I am consulting Mr. Sterne every day with respect to appointments in my constituency. Only to-day I recommended the appointment of a returned soldier as a letter carrier in Amherst. I do not know the man's religion or politics. I wired Mr. Sterne to know if he thought this man would be suitable for the position, and he wired back "yes." I know the man, I have known him for a number of years, but I do not know his religion or politics.

Mr. COPP: Does not that exactly prove what I say, that Mr. Sterne is the dispenser of patronage and that he is referred to by my hon. friend whenever an appointment is made? My hon. friend applies to him in connection with the appointment of this man. He had to get Mr. Sterne's recommendation before he appointed him. I am not making any charges, but I have a suspicion in my own mind that Mr. Sterne had found out that this gentleman who was appointed recently would be very acceptable to my hon. friend in Amherst. My hon. friend says that recently all contracts have been let by tender and to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. RHODES: I believe so.

Mr. COPP: That being so, I want to congratulate my hon. friend upon having taken that course in regard to war expenditures, particularly because if there are any expenditures in regard to which no patronage should be allowed they are the expenditures in connection with this war. My hon. friend apparently would like to have this committee believe that because there was no hay purchased, the statement I made was absolutely incorrect. I told the committee, when I referred to it, that they expected to have

horses billeted there, and contracts for hay were let. I did not attempt to deceive the committee by saying that there was any hay supplied, because I knew better than that. I knew there was no hay supplied. In fact, my hon. friend was being importuned to make up for the loss because some of his friends did not get an opportunity to supply hay and oats. But still the fact remains that a contract for hay was made and my hon. friend admits that the price was to be $21 per ton at Amherst.

Mr. RHODES: I did not admit that; I did not say anything with respect to the price at all.

Mr. COPP: Was not $21 a ton the price?

Mr. RHODES: It may have been—I have not the figures before me—but I did not mention the price.

Mr. COPP: Well, the statement was made that it was $21 a ton and if my hon. friend does not know, surely we may take it for granted that that was the price at which the hay was contracted for. My hon. friend knows as well as I do that at that time $21 a ton was $3 or $4 more than hay was being purchased for.

Mr. RHODES: I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. COPP: Then I may inform my hon. friend that $21 a ton was $3 or $4 more than the highest price the farmers were being paid for hay at that time. He says that he had that contract let himself to his own political friends at $21 a ton with the expectation that a large quantity of hay would be used for billeting horses and remounts at that place during that winter. The principle involved is what I am talking about and what I am trying to impress upon the Prime Minister is that in the expenditure of this war vote he should see to it that no patronage is allowed to creep in or that any excessive prices are allowed to friends of the Government when supplies are purchased. My hon. friend also claims that I have made these remarks because there is a prominent Liberal from Amherst here. That was the first intimation that I had that there was a prominent Liberal from Amherst here, and I shall be very glad to see him, but his presence has nothing to do with my remarks upon this question, I simply brought the matter to the attention of my hon. friend in the most candid manner feeling that extravagance had occurred in the past and hoping that it would not occur in the future. My hon. friend says that the cost of fitting up the Canada Car and Foundry building for troops was some $26,000.

Mr. RHODES: State the figures approximately.

Mr. COPP: That is approximately correct. There is a building that was fitted up for troops and for only five months at a cost of $26,000; it cost another large amount of money to demolish it and fit up a building somewhere else. When this building was fitted up for the billeting of soldiers during five months of the winter, why was it necessary to dismantle it and go to the expense of fitting up another place in the same town for the billeting of soldiers? If that is reasonable, if that is good business, then I admit that I do not know anything about what good business is. After this large expenditure had been incurred for fitting up and arranging the building I cannot understand why it was necessary to tear it down after one winter's use and go to expense in fitting up another place.

Mr. RHODES: Probably the prevailing reason was that the building was not available for continuous use. It was being used this winter for the construction of cars, not to as large an extent as it was, but in part and it is being used now for that purpose.

Mr. COPP: If this building was only going to be wanted for one winter it was hardly necessary, even though it gave to my hon. friend's company a chance to supply a certain amount of lumber, to fit it up. It does not seem to have been good business enterprise, even although the lumber was supplied by my hon. friend's company, to fit this building up when it was only going to be used for five months. My hon. friend asked me to bring this matter before the Public Accounts Committee. It is not necessary to bring it before the Public Accounts Committee because he admits the charges in regard to the letting of contracts and that is what this whole newspaper article and argument are about. No word has been said about the letting of contracts during this past winter and I have not heard anything with regard to it? If he had pursued the course that he tells the committee he has pursued, he would be able to tell us that contracts had gone to the lowest tenderer. If my hon. friend had pursued that course no fault could be found with him. But my hon. friend says that a commission went

down through the Maritime Provinces last summer, that invitations were held out to parties having charges to make against the Government, or any department of the Government, to go and make their charges, and they would be investigated.

Mr. RHODES: That is right.

Mr. COPP: That may be true. But what better position should we be in to-day if that Commission that went through Nova Scotia had investigated these charges and taken evidence? We should not have known anything more about it than we do to-day. We have no report from that Commission as to the charges they did investigate in Nova Scotia; we know nothing whatever about it. My hon. friend from Cumberland has admitted that the charges made by the Moncton Transcript are absolutely correct. While he admits he did wrong—

Mr. RHODES: No, I do not.

Mr. COPP: If it was not wrong at first it would not be wrong now. My hon. friend took great credit to himself just now that tenders had been called for in every instance, and contracts let to the lowest tenderer. If you read between the lines you could see that he was taking great credit to himself for that, because it would have been discreditable to do the business in any other way. I repeat, the charges have been admitted by my hon. friend, and I trust that, now he has apparently resolved to do better in the future, his example will be followed by all the other members from the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I intervene in this discussion with some reluctance, because I have a very great question in my mind as to whether this discussion should really be taking place. I think, Sir, there is room for grave doubt whether we are not losing our sense of proportion in the greatest crisis that has ever been passed through by this country, by this Empire, by the world, and by the world's prospects of the advance of civilization. I intervene from a strict sense of duty, and because I think it would be unfortunate that a vote of this magnitude in connection with a war of this magnitude, should pass without a note of clear support of the Government at this crisis, coming from this side of the House.

I come from a province where up to the present moment we have recruited 2,656 more men than make our quota towards the 500,000 at which the Government is aiming. That is a fact of which, as an Albertan, I am reasonably proud, and that is a fact for which I find the explanation, if it is to be found, in this: that the people of Alberta are not so much concerned where the sugar is being got for the troops, as they are in getting the troops and beating the Germans.

I listened with very great care to the statement of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister from beginning to end. I listened to it calmly, and as I listened I was proud to be a citizen of Canada, and proud to be a citizen of Canada because of what the present Government of Canada has done in connection with this war. There were certain things which loomed up before my mind as I listened to that statement, and the first thing with which I was impressed was the magnitude of the burdens and the responsibilities which came upon the Government of a small portion of the British Empire with the swiftness and the suddenness that we know characterized the commencement of this war. It was my privilege, as it was my honour, at the beginning of the war, and as it has been more than once since, to express what was my clear convictions then, and what is equally my clear conviction now; that the head of this Government and the Government itself and the majority of its supporters were seized at once with the importance of the issues, and bent their whole energies to the task of contributing a proper quota on the part of Canada to the successful prosecution of the war. That was my conviction then and it is my conviction now, and I am clear in my own mind that history will record—whatever may be the petty political fortunes of party in this country at the next or any other election—I am confident that the impartial historian will record that my right hon. friend who leads the Government has from the day the war-cloud burst kept a single eye to the winning of the war, and has not been led aside or diverted from that purpose by any small motive or any small consideration whatsoever.

The next thing that loomed out in front of me as I listened to the statement of the Prime Minister was the point that was referred to by the right hon. gentleman himself, and that was the tremendous task which had fallen upon a large and momentarily increasing number of the staff of the Militia Department, and of the loyalty

and devotion—which often, as the Prime Minister said, must have carried their nerves to the racking point—with which every member of that staff must have done his duty. The Government and the staff of the department had splendid support from another consideration, which was raised by the Prime Minister, because the spirit that animated the Government and the spirit that animated the staff of the Militia Department was, and is, I believe, Sir, the spirit of the great majority of right thinking people in this country.

There was another thought that came to me, and it was the thought of gratitude, that though we have had this stupendous task thrown suddenly upon our Government, and especially upon the Militia Department, and though our people have had to make sacrifices and share in the carrying of the burden, yet we have such a magnificent heritage in this country, and our liberties are so protected by the flag under which we live, that none of us within this land has had to go with one meal less, none of us has had to go with any fear as to what is coming to us or coming to the Empire. I am grateful that I am in that position. I am thankful to the men at the front who are achieving this for us, and this, after all, is the greatest consideration. That is the greatest consideration that was raised in the Prime Minister's speech. We all echoed every sentiment he expressed as he recalled the way Canadians stood in the breach a year ago, and the way they are prepared to stand to-day and shed the last drop of their blood for the flag, for the Empire, for the world's liberties, the world's future, and the world's civilization. In the presence of these considerations I may be allowed to express a doubt whether the points that have been raised in discussion are calculated to help in the accomplishment of that great task—whether they are not calculated to hinder. If there had not been grounds for criticism the Government would not have been human. Humanity is fallible. It is said that the man who does not make mistakes never makes anything. If the Government had not gone into this war with the intention of making something, of helping to achieve the victory that we know is coming; if they had not gone into it animated by the spirit that makes for victory, they might not have made mistakes, but they would not have helped much in bringing about that victory. We are told, "You cannot make omelets without breaking eggs." It is one of the misfortunes of war that it brings greater profits even to the farmers, to the sons who are left at home while the other sons are sacrificing all they have at the front. Mistakes? Of course. And critics? Of course. Said Byron:

> A man must serve his time to every trade.
> But censure—critics all are ready made.

For my part, in such a crisis in the history of our Empire and of the country, as a private individual citizen who happens for a moment to have a seat in Parliament, I have no time for criticism. My talk, and such effort as I am able to exert, have been from the beginning behind the clear-eyed purpose of the Prime Minister, and they are so now; and so, I believe, are the thoughts and efforts of the people of Canada. For I do believe this: that whatever criticisms are to be offered, whatever reputations are to be made or lost, this is not the time for these things. This is the time to stand under the flag that we all love, and for the greatest cause that ever animated our people and our people's allies, and behind a Government of whom history will record that, on the whole, it has done well. It is for us to stand for that cause and under that flag until victory rests upon our banners. It is because the people of this country believe that the Prime Minister and his Government and the majority of his supporters have taken that attitude and are determined to occupy it to the end, with a single eye to victory for a cause that far transcends the squabbles of party—it is because the people believe this, that I believe they are behind the Government until the war is won.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.): I believe we all feel that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has struck the right note, and that he has expressed the feeling of the people of Canada. As he has said, this is not the time for such criticism as we have had. I had a letter yesterday from a young man at the front, and he told me that he had just come in from the trenches. He told of the fearful sights he had seen, with dead men all around him, and he asks: "What are you doing in Canada; what are you doing in Parliament? We are fighting like blazes." And for what? Is it for anything material in the carrying on of this war—is it for anything material at all? Take, for instance, the statements made by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes). He said there was nothing but partisanship in the conduct of the Militia Department in relation to

the soldiers in Prince Edward Island. I represent the largest constituency in that province, and I have never heard a word uttered with reference to partisanship. I know that from one end of Prince Edward Island to the other there is perfect harmony, that every man, woman and child is doing his or her best to forward the interests of Canada in this great war for the liberty of the world. The hon. member for Kings made one statement which, I think, should not be passed over by me; he said that no Liberal doctor is allowed to examine a soldier, and he referred to the case of a doctor whose nephew or brother had been killed. The man to whom he referred is evidently Colonel Warburton. In Prince Edward Island we have had a great number of men go to the front. In the last battery that went, Dr. Warburton examined nearly all the recruits. In previous batteries, of which there have been two or three, Dr. Warburton examined all. But in the last battery that was raised another doctor was given his turn. Dr. Warburton is not dissatisfied with the treatment he has received. He is a retired officer and the men who did the examining of the last battery are men in the active militia. It would seem that to the mind of the hon. member for Kings it is an unpardonable thing that the Conservative party should have successfully carried out Canada's share in the conduct of the war. Had they made mistakes that would have been to the advantage of the Liberal party, but because they have conducted affairs honestly they have been unpardonably wrong in the eyes of the hon. gentleman. There was another statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) to which I wish to refer, and that is with reference to the officers who have gone with the several contingents. Of the officers who have gone to the front, as well as those who are with the battalions now in Charlottetown, the majority have been Liberals. Nobody had anything to say against that. Though I am a Conservative I never had anything to say against the appointment of a Liberal officer. All that is wanted is that the officer shall be competent to fill the position to which he is appointed. That is what all Canadians want, that and nothing else. We do not want politics in military affairs, we do not want to put a Conservative in a position of command if he is not competent to command, and that has not been done in the province of Prince Edward Island.

Now, with regard to the supply of groceries and other things for the soldiers in Prince Edward Island, let me say that these contracts were given after call for tenders. I understand the contracts have been given to the lowest bidders. I have not made any inquiry as to who got the contracts, it is no part of my business; I never interfered in it one way or the other. I do not think that any of my Liberal-Conservative friends in my constituency took any interest in it. All they wanted was to get as many good men as possible and to send them to the front to do their duty for the defence of the Empire.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: (Edmonton) I wish to ask a few questions in regard to matters more or less directly connected with the subject now before the committee, and I will do so later if this is a suitable occasion to secure information with regard to matters of detail.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There are a few matters about which inquiry is made, and I will speak very briefly with regard to these and then take up what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) wants to know. If I am not able to give the information he requires, I shall have inquiry made, so that the information may be available at a later stage.

Mr. OLIVER: My intention was to ask questions with regard to matters of administration, but I will forego that for the moment. The hon. member for Red Deer has introduced a new note into this debate. Up to the present time, as I understood it, no question had come before the committee as to any lack of support to the Government in its proposals before the House. I understood that there was absolute unanimity in willingness to vote the money and support the Government. But there has been discussion in committee, as is right and proper, as to matters of detail. Some of these matters might be of greater importance and some might be of lesser importance, but I submit that all this discussion was with a view to securing greater advantage and a greater efficiency in the proposals of the Government, in its administration and in its expenditure. If my hon. friend takes the position that because this country is at war the Government must be supported in everything, right or wrong, good or bad, and that that must be done with a view to securing success in the war, I can only say to him that in my humble judgment that is the wrong way to secure success. Success will never be achieved by that means.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Can my hon. friend quote a phrase from what I said that would indicate that as an opinion of mine—not a phrase?

Mr. OLIVER: My memory is not good for details, but I gathered from the enthusiastic applause with which his remarks were received that that was their import, to our friends on the other side at any rate.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I should say that the silence on your own side would indicate that.

Mr. OLIVER: I think my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) said very specifically that he had not time to criticise or assist in criticism of the Government at this present time. He declared that the Government was doing the best that could be done, or if it was not, it was to be excused for not having done that very best. My appreciation of the position is this: while we recognize the stupendous responsibilities that have been placed upon the Government of the day by the outbreak of war; while we recognize that the conditions call for every support that is possible to be given to the Government in the discharge of those responsibilities, the very fact of the greatness of the responsibilities that are on the shoulders of the Government lays the responsibility upon the shoulders of members of the Opposition to take their proper part as critics of the action of the Government, and they cannot divest themselves of that responsibility by saying yea and amen to everything that is put before them by the Government. There has not been captious or partisan criticism of the Government during this debate. There has been no unworthy criticism of the Government or its administration. What might seem to be trivial matters may have been considered, and some important matters may have been considered, but I ask this committee, who is to say that a matter which tends to affect the mind of the people at this particular time is a trivial matter? Let it be small in material importance, if you will; if those who are discharging the responsibilities of government in this country are not dealing fairly or squarely or honestly or with a sufficient sense of their own responsibilities, is that the way to win the war? Is that the way to get that unanimous support that we must have in order to win? That is not my appreciation of the situation. We on this side of the House are elected to this position for the purpose of criticising the Government. That is our business, the country looks to us to see that the actions of the Government that are open to criticism shall be criticised on the floor of this House, and we as members of the Opposition will be doing far less than our duty if we fail to make that criticism when it is called for by the circumstances. The civilization of the world is to-day in danger. It is in danger because it is being attacked by the greatest organization of military efficiency that the world ever saw. How is civilization to be protected? Are we to meet efficiency with inefficiency? Unless we meet efficiency with efficiency, civilization goes down; and we cannot have efficiency unless in this country of free government we have fair but free criticism. We look across the water and we see a Government in power in Great Britain relieved during a period of a year or more from the ordinary vicissitudes of parliamentary debate, of opposition, of criticism. It is not for us at this distance to criticise what has been done over there, but I think no one will come to the conclusion that the experiment has been to the advantage of the Empire or the Allies or the cause of civilization. I say it would be deplorable for the part Canada is to play in this war if we in this country took such a position as has been taken over there. I do not suggest for a moment that I am here to criticise what has been done there. They have their special responsibilities, and we on this side are not in a position to say how best they may meet them. But the fact remains that the dispensing with political criticism in the Parliament of Great Britain has not resulted in success for the Allies; and we cannot expect that if we are to take the position that my hon. friend (Mr. Michael Clark) has suggested here to-night, we would have any better results. We have a duty to perform, and we must perform that duty. Our appreciation of the matter is this: in the discharge of our responsibilities as critics of the Government of the day we are doing our part to win the war just as much as the Government is doing in discharging its responsibilities. I hope my hon. friend will pardon me if I do not agree with him, but my view is that if we took the position that he has outlined for himself, we would certainly not be doing what we should do to secure success; and that way failure lies. Efficiency is what we want. Efficiency is what we must have. We need efficiency to the last limit, and we can only get it in the

administration of the country's affairs, as in any other line of life, by the friction that comes of mind against mind by criticism and discussion of important matters.

The Premier in giving to the House a statement the other day of the number of men enlisted and their location, spoke of the casualties and of the wastage. He said that the casualties amounted to something over 20,000 and the wastage to about the same or a little more. What is the exact meaning of wastage?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would include all men who, for any reason whatever, are discharged from the service after having been once enlisted, for example, men who, upon a second examination, are not permitted to go to the front; men who are invalided from disease or any cause before going to the front; men dismissed from the service on account of misconduct or crime, deserters and minors.

Mr. OLIVER: The proportion seems to be very high. It is a serious matter, and the statement of the Prime Minister would seem to indicate fully the truth of the suggestion from this side of the House of looseness in the medical and other examinations in taking on recruits. Such figures show anything but careful and competent administration of the work of enlistment. Take the case mentioned by the honorable member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), where a man sold his farm for the purpose of enlisting, after having passed a preliminary medical examination, and was subsequently rejected because he could not pass a second examination. That man found himself without employment and without his farm. That is only a sample case. There are hundreds of such cases throughout the country. Every such case, of course, leaves a sore spot. It is a case of injustice. Something has been done that should not have been done, and a citizen of this country has suffered an injustice that he should not have suffered, and would not have suffered if proper care had been taken in the enlistment. Last session I had occasion to say to the Minister of Militia that notices had been sent out in the part of the country in which I live, calling on men to offer their services. Men left their farms, travelled hundreds of miles, after giving up their positions, but were not able to enlist because the authorities would not take them on at that time, so that these men were left stranded in the cities for months until a new opportunity was given to enlist. This is not good management; it is not creditable to the country or to the administration. With all due respect to the honorable member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) this is not the way to win the war.

Reference has been made in this House to the change in the method of publishing the lists of casualties Formerly the battalion or corps to which the injured men belonged were published. Recently that has been eliminated, with the result that very many heartrending mistakes occur. Is the change in method a decision reached by the Militia Department or by the Imperial authorities?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is a decision reached by the Imperial authorities. Some statements were set forth in the documents, that I did not think it desirable to publish. I therefore handed the documents to the right hon. leader of the Opposition a few days ago. I should be very glad if my hon. friend would look at them before they are returned, or if they are handed back to me I shall send them to him. The effort has been made to obviate the difficulty alluded to by giving the residence but not the battalion, in so far as it can be made out.

11 p.m.

Mr. OLIVER: Recently the list unfortunately is very long. When there was an index of battalions it was easy to follow the lists; but when there is no index of battalions, in case there is a duplication of names, as the ordinary reader does not know anything about the numbers, mistakes are apt to occur. Unless there is some better reason than I can possibly conceive, it seems to me that the interested public are put at a disadvantage for no very good reason. Perhaps it would be possible for the Prime Minister to inform the House in a general way what the idea is.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The idea which the War Office has in mind, and which it supports by a memorandum, which was transmitted to us through the Colonial Office, is that giving the casualties with the numbers of the battalions gives certain information to the enemy which it is undesirable to afford.

Mr. OLIVER: Of course, I am not responsible for the conduct of the British

armies in the field, but I am one of the people of Canada who have some interest in the armies in the field, and I am going to say upon my responsibility as a member of tne House of Commons that I do not think that the advantage compensates at all for the disadvantage. Of course, we have to accept the situation as it is.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We hardly felt like taking the responsibility of declining to accept a very strong representation, which, as we understood, had behind it the support of the Commander-in-Chief and the General Staff at the front.

Mr. OLIVER: In expressing my opinion I am exercising a privilege, which, I appreciate, could not very well be exercised by the Government. In connection with the publication of the casualty lists there is another feature to which I wish to draw attention. The list, as published, is a number of days, say three, four, or five days, or a week behind the actual facts. The other day I received a telegram from a man in Edmonton giving the name of his son, who had been wounded, and wishing me to get particulars as to his condition. He had been wounded, I think, on the 8th of April, and it was not until at least a week after that date that the young man's name appeared in the casualty list, indicating that the casualty list does not represent the losses of the immediately preceding day, or, indeed, of any particular day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is quite true, so far as the immediately preceding day is concerned. But my hon. friend must remember that the information has to be picked up, in the first place, under the fire of the German batteries at the front, amid all the confusion and strain which are incessant under the conditions which prevail at the front. The identification number of the man must be obtained; sometimes he may have lost his life in a situation which renders it impossible to get near him at the moment. Delays are absolutely inevitable. After that has been done the information has to be transmitted to London, and then across the Atlantic. The code messages must be deciphered; the man's number must be compared with the records we have here, and a telegram must be sent to his immediate relatives. It must also be ascertained that the telegram has been delivered, and then, and not until then, can the information be made public in the press.

Mr. OLIVER: I quite appreciate the difficulties of getting the information. It would not be possible, we will say, to get the list of casualties of to-day for publication to-morrow, but the casualties take place on a certain day. That day is known, and it seems to me that there is no reason why the date of the casualty should not appear in the list when published. That is to say, it should appear that the casualties took place, say, on a Thursday or on a Friday, or some other particular day. As a matter of fact, at the present time, the casualties appear without either the name of the battalion, or the date. The lists give an absolute minimum of information without, as it seems to me, any good or sufficient reason. Remember that it is not the British Government, nor the British War Office, that is interested in these casualty lists; it is the people of Canada, and the people of Canada would like to know from day to day what their losses are, and if the losses on a certain day are such and such, they would like to know that these losses were on that day.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can conceive that the military authorities at the front might not regard it as a prudent course to indicate the precise number of casualties that had occurred in the Canadian forces on a particular day. I can easily conceive that they might take that in view. However, that may be, I do not think they ask us to pursue a different course from that pursued on the other side of the Atlantic. So far as I know, the method of making public the casualties is precisely the same there as here.

Mr. OLIVER: I am going to take the liberty at this time, and on this occasion, to express the view of the Canadian people who are interested—I am taking the liberty of saying that it is the view of the Canadian people. The Canadian people are interested in these casualties more than anybody else, and I claim that they are entitled to be considered in regard to the matter of their publication. The impression on my mind is that these casualties are fed out, so to speak, judiciously —in the opinion of those in authority—with the view that they shall not alarm the public by giving too large numbers on any particular occasion. That is to say, those who at the moment have

authority in these matters do not, in their wisdom, think that they can trust the public with a knowledge of their losses from day to day. They are afraid to trust the public. They treat the people who are offering their fathers and brothers and sons as a sacrifice in the Empire's cause as if they were not to be trusted. They do not deal with them honestly and fairly and above board. They do not say: yes, on a certain day such and such a thing occurred, and such and such casualties were suffered. They say: we are in control; we are afraid to let you know, and we will only give out just as many casualties as we think ought to appear on a particular day. I am speaking on my responsibility as a member. I am not criticising this Government. But I say that that is not fair; it is not right, it is not good business. It is not the way to win the war for the Government, or for those who are in control of military affairs, to maintain an attitude of distrust towards the people upon whom they must absolutely depend, and who must absolutely trust them for success. If they do not trust the people, the people cannot trust them. If they do not trust the people to the extent of telling the truth in regard to that matter, which is so close to their hearts, the people cannot trust them in their administration of affairs. I go further, and say that, in my humble judgment, the dissemination of information by the military authorities has been used very much more to deceive and mislead the people of their own country, and to cover up their own incompetence, than to mislead the enemy.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is my hon. friend referring to the action of the department here?

Mr. OLIVER: No, I do not know whether it is the department here or the department there. Whoever it is, they are not treating the people who are making the sacrifices with fair consideration; they are not giving them their confidence, and it is not being done for the good of the Empire; because everything that detracts from the confidence of the people in the conduct of military affairs certainly does not tend towards the people giving their support. There are many other matters that I wish to deal with, but as I understand the Prime Minister wishes to make a reply to what has been said, I will postpone what I have to say further to some other occasion.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I wish to congratulate my right hon. friend the Prime Minister upon having appointed officially General Lessard. The people of Quebec are very jealous of their heroes, and they are in that connection very conservative in a way. They are proud of them, whether in politics, in religion, in literature, in the arts or in military matters. General Lessard is one of them. Will my right hon. friend, who is a friend of the province of Quebec, listen to my candid advice? General Lessard has gone to the front to inspect officially troops, and no better man could have been selected; in fact, it was a surprise, and indeed a matter of regret, that his services should have been ignored since the beginning of the war. But, I did not rise to criticise. When his task on the other side is completed, I would ask my right hon. friend to give us back General Lessard in the province of Quebec, and I make bold to say that under General Lessard, Quebec will raise more battalions, because the province has confidence in his military efficiency, in his capacity, in his judgment. Fathers and mothers will be quite ready to confide their sons to the leadership of such a distinguished military officer.

I say this because there has been criticism in the press of the various provinces of Canada as regards recruiting in Quebec. I sincerely regret that there is not a happier feeling existing between the French-speaking population and the English-speaking population in Canada; I mean in the back concessions of the country. We have our own extremists, and my English-speaking friends have their own extremists. I am always reminded of the opening sentence in Lord Durham's report, which runs as follows: "I came to Canada in the expectation of finding one country and one people; I found two countries and two peoples." Since the beginning of the war there has been, generally speaking, bad feeling as regards the attitude of the province of Quebec, and if I speak of that particular subject this evening it is because I think it is relevant to the issue, and because I wish to, if possible, clear the sky.

It has been stated that the French-Canadians were not enlisting as they should. Let me make on this subject a frank statement to the committee. There are surely people with heads on their shoulders who read the daily papers. Every morning since the famous battles of Langemarck and St. Julien, the roll of honour is published in

those daily papers, and I can find in it the names of the young English-speaking Canadians and of the young French-speaking Canadians who enlisted with the first contingent. In this morning's Le Canada among those in the casualty list I read the names of Paul Adrien Lambert, Lachine; Charles Richard, Montreal; Louis Savard, Quebec; Edouard Goulet, Trois-Rivieres; Joseph Mongeau, Sorel; Hormisdas Berthiaume, St. Eugene; Romulus Bourget, Montreal. If any one takes the trouble to scrutinize the list every day he will find that there is quite a galaxy of young men from my own province who on the battlefield are doing their duty to their country, to their King and to the Empire. Let me pay my respects to the British-born in Canada. They have done wonderfully well. They responded to the call as true Britons should respond wherever they may live. If I speak of the British-born in this way it is because in connection with the figures I intend to give the committee, I must make a distinction between the British-born, the Anglo-Canadians and the Franco-Canadians, in order to be fair and just to the people of my own native province who are being accused in some parts of Canada of shirking their duty in this war. If my right hon. friend will give us General Lessard he will find that the habitants of Quebec will respond cheerfully. I have already invited my right hon. friend to visit the province of Quebec, but he could not accept the invitation on account of his sessional duties, but if my right hon. friend, who commands the respect of my province, as he commands the respect of the country, will come to Quebec with my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and with some of his ministers, we on this side of the House will join with him and we will make an appeal and thus swell the number of the existing French-Canadian battalions.

Coming back to the British-born: When the first contingent left Quebec, the figures were as follows: There are 33,000 soldiers gathered at Valcartier, and I say in passing that all credit is due the Government and the Department of Militia and Defence for the mustering of our yeomanry within such a short interval. Of the 33,000 soldiers who left Valcartier with the first contingent, 26,000 were British born.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Where does my hon. friend get his figures?

Mr. LEMIEUX: From Senators Mason's statement in the Senate the other day. Of that 33,000, 2,500 were French-Canadians who had responded to the call of duty and 4,500 Anglo-Canadians. I may be told that 2,500 is not a large number, but in speaking of recruiting in the province of Quebec, we must bear in mind certain facts, and I am glad that I am addressing myself this evening to leaders of the people from all provinces in Canada. First of all, Quebec is a self-sustaining province; she is the only province of the Dominion which does not receive any influx of immigration from abroad. Quebec receives no immigration from the British Isles, no immigration from the United States, no immigration from France, and practically no immigration from Belgium.

Mr. WRIGHT: Where do all the Jews and foreigners in the city of Montreal come from?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was speaking of the French-Canadians—not that I despise the Jews and foreigners in Montreal; for after a while they cease to be foreigners, and become naturalized and just as good Canadians as my hon. friend and myself. I am not speaking of what we call the foreign element, but of the native born French-Canadians. The increase in population of French Quebec, if my hon. friend prefers that description, is due solely to her birth-rate, and we are rather proud of that. It is not so with the western provinces, or the great province of Ontario, to which flock nearly all British immigrants who come to Canada. In Ontario the trend is from the farms to the city: in Quebec, as all those who know the province will realize, the trend is in the opposite direction.

I hate to prove anything by the law of averages, but what I am stating now I state in good faith, and in order to dispel any prejudices that may exist in the minds of the people. I think I shall be able to prove to the satisfaction of the committee and of the country at large that Quebec is not below her proper proportion of recruits at the present time. Do not forget, that Quebec is above all things a rural province. We are being urged to increase production. Not later than two days ago I received a voluminous pamphlet urging the people of Canada to go in for more production, and still more production; and only this afternoon we were told by the Prime Minister that production was an imperative, yes, even an Imperial duty. If he did not use that expression, that is what I gathered from his remarks. The farming population in Quebec is primarily

needed on the farms. Bear in mind the appeal that is now made from the platform and in the press, in the province of Ontario and other provinces, for more farm hands. In the province of Quebec, with the exception of the city of Montreal, the city of Quebec, the city of Sherbrooke, and to a certain extent, the city of Three Rivers, our population is entirely rural.

What has the province of Quebec done in the way of recruiting since the beginning of the war? Let us face the facts without any prejudice, bearing in mind the situation as I have described it in good faith. I have stated that with the first contingent there were in round numbers 2,500 French-Canadians, and my right hon. friend will, I am sure, agree with what I am now going to say. In many battalions, in the Maritime Provinces for instance, and in Northern Ontario, and the western provinces, there was quite a large sprinkling of French-Canadian volunteers. The other day Mr. Mageau, the local member for Sturgeon Falls, stated through the press, that in a battalion organized in Northern Ontario at least 40 per cent were French-Canadian volunteers; and those who are familiar with conditions in my province and the facility with which the French-Canadian absorbs other races, know that in many other regiments there are any number of Ross's, Scotts, Warrens, Camerons, Campbells, who would be very surprised if you addressed them in English, because their language is French. So that, in addition to the 2,500 French-Canadians in the first contingent, at least 1,000 were sprinkled through the various English speaking regiments of Northern Ontario, and eastern and western Canada. Since a year and a half ago we have had a recruiting movement amongst the yeomanry of the province of Quebec, in which our public men are taking an interest. We have requested the Militia Department to favour the formation of French-Canadian units. I am glad to say the Militia Department gave a favourable answer to our request. I quite understand that there should be only one badge of nationality in this country—Canadian nationality. But look at what takes place in the Old Country. You have there the Irish Fusiliers, the Welsh Fusiliers, the gallant Scotch Grenadiers, and the English crack regiments. You cannot do away with these racial characteristics and affinities; they are deep-rooted, they are part of the soul of men of any nationality. At the beginning of the war I urged very strongly upon the Minister of Militia that not only should we have French-Canadian units commanded by French-Canadian officers, but that the various corps should also have their own national uniforms. That, I confess, was a hobby of mine, and, perhaps, I was wrong. I advocated it to promote the cause of recruiting. We have at the present time in Quebec thirteen French-Canadian units or battalions. Some of them are at the front, others are in course of formation, and others are ready to start. I have said that 3,500 have already gone, and that is a modest figure. Then we have these other thirteen units of 1,100 per unit.

Mr. MORPHY: How many are filled up?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Nearly half of them are filled up.

Mr. MORPHY: How are the others?

Mr. LEMIEUX: They are doing pretty well. I will give an instance. Yesterday I met Colonel de Salaberry. I may say, en passant, that I was instrumental in having Colonel de Salaberry brought from the front, where he had served with distinction. I appealed to the Minister of Militia, and said: Here is Colonel de Salaberry, the grandson of the hero of Chateauguay. He has served well and faithfully. Now we want a good name, we want a great name to induce our young men to follow the colours. The minister brought back Colonel de Salaberry, whom yesterday I met at church. Colonel de Salaberry has not been here more than four weeks, and he has already recruited 300 men. Three months ago. as the Prime Minister will remember, I asked him to give me a letter, which letter was read in Montreal at a public meeting to promote recruiting for the Desrosiers-Asselin regiment. Colonel Derosiers had been at the front. He was called back and started to form a regiment with Major Asselin. They had not one recruit three months ago, and to-day, I am pleased to inform the committee and the country, the Desrosiers-Asselin regiment is almost completed. Three months of recruiting, three months of organization and work, has brought the battalion together. I think that within two months, when perfectly drilled and trained, the men will be anxious and eager to leave for the front. Now, let me give a list of our thirteen French Canadian units:

1. 22nd Battalion, under Colonel Gaudet, at the front.
2. 41st Battalion, Lieut.-Colonel Archambault, at the front.
3. 57th Battalion,Colonel Paquet.
4. 69th Battalion, Lieut.-Colonel Dansereau. Just left for the front.
5. 150th Battalion, Lieut.-Col. Barré.
6. 163rd Battalion, Lieut.-Col. Desrosiers.
7. 165th Battalion, Lieut.-Col. Daigle.
8. 167th Battalion, Colonel Readman—an English name, mark well, but a French-Canadian.
9. 178th Battalion, Colonel Girouard.
10. 189th Battalion, Colonel Piuze.
11. 206th Battalion, Colonel Pagnuelo.
12. 230th Battalion, Colonel De Salaberry.
13. 233rd. Battalion, Colonel Leprohon.

Then there is the stationary hospital under Lieut.-Col. Mignault, to which my hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) alluded to in very kind words this afternoon. Let me say, in passing, that speaking as one who has French blood in his veins, I thank the Prime Minister and the Canadian Government for the noble gift they made the old Mother Country, in providing a Canadian hospital for those wounded in France. There is also the stationary hospital under Colonel Casgrain, and the one that left a few days ago under Colonel Beauchamp. There is also a corps of engineers which left several months ago under Major Janin. Unfortunately Major Janin perished with the Arabic.

Mr. MORPHY: Is that the whole list?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have given the whole thirteen battalions.

Mr. MORPHY: I thought the hon. gentleman said thirty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Assuming 3,500—a very low figure—as the number of those who went with the first contingent, then add these thirteen regiments—

An hon. MEMBER: Battalions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should have said battalions. I am not a military man, although I have at the front a nephew who married a nice English-speaking girl from Ontario, and to whom I cabled "Good for you, you have settled the bi-lingual question." These thirteen battalions will number at least 14,000 men which, added to the number of those with the first contingent will make 17,500. I do not include the hospitals and the others I have already mentioned. But I say this to the right hon. Prime Minister and to my English-speaking friends on both sides of the House: give us General Lessard and let the Prime Minister and his ministers and the public men on this side of the House make a proper appeal to the province of Quebec, let the press of Canada be fair and generous, and I make bold to say that the old province of Quebec will respond nobly to the call of duty, King and flag.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: As we are all anxious that these resolutions should be reported to-night I trust the committee will bear with me for a few minutes. It is possible that I may not be here when the matter comes up in committee in the form of a Bill, and I would like to say a few words now. I do not think it requires any effort on my part, speaking in the absence of the leader of the Opposition, to reassure the Government, if that be necessary, that they have the hearty co-operation of every member in this House, no matter on what side he sits, in everything that is necessary to be done until victory finally comes to the cause which we all think is the noblest cause for which man ever contended. As to criticism, I think the Prime Minister invited criticism. Having been a member of a Government myself, let me quietly tell the members of the House who have not had that trouble on their hands, that although they may not think it, Governments like criticism. It is not an admission of weakness on the part of a Government to invite criticism. The Government would not dislike it if some of their own friends would criticise occasonally, and in this I speak from experience. Criticism enables a Government to stand off people of both political parties who ought to be stood off. Some criticisms may seem in Parliament to be of small importance, but nothing that tends to improve conditions can be called a small matter. I have taken considerable part in recruiting in my own weak way, and those things that we in Parliament regard as small are really the things that affect recruiting in the different localities. What is not a large matter to us sitting here to-night is mountain high in some localities when you appeal to the people on recruiting, or on behalf of patriotic founds. We must not however, lose sight of the magnitude of the war or forget the sense of proportions. Towering above all these things is the one great object we have in view, which is that Canada shall do her part, as she has been and is doing and will continue to do, until victory comes to the Empire. That is what we must keep in

view, and if I had time I would elaborate it, and say that even if we were not part of the British Empire, I would not feel that I was a good Canadian citizen doing my duty to my country, if I did not take some part in this fight for the betterment of world conditions.

The hon. member for Rouville has spoken of our fellow-citizen in the province of Quebec. Remember, we have many French Canadians in Ontario and throughout the West. I do not like to discuss these things, because we are Canadians, one and all, and in each doing his own duty, we will find that we have enough to do. Let us do our best in our own locality in the sphere in which we exert influence, and the results gained cannot but be good. If it be true that the recruiting in Quebec has not been what some people say it ought to have been, the men who have gone must have been of the real kind of stuff and worthy of the front ranks of any fight, because when we read the casualty lists we find French Canadian names dotted all through them. I say again that the men who have gone from the province of Quebec have not only brought lustre to their own province and to the land of their forefathers, but have brought credit and renown to the Dominion of Canada and to the British Empire as a whole. It would not be out of place for me to say as one not of French Canadian but of Irish descent, a word about the situation, as it may affect Canada, that has arisen in the land from which my forefathers came. In the present crisis John Redmond has proved himself a patriot of the right sort, a man who has won for himself greater distinction, if that be possible, than heretofore he enjoyed; a man who will have a bright page in the history of this Empire when it comes to be written in future years. He said recently, in condemning the outbreak in Dublin, that these foolish men were encouraged not only by Germans and German sympathizers, but by some misguided individuals on this continent. I think it will not be out of place for me to say, being of Irish descent, that there must be no mistake in the old land about the fact that in this case America does not include Canada. I know that I am justified in saying that from one end of Canada to the other the men who came from Ireland or whose fathers or grandfathers came from Ireland are true and loyal to the British flag. No people in the British Empire will condemn more strongly the outrages of misguided men in the city of Dublin, than will the Irishmen who have found a home in Canada.

I want to say this on behalf of the Militia Department. I myself have annoyed them terribly, although I think the Government will not say that I have criticised their conduct unduly in the House. It is better for the Government, it is better for the Prime Minister that criticism should come, if it is of the right kind, and the Prime Minister was wise in inviting criticism. We are passing to-night a resolution for the raising of $250,000,000. Who will say that we have engaged in undue criticism if in one day we pass in this House a resolution giving the Government a credit for that enormous sum. There is no desire on the part of any person but to get what is best out of the money we are expending, so that satisfactory results may come from its expenditure. I say that I have annoyed the Militia Department incessantly about things that they may have thought small. I am afraid, with all due deference to some of the speakers to-night, that I have annoyed the Department with things as small as some people think the criticism was to-day. But what may seem small here is big in some localities. I sent my complaints to the Militia Department, whether the information I received was good, bad or indifferent. Being personally acquainted with the deputy minister, I have loaded him with a great deal of material that he may have thought useless and cumbersome, but I have always received most courteous treatment. When representatives of the people in Parliament take some pains in these matters, the people appreciate that the Government and its supporters and the members of the Opposition are here to do the very best they can under these very serious conditions which confront us. Members sitting to our right and left, in front of us and behind us, are startled every time the telephone rings, jump every time a telegram is handed to them, are almost afraid to see an official of the Militia Department coming toward them, lest he have some bad news.

The situation has come home to us; members representing constituencies in this House have those dearest to them in the trenches, their lives hanging in the balance. Some have paid the highest tribute they could to their love of country, and it is with deep regret we have seen that a minister of the Crown has to mourn the loss of a dear son. It is a serious time, a serious situation. Whatever differences we

may have had, have sunk into insignificance in the one great task we have in hand. I have, in going through the country endeavouring to do something in the way of assisting in recruiting, been asked a question that has been asked here to-day, and in a measure I answered it myself by my experience. I have been asked: Why should men without experience be given commissions as officers. There are in localities in Canada men who are not military men, men who have had no military training and who, on the field might be failures; but as men holding the respect of the communities in which they live and having the power of organization and the ability to attract men to them, they make better recruiting officers than any general you could send into a community. Many of these officers, I imagine, will never go the front; I do not think they would be useful there, nor could they be trained in time to take charge of actual operations in the field. But until such time as the battalions are ready to be taken charge of for fighting purposes, these other men without training, are the very best men that can be secured to rally the recruits. I have several instances in my mind. In the city of Toronto, there is what they call the Sportsmen's Battalion, the officers of which have never had any military training, but they recruited that battalion with wonderful rapidity. That has occurred in several places, and I have entirely altered my mind as to the necessity of a man having military training to get together a battalion, because many officers who have never had military training have shown themselves best able to get together the men, who can then be trained by experienced military officers.

This resolution is for a large amount of money, and while it is a sad duty to vote it, still that sadness must be tempered by the consideration that we are glad in Canada that we are able to vote it, and we are doubly glad that there is no dissenting voice to our voting it from one end of the country to the other. It is divided into several parts and "the defence and security of Canada," is the first. We have all read in the newspapers lately items which give a certain serious aspect to that section. We have read recently of a plot unearthed in the city of New York for the destruction of the Welland canal and for other depredations in Canada. Money is necessary for the defence of Canada in Canada. Even those, of whom there are very few, who still insist that they should not go outside of Canada to serve the country, might possibly be put to work to do all this Canadian duty. We might take them on their own ground and put them to work defending Canada under this section.

12 midnight.

Mr. EDWARDS: They would not do much good.

Mr. GRAHAM: I should not like to say that.

Mr. MORPHY: You have to furnish the foe first.

Mr. GRAHAM: Let not my hon. friend be so sure. As I was remarking, a plot was exposed in the city of New York, which if carried out, would have done an immense amount of damage not only to Canada but to the Empire. Perhaps the hon. member has read also a confession by a man in New York who said there was another plot to gather together a certain number of men near the Canadian border and rush them across. They could not have accomplished anything; they could have been taken care of if they had come across the line, and I have very grave doubts if they would have been allowed to cross. It is necessary that certain money should be devoted actually to the defence of Canada in Canada, and I was making the suggestion that if it be necessary, the very few men in certain parts of Canada who insist that they are ready to fight but would not go outside of Canada to fight, should be utilized for that service.

Mr. EDWARDS: With Choquette for leader.

Mr. GRAHAM: This resolution also provides "for the conduct of naval or military operations in and beyond Canada," which includes, of course, all the operations in which we are engaged, and which are of mighty import. The vote also provides for: "Promoting the continuance of trade, industry and business communications, whether by means of insurance or indemnity against war risks or otherwise." This is not the most unimportant section of the resolution because if the trade or the industry of Canada in its various parts were to fall down, we might become a burden to the Motherland and the Allies, instead of an aid to them because, on the continuance of our trade and industry, as far as we possibly can continue it, rests our financial progress, and without that financial stability we might be a burden instead of an aid. Money expended along those lines is second in importance only to the money spent in buy-

ing munitions and paying for the men at the front. The resolution also provides money for: "The carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the existence of a state of war." This section is one of some considerable importance. Then the resolution says:

> Payments made for the said purposes during the fiscal years ending respectively the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and fifteen and the thirty-first of March, nineteen hundred and sixteen, in excess of the amounts authorized by the War Appropriation Act, 1914, and the War Appropriation Act, 1915.

At the beginning, of course, no person had any idea that the war was going to be of such magnitude or that the expenditure was going to be of such huge proportions, but now, we are prepared to accept almost anything. This clause must mean that the Government has found itself obliged to expend a good deal of money, by Governor General's warrant I presume, in excess of the amount provided in 1914-1915.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There have been no Governor General's warrants.

Mr. GRAHAM: The money was expended in excess of the vote.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes. At least liabilities have been incurred. I think they came to about $10,000,000 more than the amount provided in 1914-15 and to about $50,000,000 more than the amount provided in 1915 and 1916, the reason in the latter case being, of course, that the establishment was increased very much beyond the number estimated for when we voted the $100,000,000 last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was not finding fault with the money being expended; I was referring to the method in which I supposed it had been expended, and I was going to say that I hope that in the future— and I hope that the future will be very much restricted—the vote we are making now will be fully ample to meet the requirements without being over-expended. Of course if the necessity arises, Parliament will uphold the Government in any expenditure necessary, but it will be wise to make the amount as large as we think will be needed so that the Government may not be put in the position of over-expending the appropriation. These are things that struck me as I was reading the resolution. No matter what we may think, this is a very important resolution. It involves an enorous amount of money, and while we are anxious to put it through and expect to put it through in a very little while, it is wise that we should understand it and understand what is expected to be done, always keeping in mind that it is efficiency we are after and not carping criticism. I might ask the Prime Minister whether, when the Bill is in committee, he will be able to give us information as to the probable expenditures under the various heads in the resolution, or whether the Bill founded on the resolution will be subdivided in that way. I am not asking for that information to-night, because it would involve too much detail, but when the committee comes to deal with the Bill founded on this resolution I presume that questions will be asked, and the Government should be in a position to give us an idea of what is likely to be the subdivision of expenditures for the coming year.

Let me say, in conclusion, that no matter what party they may belong to—I do not care from what country their fathers or grandfathers came, or how long they have been here; no matter what the differences of opinion may be, or what criticism may be made of what the Government has done, or has not done, let all the people of this country understand; let the people of the Empire fully understand, as they do; let the Allies understand, and, above all, let our enemies understand that the Canadian people are as one behind the Government until this war is won and victory crowns the cause to which we are all so devotedly attached.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I appreciate very much what has been said by my hon. friend who has just addressed the committee, and who has given evidence that he understands the very great responsibilities which have devolved upon the Government in the conduct of this war. Responsibilities have come upon us, especially during the past year, with the vastly increased establishment of the military forces, which no one of us could have anticipated in August, 1914. Not only has the magnitude of the war proved greater than we supposed at that time, but its probable duration will also be much longer than any of us then imagined. I am also very grateful to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) for his appreciation of those responsibilities, and for his tribute to the purpose of the Government in what it has done towards making our part in this war effective. Probably no one who has not been brought

closely in touch with those responsibilities can adequately appreciate what they have been. Therefore, a word from any hon. member of this House testifying to his understanding of what the burdens of Government have been during the past eighteen or twenty months is very acceptable to those who have had to bear the weight of those responsibilities.

While I do not in the least suggest that the discussion has been too long—I would not have been surprised if it had lasted more than one day upon the resolution itself—nevertheless, some of the matters which have been dealt with were of a rather trivial nature, as has been observed, although they may loom very large, as the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has said, in the immediate communities which they concern. So far as the responsibilities of the Government are concerned, I hope it will be understood, not only by the members of this House, but by the country, that the various transactions and affairs carried on through an enormous territory in this country are in many cases absolutely beyond the direct control of any member of the Government, or, for that matter, of any departmental officer. Naturally such transactions cannot be dealt with by a wholly centralized administration in a country which extends nearly 4,000 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and which is composed of a great many scattered communities.

In the first instance, I should like to refer to the question of patronage, which has been discussed by a good many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Let me affirm to the members of this committee, and to the country, that, so far as I am concerned, and so far as the Minister of Militia is concerned—he has had mostly to do with them—there has been absolutely no desire or intention on the part of the Government to deal with these matters from any party political standpoint. In the early months of the war the question of contracts was brought to my attention by an hon. gentleman who owns allegiance to the party which is represented on the other side of the House, and I told him at that time that it was not seemly or desirable, whatever the practice might be in ordinary conditions, that such matters should be dealt with from a party political standpoint. I am in a position also to affirm, on behalf of the Minister of Militia, that that was precisely his own view. Indeed, on many occasions, on countless occasions, I might say, during the past 18 or 20 months the reproach has been made to me personally, and it has been made with regard to the Minister of Militia, that party considerations had been absolutely put aside, and that the conduct of this war by the Government had been of such a character as to discourage some members of the Conservative party. These reproaches have even been carried to the extent of suggesting that military officers who had been appointed by the Minister of Militia and Defence were using the positions, which he had entrusted to them, for the purpose of injuring or discrediting the Conservative party. I have always said in reply to such representations that these officers had been selected for the reason that they were efficient, and because the Minister of Militia and Defence believed them to be the best men for the particular positions entrusted to them, and that I was not disposed, nor was the Minister of Militia disposed, to attach importance to representations of that kind. It is possible that in a number of localities persons affiliated with the Conservative party may have endeavoured to make use of patronage in regard to some of the matters complained of, but, so far as any information which has come to me is concerned. I believe that the hon. gentlemen who have put forward those views in this committee have been rather misled in the instances referred to, or that the cases have been very much exaggerated.

My hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) referred to recruiting in small communities, and he doubted the expediency or value of that system which has been pursued during the past winter by the Minister of Militia and Defence. The minister discussed with me and with his other colleagues the method before it was put into operation. and it was his idea that keeping men a certain number of months in the community in which they were recruited would accomplish two purposes. In the first place, they would be under the eye of their immediate relatives, under the eye of the mothers and the fathers of the boys during the early months of their training. Their parents and immediate relatives would know the associations into which they were brought and would probably have greater confidence in sending them forward to camps at a later date if the early preliminary training took place in the communities where these young men lived. In the second place, he had in mind,

whether rightly or wrongly, that such training for a few months would be equally as valuable as it would have been if the method suggested by the hon. member for Regina had been pursued. As an illustration of that, may I point out to my hon. frind from Regina—whose remarks were put forward in a very reasonable way, and whose criticism, if it can be called criticism, was of a character that the Government will always welcome—that I see every day from my office window in the eastern block, men being trained upon the lawn of Parliament Hill and I see them being trained in squads of about eight. I have seen that going on day after day and for a time I wondered why it was so done. But I think I appreciate the reason for it, namely, that the first training which the soldier must receive is what is called squad drill and that can go on equally well in the community where a few men are recruited as in larger camps.

With regard to the criticism that has been made of the medical inspection, I have sought information from the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence and he has informed me that our inspection in Canada is equally as strict as that in the United Kingdom. It may be that too much zeal on the part of recruiting officers has led to some influence being brought to bear on the medical men who examine these recruits; I will neither affirm nor deny that because I do not know. I understand, however, from the deputy minister that after these men are sent to camp, as they all will be sent to camp, a further medical examination takes place, and then very possibly some of the men who have been accepted by the local medical officers may be weeded out. It would be difficult to devise a method by which incidents of that kind would be entirely avoided. We have to select the medical men in different parts of the country. There has been some suggestion that they are selected on account of their political affiliations. I venture to think that that cannot possibly be correct and I will give an illustration in my own constituency. In many cases, as I know, in Nova Scotia men are selected not by the Department of Militia and Defence but by the local recruiting associations. There was a gentleman in my own constituency, a man honoured by those who are his friends politically and by those who are opposed to him, a man who has been in practice for forty years or more in the locality in which he resides. There is also in the same locality a young man, a member of an old and well known family in that particular district, who has been in practice only two or three years, whose family has been recognized as the champions and leaders of Liberalism in that district for a great many years in the past. When it became necessary during the past year to select a medical officer for the examination of recruits in that district, the man selected was not the physician who had been practicing for forty years and who was honoured and respected by all and who happened to be a Conservative, but the young man of two, three, or four years' standing who happened to belong to about the strongest Liberal family in the district. I should think that an illustration of that kind would convince hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that the selection of medical officers has not been conducted in so far as the Militia Department is concerned, with any regard for political affiliations.

Then the statement has been made, that in some cases a sufficient sense of responsibility has not impressed itself upon the officers commanding regiments or engaged in recruiting regiments. My hon. friend from Regina gave a reference to the case of Private Robert Darragh whose family, most unfortunately, were not made acquainted with news of his illness. I shall have that matter inquired into. As far as commanding officers of regiments are concerned, when well founded representations are made to the department that any officer is not discharging his duties with competence an inquiry is made by the Adjutant General. An hon. member on the other side of the House within the past week wrote me a letter representing that a certain commanding officer was not filling the bill, if I may use that expression, and that the particular regiment which he was recruiting would not be effectively organized or properly trained unless some change were made. The course which I took is the one which, I believe, has been taken in all such cases by the department. The matter was referred to the Adjutant General to whose branch such matters naturally appertain, and he was instructed to send a special officer for the purpose of inquiring into the organization and probable efficiency of that battalion if it should continue under the command of that officer. The complexity of these matters that daily

present themselves to the officers of the Militia Department, and to the minister whoever he may be who is entrusted for the time being with the administration of the department, is very great indeed and probably beyond the conception of those who have not been brought personally and closely in touch with it.

My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) referred to some matters. I was rather surprised to hear him express the view that I had been taking undue credit to the Government, or to the department, with respect to what has been accomplished in this country. It has been my duty on a great many public occasions——

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not speaking of the personal attitude of my right hon. friend because I did not accuse him of having made that statement, but I was referring generally to the claim that was made to the effect that the way we had responded to the demands of the war was a matter of wonder. I said that it was not a matter of wonder.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is another matter and I will come to it in a moment. It has been my duty on many different occasions to point out, as I am glad to do now, that without the splendid spirit of the Canadian people, and the equally splendid support that they gave to the Government, it would not have been possible for any Administration to accomplish all that has been done in the past twenty months. Let there be absolutely no doubt about that. My observations were made rather for the purpose of impressing on the members of the committee, and upon the people of the country, the very great magnitude of the task that had been undertaken with the support of the Canadian people, and to express the belief that that task had been discharged in a manner fairly creditable to this Dominion and to its people. In regard to the number of men who have been enlisted, my observation was to the effect that not one of us would probably have believed in August, 1914, that within eighteen or twenty months 310,000 or 320,000 men would have rallied to the colours of this country, or that there would have been occasion for them to do so. It is all very well for us to-day, with all this accomplished by the Canadian people, to say we had no doubt upon the subject; but I venture to think that if we had looked forward in August, 1914, to the enlistment of 310,000 or 320,000 Canadians within the period that has intervened, we could hardly have believed that it would have been accomplished with the expedition and efficiency which we have witnessed.

My hon. friend also alluded to a supposed lack of enthusiasm because the militia units did not go forward as such. I have not found any lack of enthusiasm by reason of that or by reason of anything else. The mere fact that more than 102,000 men have rallied to the colours in the first three and a half months of this year indicates that there is no lack of enthusiasm in any part of this country; and as far as militia units are concerned, there has been no reason why any militia regiment should not organize a regiment for overseas service. That has been done in several cases. It has been done, I am informed, by the 89th Rimouski Regiment and by the 65th Regiment of Montreal. The Grenadier Guards of Montreal, the 5th Royal Highlanders, the Victoria Rifles, the 48th Highlanders, the Mississagua Horse, the Queen's Own, the 10th Royal Grenadiers, the 90th Battalion of Winnipeg, the 55th Irish Rangers and other militia regiments have raised or are raising overseas battalions with the parent regiment.

My hon. friend from Pictou also alludes to the work of a gentlemen who bears my own name, Colonel Borden, and I entirely agree in the appreciation that he has expressed of Col. Borden's work. He seemed to have some apprehension about the Highland Brigade. Let me tell him that those apprehensions are entirely groundless. The only question about the Highland Brigade and the 85th Regiment is this: The 85th Regiment was organized by Col. Borden, and is now fairly well trained and practically ready to go to the front. The only question to be determined is whether, inasmuch as the 85th Regiment under the command of Colonel Borden was really ready to go to the front and had been organized for a considerable time, and having regard to the further fact that if the regiment was retained in Nova Scotia it would be very useful, not so much in the organization, but in the training of three other regiments which had been recruited there—the question is whether, having regard to these considerations, it would be better in the public interests for the 85th Regiment to go immediately to the front, or to remain in Nova Scotia, going to Aldershot or some other central point, and assist in training the new regiments which had really been raised through the efforts of Col. Borden in co-relation with the 85th, which he commands. The Chief of the

General Staff has been consulted about that, and I understand that Col. Borden himself has been sent for, and his opinion will be considered before any decision is arrived at.

My hon. friend referred to recruiting officers, and their inability to pay for a band. I really do not know anything about details of that kind. I do not suppose it would be proper to pay for a band unless there was some authorization for it from the Department of Militia and Defence. Recruiting has been carried on in many parts of the country by voluntary effort, and the Government is most profoundly grateful, and I think the people also ought to be profoundly grateful, to the men who, night and day, have been devoting their energies to this good work. It has been done to a very great extent in a voluntary way, and possibly it may have occurred that some of these voluntary associations have not been able to give an undertaking that the Department of Militia and Defence would pay certain expenses. All that, however, simply shows due regard for the public interests, to the end that public money shall not be expended except under adequate sanction

The hon. member for Pictou speaks of cold water being thrown on idealism by reason of the improper distribution of contracts for supplies. I do not quite agree that the idealism of the people of this country is influenced by considerations of that kind. He speaks of some gentleman in Cape Breton having undertaken to bring the affairs of the Hospital Commission into a question of patronage.

Mr. MACDONALD: No. The question was whether or not the Government was going to take a certain hospital, in which event he was going to prepare a list of employees whom he would recommend.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All these hospitals are regulated by a commission of gentlemen who have been appointed without regard to their political affiliations, and if there is any gentleman in Cape Breton or elsewhere who imagines that the Hospitals Commission is administering its affairs with a view to political patronage, all I can say is that that gentleman will find himself very thoroughly mistaken in the end.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am not complaining about the Hospitals Commission.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With regard to the obtaining of commissions through favoritism, my experience of these matters has been that the Minister of Militia and Defence has sought to get efficiency, and has been guided by that consideration alone. One hon. gentleman opposite, I am not quite sure who it was, indicated that the Government might be subject to criticism whichever course was pursued. For example, if a Conservative was appointed to a particular commission, the allegation would be made that it was done through favouritism, and if a Liberal had been selected for the command, the allegation would be put forward that the commission was offered for the purpose of getting the man out of the way, and clearing the political atmosphere.

With regard to machine guns, about which my hon. friend from Pictou has made some inquiry, I do not understand that there was such an appeal made by the Government as he suggests. Let me state what the situation was. The Government of the province of Ontario, for example desired to make some contribution to the war through the Federal Government. They suggested and desired machine guns, and we accepted their proposal in the same spirit in which it was put forward. The matter was fully explained to the public in a letter which I wrote to the Government of Ontario, and which I believe was made public by that Government at the last session of the legislature. A gentleman, a splendid patriotic citizen of this country, who had lost a very near relative in this war, came to the Government nearly a year ago and desired to make a contribution of $100,000 as a memorial, so to speak, of the sacrifice which his brother had made in giving up his life in this war. He was especially desirous that that sum should be utilized by this Government in the purchase of machine guns, and if the regulations of the War Office would permit it, that those guns might be added to the ordinary establishment of regiments in the British service for our Canadian forces when they went to the front.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was that Mr. James Carruthers?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, it was Mr. Huntley Drummond, of Montreal. We assented also to that. Then the matter was taken up in the press, and appeals were made. At that particular time a great deal was said in the press as to the vast importance of machine guns at the front. The Government had not been idle in the meantime. I remember, I think it was in October, 1914, when I was attending to the affairs of the Department of Militia and Defence for about a week, it was represented to me that unless a certain proposal that

was made to us with regard to the provision of machine guns was accepted at once, we might lose them altogether. The number of guns in question was 250. I directed that the guns should be ordered at once, and they were ordered the same day the matter was brought to my attention. Further orders were given during the autumn and winter, and very considerable orders during the spring and summer of 1915. The Government had in mind the necessity of machine guns throughout. But when this campaign was made by the press in various parts of the country, patriotic people all over Canada were naturally very much interested and enormous sums of money were subscribed and very large amounts paid in. If I remember well the total amount of subscriptions paid in was nearly $800,000. When I returned from Great Britain the matter was brought to my attention and I made a public announcement in the city of St. John as to what the desire of the Government was. I have not the words before me, but I made it clear that so far as the provision of machine guns was concerned, that should be defrayed from the public treasury, and I expressed the hope that those desirous of giving of their means for patriotic purposes would contribute rather to the Patriotic Fund, the Canadian War Contingents Association, the Red Cross Fund and other movements of that kind. I found it necessary to make three or four public statements before the movement came to a standstill. Then the question was, what should be done with the money that had been paid in? After very careful consideration we arrived at the conclusion that it would not be desirable, or even possible, to repay those sums. In a few cases request was made of the Government that sums contributed should be repaid. In all such cases the same answer was given and the reasons explained why, under the circumstances, the Government thought it undesirable to begin repayment of these sums. One reason was that a portion of the money had been applied to the purpose for which it was given, and we did not see that it would be useful or desirable to entertain any request for repayment.

My hon. friend from Pictou has also spoken of the commandeering of ships, and with a great deal of what he has said I desire to express my concurrence. I can assure him that this Government has not been behind hand in placing before the Government of the United Kingdom all the considerations he has expressed, and in several instances at least we have induced the British Government to reconsider their determination to commandeer vessels engaged in the local trade of Canada. For very good reasons we took that stand. It is quite impossible for a committee of the Admiralty in London, upon which the Government or the people of Canada have no representative, to be thoroughly aware of the local conditions in this country, to be thoroughly aware of the interests of our people and their dependence upon water communication. All this has been put forward in very cogent terms, and on a very great number of occasions during the past four or five months that very subject has been the cause of urgent communication from the Government of Canada to that of the United Kingdom.

I join my hon. friend from Pictou in his tribute to the women of Canada for their splendid spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice in this war.

The hon. member referred also to recruiting for the naval service. I regret that I am not able to give information on that subject, but the Minister of the Naval Service, no doubt, will do so.

The hon. member was inclined to criticise the efforts put forth by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Finance to impress upon the people the importance of production and the necessity for saving. I do not think that an admonition of that kind is out of place, notwithstanding the view of my hon. friend to the contrary. I recollect being very much impressed by a remark made to me by a representative sent by the Government of Denmark to this country a few years ago, I met him for a few moments on Parliament Hill, and, in the course of a short discussion, I asked him: What is it that has impressed you most during your visit to this country up to the present moment? He answered: "If I may be perfectly frank with you, the thing that has most impressed me in this country during my visit is the awful waste that goes on in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific." I think that increased production, the desirability of saving and the elimination of waste ought to be impressed upon the people of Canada during this war, and in my judgment the Department of Finance and the Department of Agriculture have made no mistake in the movement for that purpose which they have initiated.

So far as cruel and unusual punishments are concerned, I entirely agree in condemnation of such methods. The Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence informs me that there is no warrant for them in the militia regulations. Every necessary investigation will be made—an investigation is being made at the present time,—and if it is found that the allegations made in this House with regard to this matter are well-founded, then the necessary action must of course follow.

My hon. friend from Kings, P. E. I. (Mr. Hughes) brought up matters with which I shall not trouble the House to any great extent, but I desire to say a word or two about some of them. As to powder milk, I am informed that the analysis to which exception is taken was made by the Dominion Analyst, and the department thought themselves entitled to rely upon it; also that the ration of which powder milk formed a part was determined by the Army Service Corps, and that tenders were called for in the usual course.

With regard to the advertisement of the Military College, he said that a newspaper somewhere in his province had not been permitted to publish it. The Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence informs me that the publication was restricted to a few papers, and that many Conservative newspapers have applied for permission to publish it and have been refused.

The hon. member says that " 600 canned Canadian officers "—to use his expression embodying some wild misinformation of which he has become possessed—are to be found in Great Britain at the present time. I am informed that a certain number of officers in Great Britain are what is called " supernumeries," but all are attached to some unit and all are employed.

Some hon. member on the other side, I think it was the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) criticised members of this House who have put on uniform in the endeavour to do their duty as loyal, patriotic sons of this country. My hon. friend is sufficiently answered by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), who points out that, even where men do not possess the military knowledge and experience which would enable them to go to the front, or even where they are beyond military age and could not face the physical endurance required of them if they should go to the front, nevertheless they can give real and valuable service to this country by devoting their energies in the communities where they reside to promoting the enlistment of battalions which will go to the front. It seems to me that such efforts are not to be condemned, but are to be commended.

My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp) spoke of many matters as to which answer has already been made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes.) I will not pause to deal further with them. There was no wish or sanction on the part of the Government for any departure from well recognized and proper methods of administration in the county of Cumberland or elsewhere.

My hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) spoke of General Lessard having been ignored since the outbreak of this war. I must take exception to that statement, because General Lessard has been engaged in the discharge of exceedingly important duties. I do not believe that any man at the front has had responsibilities that are more important or that have been discharged more adequately than those assumed by General Lessard in his position as Inspector General. I know of his work in the province of Ontario, and I believe that he has rendered most valuable service to Canada and the Empire in the discharge of his highly important duties as Inspector General. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the assistance which General Lessard could render to the cause of recruiting in the province of Quebec; I should be very glad to take all that into consideration. I pay a tribute also to the gallant and loyal citizens of French origin from the province of Quebec who have gone to the front and who have in very many cases notably distinguished themselves. I paid the same tribute to them when I had the privilege of being in France and Belgium last summer. I had the honour on that occasion of congratulating some of them upon the fine service which they had rendered to this Dominion and the whole Empire.

My hon. friend the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) spoke of certain matters as to which I gave him answer at the moment, except in one respect. He suggested, indeed, he asserted, that the lists of casualties were being dealt with by some authorities—I am not quite sure whom he intended—not with the view of giving information to the public as it ought to be given at the earliest possible moment, but with the view of political expediency and in order to cover up the shortcomings of those who are responsible for the conduct of this war. I desire so far as this Government is

concerned to repudiate in the strongest terms consistent with Parliamentary usage any such statement as that. I am informed and I believe that the casualties are published in this country as speedily as possible consistently with the considerations to which I alluded when answering the hon. member for Edmonton. It is necessary in the first place that the next of kin so far as they are known shall be notified. The telegrams are decoded, the men are identified, all the detail that is necessary is dealt with, and after all that has been done the casualties are published at the earliest possible moment. So much is this the case that the staff of the Department of Militia and Defence which is charged with this duty remains at work until four or five o'clock in the morning whenever these casualty lists come in. The idea is to give notice to the immediate relatives of those who are killed or wounded, and when it is ascertained that that advice has been given to the immediate relatives, not a moment's time is lost in making the casualties public.

I do not know that there is anything further with which I need trouble the committee at the moment. In conclusion, I hope hon. gentlemen on both sides and the people of the country will at least give those responsible for the administration of public affairs, under these circumstances of great strain and urgency, the credit of believing that they are inspired by a fixed resolve to do their duty. So far as I am concerned and so far as my colleagues are concerned, we have devoted ourselves to the great common purpose, which is of the highest possible import not only to this country but to the Empire and to the world, with all the energy that in us lies.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 12.55 a.m., Tuesday.

Tuesday, May 2, 1916.

The House met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1916-17.

A message from His Royal Highness the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1917, was presented by Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

WAR LOAN—$250,000,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Acting Minister Militia and Defence) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 97, for granting to His Majesty aid for military and naval defence.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MILITARY DECORATIONS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A list of decorations, medals, etc., awarded to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force was received some time ago and a copy of the same was laid on the table of the House on the 12th April. It was afterwards ascertained that the list so received contained certain errors. It was therefore checked by the Records Office with the London Gazette to the above date, and I lay upon the Table the corrected list.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SITTINGS AT TWO O'CLOCK.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has been suggested to me by some hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that it might be more convenient, and would tend to the equal expedition of business, if, instead of arranging for morning sessions, the House should meet at two o'clock. I am ready to accept that suggestion if it meets with the approval of the House, and therefore, if there is no objection, I would propose the motion on the Order Paper in that amended form:

> That on and after Wednesday next, the third day of May, and until the end of the session, this House shall meet each day at two o'clock in the afternoon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that the Government have nothing further to bring down?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think there is anything more of an important character. There may be one or two trifling measures. I recall to mind possibly a slight amendment to the Exchequer Court Act. It is to meet a difficulty that my right hon. friend encountered—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no objection at all. Any matters of that kind would not count. I had in mind important legislation. There have been persistent rumours that the Government was contemplating railway legislation. I see that in the Estimates that have just been placed

upon the Table there are appropriations for the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern. I presume this is the legislation the Government had in contemplation, and nothing more.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is the legislation contemplated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And no more railway legislation of any kind?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not quite sure about that, but if there should be I do not know that meeting at two o'clock would greatly interfere with the discussion of it. Nothing has been decided upon up to the present time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood my right hon. friend to say a moment ago that nothing more of consequence would be brought down—only an amendment to the Exchequer Court Act and things of that character. If that be so, there is nothing more to be said. What I wanted to know was whether we were to expect any more railway legislation of an important character.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Nothing has been decided upon so far. The only thing that has been decided upon is what I mentioned to my right hon. friend a moment ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The motion as amended by my right hon. friend is not so objectionable as a motion for morning sittings would have been, but my right hon. friend knows that as a general rule the mornings are not taken until we know what the programme of the Government contains in the way of important legislation. We resort to the morning sittings only when the business remaining to transact is not of a contentious character, though it may be important. At present on the programme of the House there is nothing of any consequence, barring the resolutions which have been brought down to-day and the measure relating to the war loan. As to the war loan there is no contention on our side; it will be scrupulously looked into, but not in any contentious spirit. But I will not say that of the very important resolutions that have been brought down to-day. I see that it is proposed to give further aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern. These resolutions must have been the result of negotiations between the Government and the respective companies, and there must have been important and voluminous correspondence between the Government and the two companies in regard to it. The only suggestion that I have to make to my right hon. friend is that before we change the programme and meet at two o'clock in the afternoon we should have that correspondence. I hope it will be brought down immediately.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that the Minister of Finance will be able to lay on the Table to-morrow any documents that are available.

As my right hon. friend has observed, we are not proposing to make any very important change. Some hon. members, to my certain knowledge, would be very glad to see the House meet at two o'clock in the afternoon instead of three, as a general rule. I departed from the proposal to hold sessions in the forenoon because there was a feeling, possibly well grounded, among some hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that we should really get through more business by beginning at two in the afternoon than at eleven in the morning, as the latter would necessitate hon. members coming a long distance from their various places of residence in the city to this Chamber as at present located, and then going back home at one o'clock, and returning again for the afternoon sitting. So I thought the proposal which I have made would tend to an almost equal expedition in the despatch of business, and would at the same time meet the convenience of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: After the statement of my right hon. friend, the correspondence respecting these appropriations will be brought down to-morrow, I have no objection to the motion.

Mr. GRAHAM: I should like to make a suggestion to the Prime Minister, and it is perhaps worthy of the consideration of the House. During the session we are sitting here night after night—at least, some of us are—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A few of us.

Mr. GRAHAM: Sitting here night after night is wearying work, and a man cannot do as good work the next day as he could if he had had the ordinary hours of rest. At one time I had the honour to be the leader of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario when the late Sir James Whitney was Premier, and without any undue

publication we made an arrangement by which we sat only three nights a week during that one session. The result was that the members were all fit for work the next day, the business was just as well done, and the session was no longer than it otherwise would have been. I would suggest that it would not be a bad idea for the Government to try an experiment of that kind next session, perhaps having the programme in better shape when the House meets, and cutting out the night sessions partially, and nearly all of the late hours.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my hon. friend mean that the Legislature met earlier in the day?

Mr. GRAHAM: We met at exactly the same hours and I think the business went through just as rapidly. Possibly some of us did not speak at so great a length as we do now. At all events, the business went through, and the session was no longer than when we were accustomed to sitting every night.

Mr. ROGERS: You had no Maritime Province affairs to deal with.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If we could get into a reasonable frame of mind in regard to business, and possibly cut out some matters of rather a trivial character that are frequently brought up and consume a good deal of time, I daresay the proposal of my right hon. friend might result as he anticipates; but of course the number of members in this House is very much greater than the number in the Ontario House, and members naturally have regard to their usefulness and the importance of the constituencies which they represent. I am afraid it would be rather difficult to get through the business of the session by sitting only between the hours of three and six. In the United States they meet in the forenoon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They meet at twelve o'clock.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And I do not believe they sit in the evening, as a rule.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Very seldom. The hours are from twelve to six.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If any such consummation as that could be brought about, I am sure that no one in the House would welcome it more warmly than I should, because, while very late sessions are trying upon all members of the House, and especially upon those who remain to the end, they are naturally more trying upon members of the Administration than upon any other members of the House, as my hon. friend from South Renfrew will have realized during the time he was a member of the late Administration. I shall be very glad to consider what he has in mind, and if it should be thought desirable that we should meet earlier in the day, and hold committee meetings in the evenings, as far as I personally am concerned, I shall be very glad to try the experiment.

Mr. MARCIL: If the House does not sit at night there is no reason why the committees should not meet earlier in the morning, or why the business of the House should not be transacted between two and six in the afternoon. Experience has shown that the afternoon sittings are the ones at which most business is done, and if the evening sittings were cut out the committees could meet at nine-thirty or ten in the morning, and get through by twelve or half-past, and the House could meet at two and go on till six or even seven, if necessary.

Motion amended as proposed, agreed to.

PRIVILEGE.

MR. KYTE'S SOURCE OF INFORMATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. KYTE: I desire to say a word or two on a question of privilege. I notice in the Montreal Gazette of to-day's date the following despatch:

> A feature of the testimony to be taken by the Royal Commission investigating the Kyte fuse contract charges which is being awaited with interest in Ottawa is that which will show from what source the member for Richmond obtained the information on which he based his series of allegations as to million dollar commissions. There has been considerable speculation ever since Mr. Kyte's speech, in which he read an alleged contract for the division of huge commissions among Messrs. Yoakum, Cadwell and Bassick, as to the source from which the contract came. It has already been stated, and has not been denied by the Opposition, that no such contract has ever been executed. It is now understood, however, that information was obtained from a firm of German-American lawyers in New York, and how Mr. Kyte obtained possession of it is the mystery to be solved. That statement is being freely made in the corridors that it was the firm in question which was the source of his information, and if this is the case it is of interest that the same firm has never had any hesitation in acknowledging its strong pro-German sympathies. If this is brought out in evidence there will be little sympathy for Mr. Kyte in Canada.

That article contains two statements which I desire to contradict in the most

emphatic terms. The first is as to whether or not a contract actually existed between Yoakum, Cadwell and Bassick for the division of the $1,000,000. I state most emphatically that my information is that a contract signed, sealed and delivered between these parties does exist. As a matter of fact, its existence was not denied by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence when he made his speech in this House in reply to me. As to the second statement, with respect to the source of my information, I desire to say that my information came from sources as loyal to British interests as those which are associated with the Montreal Gazette. I do not make the statement with any desire to be offensive towards or to impugn the loyalty of any person associated with that newspaper. I think it is important that this denial be placed upon record at the earliest possible moment, and, as the evidence comes before the Royal Commission from day to day, it will be time enough for the Montreal Gazette, or any other newspaper, to comment upon the value of it.

THE BILINGUAL QUESTION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: In the absence of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe), I would ask the Minister of Justice if he would kindly complete the return which he has brought down with respect to certain legislation of Ontario re the bilingual schools. The hon. member for Kamouraska would like to have the Order in Council with the report made by the minister upon which it was based, as well as the correspondence exchanged with the Government of the province of Ontario.

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that all that I was asked for was the petitions, and they were produced by the Secretary of State. I shall be happy to bring down the Order in Council.

Mr. MARCIL: And the correspondence exchanged with the Ontario Government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have not yet seen the Order in Council.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will bring down the Order in Council, with the report on which it is based. I did not understand it had been asked for.

ALLEGED CAPTURE BY RAINBOW.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has read the despatch which I read to the House yesterday about the capture of a German ship by the Rainbow? I would like to know if the statement is true.

Mr. HAZEN: I believe that some vessel was captured by the Rainbow. There is in the department some information about the matter, and I will get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was it a German vessel?

Mr. HAZEN: I am not sure whether it was a German vessel or not, but it was a vessel carrying goods for the enemy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The despatch stated it was an American vessel, but flying the German flag.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. EDWARDS: Three months ago I asked for some information in regard to certain expenditure at Fort Henry and the Royal Military College. Part of that information should come from the Militia Department and the rest from the Department of Public Works. I understand that both departments have prepared their answers, but they have never reached this House. I think I have been fairly patient in regard to the matter, and I would like to have the information.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think, so far as the Militia Department is concerned, that my attention has been directed to the matter. I will make inquiries and endeavour to expedite the information.

SALE OF SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. MACDONALD: Yesterday the right hon. Premier laid on the table a return relating to small arms ammunition. In the memorandum apparently prepared by the minister for submission to Council there is no Order in Council, and I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether an Order in Council approving the sale was ever passed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No Order in Council has ever been passed. The subject came up in the absence of the minister,

and it was delayed until his return. As the papers were asked for in the House, and as certain allegations were made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, the matter stood in that way until the papers were brought down.

Mr. MACDONALD: I might call attention to the fact that the memorandum which was apparently submitted to council was dated January 5, 1916, two months before the minister went away, and there was ample time to obtain an Order in Council if one cared to be obtained. In addition to that, the memorandum speaks of the fact that assurances were given that the ammunition sold to Col. J. Wesley Allison was to be used for testing purposes, and also that assurances had been given that no commissions were to be paid. There do not appear within the file any letters or any documents that would indicate that any such assurances were given in writing. Will the right hon. gentleman see that the return is completed in those respects?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If there are any other documents that are relative to the matter I will see that they are brought down. My impression is that everything has been brought down which touches the matter mentioned in the order.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister has filed a memorandum in which he says that assurances were given. I assume that, if those assurances were considered of any value, they would be in writing.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not sure that there are any assurances of that kind in writing. I will make inquiry and ascertain.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice), Bill No. 90, to amend the Canada Temperance Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Mr. DOHERTY: As hon. gentlemen will see on looking at the Bill, the sections of the Canada Temperance Act proposed to be amended are sections 120 to 124 inclusive, and also sections 127 and 139. As regards the amendments to sections 120 to 124 inclusive, they consist merely in the insertion in the existing sections of the Act of words intended to impose upon persons to whom the sale of liquor is permitted under the Canada Temperance Act in a Canada Temperance district the prohibition enacted by the Bill which recently went through this House in aid of provincial legislation, namely, the prohibition of the sale of liquor for the purpose of its being sent into any part of a province to be used in violation of any prohibitory law in force in that province.

As hon. gentlemen understand, the Bill to which I have just referred, which passed this House, had to do with the selling of liquor for the purpose of its being sent from one province into another. The effect of the bringing into force of the Canada Temperance Act in a district or portion of a province being to oust from that particular district or portion of the province the provincial legislation, that particular portion or district, as regards prohibitory legislation, is in the same position as though it were outside of the province. It was thought, therefore, that to be consistent the same rule should be laid down with regard to the sale of liquor in cases where it is permissible under the Canada Temperance Act, as was laid down with regard to the sale of liquor in one province to be sent into another province for use in violation of the law of that province. This covers the amendment proposed to be made to the four sections: 120, 121, 123 and 124. These are the four sections of the Canada Temperance Act which grant permission under certain restrictions to sell liquor within the district in which the Act is in force. The effect of the amendment is to add the further restriction that it should not be sold unless it is to be sent outside of the district in which the Canada Temperance Act is in force, and not into any other portion of the province to be there dealt with in violation of the provincial law in force therein.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the minister given any thought to the subject of the suspending of the operation of the Canada Temperance Act in a province which has adopted provincial prohibition? I recently received a very strong letter from a gentleman in the city of St. John who has taken a very warm interest in the prohibition movement, and he is of opinion that the operation of the Canada Temperance Act should cease in a province which has adopted total prohibition for the province. I can see the force of that, because it is not desirable to have a conflict of laws in any province. I would think that where the Provincial Legislature brings into force a prohibitory

law, ipso facto that should suspend the Canada Temperance Act.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Is it not true that the Act as passed in the province of New Brunswick does not come into force this year, and that Scott Act counties will have time to repeal their Act if they wish to do so? The same suggestion was made to me as was made to my hon. friend but it struck me that the people in a Scott Act county might feel that their Act was better than the one which had been passed by the province. After their having, by exercise of local option and a vote upon it, got what they wanted, it would seem to be arbitrary that we should take that away from them without any expression of opinion being possible from the people of the county itself. That, I thought, was an objection to the suggestion made to me along the line of the suggestion that my hon. friend has just mentioned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the Government has given thought to the subject, I have nothing further to say. The matter was brought to my attention by a gentleman who is very sincere in the matter of prohibition, and I thought it well to bring it to the attention of the minister.

Mr. DOHERTY: I had similar representations made to me as were made to the hon. member for St. John and my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I did give consideration to the matter; I had an opportunity of discussing it with at least one gentleman who was very much disposed to support the proposition. What occurred to me was what my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has already pointed out and further, that several provinces are introducing new prohibitory legislation and that this House has passed an Act in aid of prohibitory legislation. It seemed to me wise that we should not at once, anticipating the working of these laws, cut off the application of the Canada Temperance Act. There was the objection suggested by my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce; furthermore, this consideration presented itself to my mind and rather appealed to me: the legislation of one province might, to those interested in the cause of temperance in that province who were in districts where the Canada Temperance Act was in force, appear more effective than the Canada Temperance Act. That might, perhaps, not be the case in another province and with regard to other districts, so that it seemed to me that it would be wiser to allow the new prohibitory legislation of the province to go into operation and to allow the Act that this House has just passed to go into operation, with the view that after experience people would probably be in a better position to determine which of the two systems, the Canada Temperance Act or provincial legislation, was preferable. Then we might legislate to make some provision enabling parties in districts where the Canada Temperance Act was in force to express in some way their desire to have it done away with before we would proceed absolutely of our own authority to do away with it. The latter course involves, as the hon. Minister for Trade and Commerce has pointed out, our taking away from people something that they voted that they wanted, without opportunity for consultation with them or of learning their desire in the matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that by this Bill it is proposed to provide practically the same penalties for taking liquor into Scott Act counties as are provided for taking it into another part of the province where the prohibitory law is in force?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is not quite what is intended. The four sections of the Canada Temperance Act that are dealt with are sections that permit certain classes of people and for certain restricted purposes to sell liquor, and the object of this legislation is to bring those persons under the restriction that they must not allow it to go into any other portion of the province to be used in violation of the law of the province. The Canada Temperance Act area is, for the purposes of the liquor law, taken out of the provinces, so to speak, and persons who are permitted to sell liquor in that portion of the province are not governed by the provisions of the provincial law. The purpose of the added restriction is to prohibit them, in the exercise of the limited right of sale, which is granted them by the Canada Temperance Act, from selling liquor to be sent into another part of the province to be used in violation of the provincial law.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would there be the same penalties against a wholesale dealer or manufacturer in any province of Canada sending liquor into another province for special use in a county where the Canada

Temperance Act is in force, as would apply in another part of the province?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is already in the Canada Temperance Act as it stands a prohibition against sending liquor into the Canada Temperance Act district. Under section 117 of the Canada Temperance Act, as amended in 1908, it is prohibited for any person:

> To send, ship, bring or carry, or cause to be sent, shipped, brought or carried, to or into any such county or city, any intoxicating liquor.

That is to say, into a county or city where the Canada Temperance Act is in force. So that, so far as protecting the Canada Temperance Act districts from the importation of liquor is concerned, the Canada Temperance Act already protects them. The purpose of these amendments is to protect the remaining portions of a province, which are not under the Canada Temperance Act, from liquor sold within a Canada Temperance Act district being sent into those portions of the province, to be used in violation of the provincial law there in force.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me put a concrete case. In the Act recently passed by this House there is provision for enforcing a penalty in the province from which the liquor is sent. Suppose the liquor is sent from Quebec into a county in New Brunswick where the provincial prohibitory law is in force, but where the Canada Temperance Act is not in force, can that manufacturer, or that wholesale dealer, be prosecuted in the province of Quebec under the law passed at this session?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, because the law passed this session was one in aid of provincial legislation, not in aid of the Canada Temperance Act. The Canada Temperance Act, as I have said, already makes it an offence to send liquor into any district in which the Canada Temperance Act is in force. It does not contain that provision enabling prosecution to be brought elsewhere than where the offence was committed. There is not any special provision in the Canada Temperance Act as it stands with regard to the place of prosecution.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That presents very clearly and very strongly an argument in favour of suspending the operation of the Canada Temperance Act in a province where provincial prohibition is brought into force. Otherwise I am afraid that there will be a very great deal of confusion. For instance, suppose a manufacturer is proceeded against in the province of Quebec for sending liquor into the province of Prince Edward Island. His answer will be: it is true that I sent liquor into Prince Edward Island, but it was destined for a county where the Canada Temperance Act is in force. Then the prosecution would fail in the province of Quebec. You are going to have a lot of legal difficulties arising and a very considerable amount of confusion in connection with the prosecution of offenders, and I should think—I am not going to press this view, but I throw it out as a suggestion to the minister—that where provincial prohibition has been brought into force it would be better to have the one law applying to the whole province rather than to have one law applying to a part of the province where the Canada Temperance Act is in force and another applying to the parts of the province where the Canada Temperance Act is not in force. I think myself that for greater certainty and for greater ease in the enforcement of the law, it would be better to suspend the Canada Temperance Act in those provinces where provincial prohibitory laws have been brought into force.

Mr. DOHERTY: I hardly think we would be justified, in anticipation of the operation of laws that have not yet come into force, in taking away from counties the Canada Temperance Act, which in some cases they have adopted within the last few months. That is the case notably in Ontario. We have had no information from those counties that they want to have taken away from them the very thing that they, by their vote, expressed a desire to have. I do quite realize that there would be advantages in having a province all under one law, and I think it is rather to be anticipated that that condition of affairs will come about. But I do not think that this is quite the moment to attempt to bring that about. It would be premature to do so. I think we can quite safely leave consideration of that question until we have had some opportunity of seeing the newly proposed laws in operation.

Mr. LOGGIE: I understood the minister to say that the Canada Temperance Act would be so amended that we could punish those who sent liquor to any county from another province.

Mr. DOHERTY: The only reason we did not amend the Act so that we could do that

is that the Act already does that. The provision of the existing Canada Temperance Act is:

From the day in which this part comes into force (the following things are made offences): No person shall, except as in this part specially provided, by himself, his clerk, servant or agent. . . . (c) ship, bring or carry, or cause to be sent, shipped, brought or carried, to or into any such county or city, any intoxicating liquor.

So that you have an absolute prohibition in the law as it now stands against anybody in the Dominion of Canada sending any intoxicating liquor into a county or city in which the Canada Temperance Act is in force. Clearly there was no need to amend the Act to bring about that result. It is true, as I said to the hon. member for St. John, that we have not the special provision enabling the offender to be prosecuted except in the particular place where the offence is committed, but in that regard the Canada Temperance Act is only in the position in which it has been, and there never has been any suggestion that there was a weakness in that direction.

When we came to pass the Bill, which was passed, it did seem to us that because we were dealing with a matter which in all cases was what one might call an interprovincial offence, it was wise to make the special provision which we made. But I should fancy that in a large number of cases, where it is a question of sending liquor into a district under the Canada Temperance Act, you will have it sent in from the neighbouring counties that are not under the Canada Temperance Act, but which are in the same province. Probably when that Act was enacted the same necessity for such a provision did not occur to those who drafted it as occurred to us with regard to the other Bill. There will remain, even if this Bill is passed, that difference between the two situations.

Mr. LOGGIE: Do I understand the minister to say that the shipper, who is obliged under the Act that has already been passed to label the liquor sent into a province that has provincial prohibitory legislation, is obliged to mark the liquor which he sends, say, from the province of Quebec into the county of Northumberland the same as he would be required to mark if it were going into the province of Ontario. I refer to districts where the Canada Temperance Act is in force.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not before me the exact text of that Act, but it seems to me that we are falling back into a discussion of the Act that was passed. If that Act, as passed, does not cover the case in its terms—and I am free to admit that my impression at this moment is that it does not—this act will not produce the necessity of labelling in that particular case. But the Act, as it is passed, will apply to all sending of liquor from one province into another when in the province there is any prohibitory law. I am not quite certain whether it says any provincial prohibitory law or simply any prohibitory law.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the minister tell me whether there is any provision to preserve the rights of those who are now in the courts with regard to offences committed against the Act which he is repealing? The minister will remember that a period of three months is allowed to bring a prosecution, and offences may have been committed that have not yet been prosecuted in Scott Act counties. Sometimes they are not even found out for a couple of 4 p.m. months. Will the right to prosecute those offences lapse when the old Act is repealed by this Act? I understand that the old Act is absolutely repealed by this Act, and that new provisions are substituted. The minister will see my point. I feel interested in the matter owing to the fact that my county is a Scott Act county, and I know that prosecutions are occasionally brought. I would like to know whether this Bill would disturb the cases that are now in the court or take away any rights that exist.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no real repeal. What is done here is to add something to the old Act, only it takes the form of repealing the section and of enacting exactly the same section with the additions. I think there has been a general consensus of opinion in the House that it is more convenient to draft legislation in that way, because, in the Bill before the House, the members see exactly the section as it will be when amended. But the effect is exactly the same as if we had said that section 120, for instance, of the Canada Temperance Act is amended by inserting certain words. There is no moment of time during which the disposition as it stood before without the addition that we are making, is not in force. It is repealed and substituted simultaneously by exactly the same disposition, while a further disposition is added, so that there is no lapse of time during which, whatever was an offence under the Canada Temperance Act, as it stood, ceases to be an offence.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is quite true. It is a legal point, of course, but what struck me was that if a prosecution is brought in court under the Act of 1908, that Act being specially mentioned, and when the case comes up for trial it is found that there is no Act of 1908 but instead an Act of 1916, the point may be one which a lawyer would make. He might say that the prosecution was invalid. I think it is usual to provide that existing rights will not be interfered with.

Mr. DOHERTY: If there was any real repeal I would agree with the hon. gentleman, but there is no real repeal here. The Act of 1908 still continues in force. What is done is to say that section 127 of the Act of 1908 is repealed, and the same provisions are substituted, so that everything that was in the Canada Temperance Act remains the law.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is exactly the same.

Mr. DOHERTY: With something added. There is something more that is the law, but everything that was in is still in. We have created another offence; that is all.

Mr. MARCIL: I am sorry that I was not present when the amendments were made to the other Bill, but out of the mass of amendments some doubt has arisen which I would like to clear up. In the province of Quebec, where municipalities have adopted prohibitory legislation to the extent of refusing to grant licenses, and, on top of that, where the county council has also refused to grant any license and has passed a resolution covering the whole county, is there anything in the new legislation which will prevent liquor from being brought into that county for any purpose whatever?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, not for any purpose whatever, but for any purpose which the provincial legislation prohibits.

Mr. MARCIL: The provincial legislation prohibits the sale.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then nobody can bring liquor into that county for the purpose of its being sold, but if the provincial legislation permits one to have liquor, then, under the Act which was passed, there would be nothing to prohibit the sending of it.

Mr. MARCIL: Then so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, out of 44 constituencies that have adopted prohibition, the Dominion legislation will have no effect whatever?

Mr. DOHERTY: It will certainly prevent any man who wants to use liquor within the province for the purpose of violating the law having it sent in for that purpose. We have not undertaken, and I have never suggested that we were undertaking to impose upon any province, or upon any part of a province, more prohibition than it wanted. All we pretend to do is that we will not let the outside man bring about within the province a violation of the provincial law. I would like, with the permission of the committee, to amend the clause for the purpose of making an amendment to an additional section. The clause itself provides, as will be seen, for the repealing of a certain number of sections and the substitution of something else. There is another section of the Canada Temperance Act which I desire to amend. It is section 136 and it provides for the right of search upon a warrant for that purpose being obtained. The section as it now stands provides that the search may be carried out in the daytime only. It has been represented to me from very numerous sources that the presence in the Canada Temperance Act of that limited right of search during the daytime presents a very serious obstacle to its effectiveness. I desire to amend the section which provides for the right of search by striking out the words "in the daytime." I beg therefore to move:

That clause 1 be amended by inserting the following words after "twenty-seven" in the ninth line on page one:—"Section one hundred and thirty-six and form R";

That the following clause be inserted immediately after clause one hundred and twenty-seven on page three:

136. If it is proved upon oath before any judge of the sessions of the peace, recorder, police magistrate, stipendiary magistrate, two justices of the peace, or any magistrate having the power or authority of two or more justices of the peace, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that any intoxicating liquor is kept for sale in violation of Part II of this Act, or of The Temperance Act of 1864, or is stored, warehoused, or kept for delivery, in violation of Part II of this Act, in any dwelling house, store, shop, warehouse, outhouse, garden, yard, croft, vessel, building, or other place or places, such officer may grant a warrant to search such dwelling house, store, shop, warehouse, outhouse, garden yard, croft, vessel, building, or other place or places, for such intoxicating liquor, and if the same or any part thereof is there found, to bring the same before him.

"2. Any information under this section may be in form Q and any search warrant under this section may be in form R".

And that the following form be inserted immediately after clause one hundred and thirty-nine on the said page three:

Form R.

Form of Search Warrant.

Canada
Province of
District (or county, or as
the case may be) of

To all or any of the constables or other peace officers in the district (or county or as the case may be) of.....

Whereas K. L. of.....in the said district (or county, or as the case may be) of..... (yeoman) hath this day made oath before the undesigned one of His Majesty's justices of the peace in and for the said district (or county, or as the case may be) of..... that he hath just and reasonable cause to suspect and doth suspect that intoxicating liquor is kept for sale (or is stored or is warehoused or is kept for delivery) in violation of Part II of The Canada Temperance Act, in the (dwelling house, etc.,) of one P. Q. of.....in the said district (or county, or as the case may be) of ..... These are therefore, in the name of Our Sovereign Lord the King, to authorize and require you, and each and every of you, with necessary and proper assistance, to enter into the said (dwelling house, etc.,) of the said P. Q. and there diligently search for the said intoxicating liquor; and if the same, or any part thereof, shall be found upon such search, that you bring the intoxicating liquor so found, and also all barrels, cases, boxes, packages, and other receptacles of any kind whatever containing the same before me to be disposed of and dealt with according to law.

Given under my hand and seal at..... in the said district (or county, or united counties, or as the case may be) of..... this.....day of..... in the year of Our lord.....

(Seal) W.S.

A justice of the peace in and for the said.. ....."

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS SMALL CLAIMS ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, Bill No. 91, to amend the Government Railways Small Claims Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

On the preamble:

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I think the Bill should be amended by making it retroactive so that it would apply to the Prince Edward Island railway from the time the first Bill was enacted.

There is no question but Parliament thought that the Bill passed in 1910 applied to all Government railways; that is obvious from the discussion that took place at the time. It would be an anomaly to have the Bill apply to the Intercolonial railway and not to the Prince Edward Island railway, simply because the Intercolonial railway happened to be mentioned in the Bill and the Prince Edward Island railway was not. I know one case, at all events, where the complainant in a suit was non-suited just because the Prince Edward Island railway was not mentioned in the Bill. Lawyers on the island have told me that they have advised other parties who have consulted them in regard to bringing suits not to enter on an action because the Bill did not apply to the Prince Edward Island railway. Now, this is an injury to the people of that province. It is putting them in a different position from the people of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Quebec, and I presume that it was not the intention of Parliament to pass legislation of that kind. In order to provide a remedy I would ask the committee to make the Bill retroactive, so that these people will be in the position they would have been in if the intention of Parliament had been carried out in the first instance. I therefore beg to move, seconded by Mr. Turriff, that Bill No. 91 be amended by adding thereto section 2, as follows:

The said Acts shall be deemed to have applied to claims arising out of the operation of the said railways, branches and ferries, on and from the respective dates at which the said Acts were passed, and shall apply thereto in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to claims arising out of the operation of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. REID: I was asked some days ago by the Prince Edward Island members to introduce an amendment to the Small Claims Act, bringing the Prince Edward Island railway under the Act. In 1910 the Act for the adjudication of small claims arising in respect of the operation of the Government railways was passed, section 2 of which reads as follows:

Subject as hereinafter provided, any claim against His Majesty arising out of the operation of the Intercolonial railway and not exceeding in amount the sum of two hundred dollars, for damages alleged to be caused by negligence, or made payable by statute, may be sued for and prosecuted by action, suit or other proceeding in any provincial court having jurisdiction to the said amount over like claims between subjects.

In 1913 an amendment was made increasing the amount from $200 to $500. When this matter was brought to my attention I

took it up with officials, and we thought it well that the whole Government railway system should be included, instead of having an amendment relating merely to the Prince Edward Island railway. If the Act is good for the Intercolonial and good for the Prince Edward Island railway it is good for the other parts of the Government railway system, and it is was with that idea in view that I introduced the amendment to the Government Railways Small Claims Act. I certainly could not agree to my hon. friend's suggestion to make the Act retroactive and apply to any suits or actions since 1910, and if he presses his amendment I would rather withdraw the Bill and let it stand until another session, when I could look into it further. Under the circumstances I would ask that the Bill go through as I have introduced it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the minister's objection that he does not wish to make valid any suits that have already been brought? Would he have any objection to allowing this Act to apply to actions brought in the future in respect to claims that have arisen before the Act came into force; in other words, make the Bill retroactive as to procedure?

Mr. REID: My object in introducing this amendment is to make the Act apply to any suits or actions brought in future against any part of the Government railway system. For instance, there may be claims against the Transcontinental. Any claims arising in future will be dealt with under the law as it stood before this Act was passed. I think it would be unfair to make the Bill retroactive and apply to cases that have already been disposed of. It does seem to me that as this Bill has been on the Order Paper for quite a while the hon. member might have done me the courtesy of sending me a copy of the amendment he proposed to make; this is the first time I ever heard of it. I have tried to carry out the wishes of the members for Prince Edward Island by having the Act apply not only to the Prince Edward Island railway, but to the whole Government railway system. I would rather have the Bill stand than have it amended at this time, as my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me that the minister is not drawing a proper distinction between the mode of enforcing the claims and the giving rise to the claim itself. I do not understand that my hon. friend from Kings wants to have any different law applied to the right of action; what he wants is that the remedy which is afforded by this Bill shall apply to causes of action which may have arisen before this legislation comes into force as well as to those which may arise afterwards. Take the case of a man who has a perfectly just claim against the railway. Before this legislation comes into force, an animal has been killed on the railway. Because the owner happens to live in Prince Edward Island, why should he be compelled to bring his suit in the Exchequer Court of Canada where the costs would amount to ten times the value of the animal? Why should he not be permitted to avail himself of this cheap remedy and use the provisions which have been made for the enforcement of the collection of small claims? Surely the minister might go that far, not in any way to alter the cause of action, nor the circumstances which would give rise to a claim, but only as to the mode of enforcing a claim. I understand that is all the member for Kings wants. The minister should not refuse to accept the amendment just on account of any pique or resentment against the hon. member for Kings because he did not let him know before that he was going to move the amendment. The amendment is so simple in its character that the hon. member assumed that the minister would at once grasp the justice and the reasonableness of it and would allow it to be passed.

Mr. REID: The Act of 1910, as it was introduced, was not made retroactive.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: It is only a matter of procedure. Supposing a person has a claim against the Government for damages for negligence, he must, before the passing of the Act of 1910, commence proceedings in the Exchequer Court. Under the Act of 1910 he has a very simple remedy in the courts of the province, and that Act was of great benefit to the people who had claims against the Government. When I came here in the early part of this session, I was requested by certain people who had commenced suits in the courts to ask the Government to amend the Act so that the remedy would apply to all claims which had arisen since 1910. I was told by one of the legal officers of the Crown, who had something to do with the drafting of the Act of 1910, that the omission to include the Prince Edward Island railway was a mistake; that they overlooked it, and they thought that the words "Intercolonial railway" in the Act and the words "Govern-

ment railways" in the preamble included all the railways controlled by the Government. It was evidently a mistake, and I would ask the minister, if he is not inclined at the present time to pass the Bill as I first asked him to introduce it, to apply to all claims, to let the matter stand for a day or two and give it further consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the hon. gentleman in favour of the amendment?

Mr. McLEAN: Yes. I was the first man who spoke to the minister about this legislation and I asked him to make it retroactive. A suit was commenced by a friend of mine in Charlottetown who thought that the words "Intercolonial railway" included the Prince Edward Island railway: but when he got into the court he found that the definition of the words "Intercolonial railway" in the Railway Act meant the railway as it existed in the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. When, however, the law officers of the Crown were drafting the Small Claims Act of 1910, they thought that the Intercolonial railway included the Prince Edward Island railway, and for that reason I would ask the minister to let the matter stand until he gets further information from the law officers connected with the Railway Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the Act of 1910 in any way spread the liability of the Crown or in any way broadened out the right of action, then I would say that the minister might very well hesitate, but it does not do that; it applies only to the mode of procedure. Section 2 reads:

> Subject as hereinafter provided, any claim against His Majesty arising out of the operation of the Intercolonial railway, and not exceeding in amount the sum of $200 for damages alleged to be caused by negligence or made payable by statute, may be sued for and prosecuted by action, suit or other proceedings in any provincial court having jurisdiction to the said amount over like claims between subjects.

Upon consideration, I think the minister will see that it is reasonable that if a man has a claim not exceeding $200, which arose last week or last month, he should be permitted to bring an action for that claim in an ordinary court of law just the same as he could bring it if the damages arose upon the Intercolonial railway. No harm can come to anybody; the Crown can not suffer; the Crown can have no advantage by refusing to have the amendment pass unless it is an advantage to the Crown to compel the people to go to the expense of commencing suit in the Exchequer Court where the costs might amount to ten times the value of the property destroyed or injured as the case might be. If any fundamental principle was involved, if there was any attempt to enlarge the right of the subject, to give him a claim that does not exist, it would be a different matter, but this amendment provided only as to the court into which the litigant may go for the purpose of enforcing his claim against the Crown. The minister might fairly consent to enlarge the scope of the Bill by accepting the amendment moved by the hon. member.

Mr. REID: As the Bill does not seem to be satisfactory to the members from Prince Edward Island, I think we had better let the matter stand. I beg to move:

> That the Committee rise and report progress.

Mr. HUGHES: As the minister seems to think that I have shown him some discourtesy by not mentioning the matter to him before to-day, I may say that yesterday I asked the Prime Minister when this Bill would likely be taken up and he was unable to give me an answer. The Acting Minister of Railways was absent yesterday, and I could not see him, and not knowing that the matter was coming up to-day, I did not think it was important to see him specially. I may say I mentioned the matter to him some little time ago. Further than that, I introduced a Bill having the retroactive feature in it, and the minister, or at least his law officers, would have an opportunity of seeing that. I understand the senior member for Queens (Mr. McLean) has stated that in the early part of the session, he said to the minister that it would be desirable to have legislation of that kind made retroactive. Therefore, for all these reasons, the minister was not taken unawares.

Mr. REID: I do not doubt what the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) says, but I have no recollection of its being represented to me that the Bill should be made retroactive. The member for Queens, P.E.I., tells me that that statement was made to the Solicitor General, so that I knew nothing of it. The hon member for Queens, P.E.I., spoke to me at the beginning of the session and asked me to have this Bill amended to cover Prince Edward Island. With that end in view I asked the law clerk of the House of Commons to prepare the Bill, bringing not only Prince Ed-

ward Island, but all parts of the Government railway system under the Act of 1910.

Mr. HUGHES: The minister will remember that I spoke to him two or three times about legislation of this kind.

Mr. REID: Across the floor of the House?

Mr. HUGHES: No, in the corridor; whenever I had opportunity of speaking to the minister.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman never mentioned the retroactive part of it.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, I did. The minister, having a great deal to do, has forgotten that part of it, but that was the feature that I was particularly anxious about. The only object of the Bill is that the people of Prince Edward Island be placed in the position that they would be in if the intention of Parliament had been correctly set forth in the first Bill that was passed. The only object of this amendment is to rectify the error that was made in the first Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It ought to be borne in mind that, as legal gentlemen know, a statute which provides for a mode of procedure is in effect retroactive even though the statute does not say so, because procedure is regarded as different from the right of action. Therefore, I think the minister should consent to remove the doubt and make this procedure applicable to existing claims.

Mr. HUGHES: Will the minister say when he will likely consider the matter again?

Mr. REID: No, I cannot say.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The committee will have leave to sit again?

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister intend that this Bill shall apply to the Transcontinental railway in the province of Quebec?

Mr. REID: Yes, it applies to all Government railways.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the minister finally makes up his mind to strangle this Bill, I suggest that if the Bill is a good measure, although it be not retroactive, it should be allowed to pass. I am sure that the province of Prince Edward Island should prefer legislation making the old Act applicable to Prince Edward Island from the date of its passing to no legislation at all. It could be amended so as to make it retroactive at a later date, if that should be thought desirable. It would be too bad to deprive all the claimants along the long stretch of Government railways which we have now, and which we did not have in 1910, when the first Act was passed, of the simple remedy that this legislation gives them, simply because the minister refuses to make it retroactive in Prince Edward Island. I do not suppose that any one along the line of the new roads is asking that this Bill be made retroactive, and it will be well to give the people along these lines the benefit of this legislation. I think the minister should insist upon the legislation passing as it is; it can be amended later if thought desirable.

Mr. REID: I think the legislation should pass as it is. I certainly am opposed to making it retroactive.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister was not so opposed when the question of taxes came up.

Mr. REID: I am talking now about this Small Claims Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: A horse of a different colour.

Mr. REID: If satisfactory, we will have the Bill passed now as it is. If not, I cannot say when I will consider it again.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister realizes the importance of having the Bill passed not only for the Prince Edward Island railway but for the Transcontinental railway in Quebec. We voted money here the other day for the purpose of building fences, and so on, along the new sections in Quebec, and towards the West. Settlers are coming in there, and claims may be arising every day. It is only fair that settlers along the line of the Transcontinental should have the same treatment as that accorded to those who have settled along the Intercolonial or the Prince Edward Island railway.

Mr. REID: I am willing to let the Bill go through, but I will not agree to make it retroactive on the Transcontinental and on the Prince Edward Island railway. I think it would be a great advantage to the Transcontinental and the Prince Edward Island railway to have this legislation on the statute book. It is good legislation for the Intercolonial railway; therefore, it is good legislation for all Government railways. This would apply to all Government railways.

Mr. HUGHES: Why should not the people of Prince Edward Island be put in the

same position that the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Quebec were placed in some four or five years ago?

Mr. REID: I cannot say why the Bill was made to apply to the Intercolonial railway only.

Mr. HUGHES: That was a mistake.

Mr. REID: The hon. member sat in this House in 1910.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member was here also.

Mr. REID: Other hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island, friends of the hon. member, were here in 1910, when this Bill went through, and they never raised a voice against it. They were willing that the Bill should go through this House as it did in 1910.

Mr. HUGHES: Thinking it applied to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. REID: Without its applying to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HUGHES: No.

Mr. REID: The Bill of 1910 did not include Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HUGHES: The matter was brought up in court, and it was discovered that there had been a mistake.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The very title of the Act of 1910 is misleading and shows that a mistake was made. The heading is—Chapter 26 of the Acts of 1910:

> An Act to provide for the adjudication of small claims arising in respect of the operation of the Government railways.

It is not limited to the Intercolonial. Then, when we come to the first section, it says: "This Act may be cited as the Government Railways Small Claims Act," showing that a clear mistake was made in drafting the Bill. It was intended to apply to all Government railways. It was a clear mistake made in 1910, and if the minister is going to correct it, why not do it right; why half correct it? He gives twice who gives quickly; in the same manner, he does a good thing twice who does it quickly.

Mr. REID: The hon. member was here in 1910, as well as other members.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And admits that a mistake was made.

Mr. REID: The first section says:

> Subject as hereinafter provided, any claim against His Majesty arising out of the operation of the Intercolonial railway—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Read the title.

Mr. REID: The title does not count in the Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, as showing the intention.

Mr. REID: If the title was part of the Act, why was that not considered in the courts?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The title shows that the mistake was made in the enacting part of the Bill. It showed clearly that the intention of everybody was that it should apply to the Government railways. It was not limited to the Intercolonial, because the title is an anomaly if it applies only to the Intercolonial.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is it not possible the mistake was made in the title?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not likely.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the Chair which is not debatable. The hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) immediately rose and said: "By the consent of the committee, I should like to say a word to the committee;"—and there have been words from so many members that I hardly know where to intervene. But as it is my duty to administer the rules as I deem them to exist, I must either request that the motion be withdrawn or insist upon putting it to the committee.

Mr. REID: I am willing to withdraw the motion if the committee are willing to take the Bill as it is. If not—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reid moves that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What does the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) say?

Mr. HUGHES: I would prefer to have the Bill as it is, rather than not have it at all. But as I said, at the request—

The CHAIRMAN: I must respectfully draw the attention of the committee to the circumstance that I have ruled that the motion is not debatable.

Mr. REID: If the hon. member will withdraw his amendment, we will pass the Bill as it is. I think that it is in the interest of all the people living along the road.

Mr. HUGHES: If the minister has decided that he will not accept the amendment, I will withdraw the amendment if there is nothing else to be done.

Mr. REID: Then I withdraw my motion and he withdraws his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the hon. minister withdraws his motion that the committee rise, and also that the hon. member for Kings withdraws his amendment.

Bill reported.

Mr. REID moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I wish now to present the same amendment. I move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering the amendment which I offered.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Reid moves that the Bill be now read the third time; to which Mr. Hughes, Prince Edward Island, moves in amendment that the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering certain amendments.

Mr. REID: Mr. Speaker, while we were in committee the hon. member withdrew his amendment and said he would not press it, that he was willing that the Bill should go through as I introduced it. Taking the hon. member at his word, the committee passed the Bill and it is now before us for the third reading. I certainly think it is breaking faith with members of this House—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. REID: —to introduce an amendment in this way, and I certainly cannot accept it. If members opposite think that this is fair, after our agreeing in committee that the Bill should pass as reported, I thing it is much better to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I wished to make a few remarks in the committee, but the chairman ruled that I was out of order and this is the only way in which it was possible for me to make these remarks. I want to say to the minister, and to say in all sincerity, that I much prefer the Bill as it stands to having no Bill at all. At the same time I must say again that it is very unfair indeed, in my judgment, for the minister to insist on passing it in this way, very unfair to the people of Prince Edward Island who have claims against the Government railways, who have brought these claims on the advice of counsel, thinking that the Act was all right, who have been non-suited, and who have now no remedy unless they take up these claims in the Exchequer Court. Men with small claims cannot go to that expense. I cannot for the life of me see why the minister should refuse to allow these men the simple method of procedure under this Bill. The Government could not be injured, no interest in Canada could be injured, no one could be injured.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to call attention to rule 21, which says:

> A reply shall be allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion or the second reading of a Bill, but not to any member who has moved an order of the day, not being the second reading of a Bill, an amendment, the previous question, an adjournment during a debate, or an instruction to a committee.

I understand that the hon. member has moved an amendment, and consequently, according to this rule, is not entitled to speak now.

Mr. HUGHES: Is not the third reading before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, an amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The amendment is that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to committee. The hon. member is proceeding to give reasons why it should be referred back.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should have done that when making the amendment. Now he is making a reply. He moved an amendment and the Minister of Railways answered.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You are taking the ground that he had already spoken once.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought I would have to wait until the amendment was read before being allowed to speak on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The amendment was that the Bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole not in order to consider an amendment, but to examine it de novo. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I trust the Minister of Railways will not feel that he ought to withdraw the Bill simply because the member for Kings moved an amendment. You see that the effect of that would be to de-

prive any member of the House of freedom of thought or of action. I am sure the Minister of Railways would not want to do that. He is not a man who would want to apply the lash to this House, particularly to both sides of the House. He might try it on one side, but he would not like to try it on this side too. See what the minister proposes to do. He says to the hon. member for Kings: "If you dare to press this amendment, if you dare to ask this House to vote upon the amendment, I will withdraw the Bill; much as I value the Bill, much as I think it would be in the public interest if it passes the House, if you venture to move an amendment I will withdraw it." It seems to me that the better way for the minister to do would be to allow the vote to be taken first, and then, if the amendment is carried, the minister can say: Well now, the amendment having carried and I not approving of it, I will not press the Bill to the third reading but will withdraw it. Surely he should allow us to vote on the amendment of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes) and not make a threat against us as he has done. I am sure the minister will realize that is hardly the kind of threat that should be made to members of the House. With regard to the amendment itself, I wish to repeat what I said in committee, that it is evident a mistake was made in 1910 in not making this Bill applicable to all the Government railways. There was no possible precedent that could influence Parliament in having one law prescribing a mode of procedure in respect to claims against the Intercolonial Railway and another law in respect to claims arising in connection with the Prince Edward Island Railway. Both railways are owned by the Government, and both are under the same management; therefore, the same law should apply to both, so far as claims are concerned. That is the first reason. You cannot conceive of any reason why any distinction should have been made. Secondly, it was obviously intended to apply to Government railways, for that is the title of the Act, " to provide for the recovery of small claims against the Government railway system," or words to that effect. If it had been intended to limit the Act to the Intercolonial Railway, the title would have been an Act to recover small claims against the Intercolonial Railway; but it does not say that; it refers to claims against the Government railway system. Then the first section of the Act, which declares what the title shall be, repeats almost the same words, showing clearly, as I have said, that whoever drafted the Bill was under the impression that the words " Intercolonial Railway " included all branches operated in connection with the Government system of railways, including the Prince Edward Island Railway. Therefore it seems to me that it is reasonable that the mistake which was made in 1910 should be corrected. The minister pointed out that I was a member of Parliament at that time, but that does not make any difference. No man could be more ready than I to admit that I was a party to the mistake which was made by Parliament at that time. I have no doubt whatever that it was a mistake, and as a member of Parliament, and as a member of the Government at that time, I am prepared to take the responsibility of that mistake upon my shoulders as one of the parties to it. But if I was a party to the mistake I ought to be the first to try to remedy it. There is no earthly reason why the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kings should not be passed. I hope that even yet the minister will be able to accept that amendment; if not, let us take a vote upon it, and if the amendment is defeated, the Bill will go to the third reading. If the amendment happens to be carried, I hope that better views will prevail with the minister and that he will allow the Bill to go through with the amendment.

Mr. MORPHY: Is there anything in the way of limitation with regard to the prosecution of claims?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do you mean as to time?

Mr. MORPHY: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think so.

Mr REID: We understood in this committee that the amendment was withdrawn, and if a vote is to be pressed I would ask that the Bill be withdrawn altogether.

5 p.m.

Mr. KNOWLES: Personally I am opposed to the withdrawal of the Bill because it is one which interests the employees and residents alongside the Grand Trunk Pacific railway so far as it is operated by the Government. In northern Ontario, especially, the people are far from law offices and the settlers are without means to prosecute their claims, and it would be a very serious thing for them if the Bill were withdrawn and they had to go through the cumbersome procedure of getting a fiat before they could sue. Either the minister thinks that this

is a good Bill, or he does not. I will give him the benefit of the doubt, and assume that he thinks it is a good Bill. Why then does he not want to have the Bill passed? We all agree that it is a good Bill, so far as it goes; there is no doubt about that. If the amendment is defeated, the House will be unanimous in passing the Bill, or what is left of it, but why, for the sake of punishing the hon. member for Kings or the hon. members on this side of the House, or for the sake of getting us in wrong with reference to legislation which the minister heretofore thought was good legislation, the Bill should be withdrawn is something I cannot understand. More than that, I question whether it is within the power of the minister to withdraw a Bill at this stage. The fact that a man is the father of a child does not mean that he can strangle that child, and I question the propriety and the legality under the rules of the House—of course I defer to your judgment, Mr. Speaker—of a motion to take away from us a Bill which we cherish, so far as it goes, and which we are endeavouring to improve. I object to the Bill being withdrawn and urge that it be proceeded with.

Mr. MARCIL: I remember very well the circumstances under which this Bill was passed. The constituency which I have the honour to represent is traversed by the Intercolonial railway, and the farmers living alongside the railway had been urging the Department of Railways and Canals for years to come to their relief by enabling them to prosecute their claims, for the loss of a cow or of a horse, and small claims of that kind, without obtaining a fiat and going to a lot of expense and annoyance. The Government consented to bring in a measure to enable such claims to be prosecuted before the ordinary courts, limiting the amount. No member of the House imagined that this treatment was to be meted out only to the people living alongside the Intercolonial railway. We all admitted that it should be extended to the people living alongside the Government railways generally. There is no reason in the world why the people of Prince Edward Island should be excluded from the benefit of a measure of this kind. It was passed by the House to relieve the farmers who were living alongside the Government railways. I am sure that it was altogether unintentional that the Prince Edward Island railway was omitted. The title of the Bill showed that it was intended for the relief of people living alongside the Government railways generally.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: The omission of the Prince Edward Island railway was not the fault of the people of Prince Edward Island; it was the fault of the law officers of the Crown; there is no doubt about that. There can be no doubt in the mind of any member that the man who drew that Act believed that it was to apply to the Prince Edward Island railway. In the body of the Act, however, the reference is to the Intercolonial railway, and when the judge, who recently tried a case in Prince Edward Island, looked up the definition of Intercolonial railway he found that in the Railway Act it applied to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec only. But that was not the belief of the law officers of the Crown who drew the Act. I have particular knowledge of that fact. I have been informed by one who knows that the law officers believed that the Prince Edward Island railway was included in the Act, and were astonished that a judgment had been given to the effect that the Act did not apply to that railway. I think it is only fair that this Bill should be amended in some way so as to make it apply to all claims which have arisen against the Prince Edward Island railway since 1910. After all, it is only a matter of procedure. If it is not amended those people who have claims against the Prince Edward Island railway will be under the necessity of going to the Exchequer Court and of filing petitions of right, and will be put to great expense. I hope the minister will take the matter into consideration, and I have no doubt that he will arrive at the same conclusion as my colleagues and the hon. member for Kings county have arrived at. This Act was intended to apply to Prince Edward Island and the people who drew it believed that it did apply. It is nothing but right and just that this amendment be made making the procedure apply as if this Act had been passed in 1910.

Mr. REID: In order that the matter may be in proper order before the House, I beg to move in amendment to the amendment that the order for the third reading of Bill No. 91 be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That motion is not in order; it is not an amendment. It negatives a motion which the hon. member has already made and he cannot do that.

Mr. SPEAKER: When there is a motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply only one amendment can be made. It is then forbidden to move an amendment to the amendment. but in this case I think it is permissible to move a sub-amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The point is that this is not in the nature of an amendment. The minister has already made one motion for the third reading of the Bill. There is an amendment that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the committee for the purpose of making a certain amendment. Then, the minister, the same member who moves that the Bill be now read a third time, undertakes to amend his own motion by moving that the order for the third reading be discharged. I submit that it is clearly out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the point of order is well taken, because the main motion was made by the hon. Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, and consequently he is presenting a sub-amendment to amend his own motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

Mr. MACDONALD: I may be permitted to say a word in regard to this matter. This legislation was introduced in 1910, when Sir Allen Aylesworth was Minister of Justice. I personally had pressed upon him, and also upon the Minister of Railways of that day for a long period of time previous to that, the propriety of providing for some simpler method by which the claims of parties living along the Government railway or the Intercolonial railway, as it was then called, should be submitted to some local tribunal and disposed of. The then Minister of Justice took very serious exception, as a matter of law, to the taking out of Exchequer Court of any cases in which claims were made against the Crown by virtue of the old principle which always applied in actions against the King. Towards the end of the session, with very great reluctance, he assented to the introduction of a measure which was submitted to him, but confining the jurisdiction of the court to the jurisdiction of a claim amounting to $200 only. If hon. gentlemen will look over the statute they will find that that is so. The Minister of Railways and Canals of that day, the Hon. Mr. Graham, accepted the measure, the principle of which was that the small claims arising along the line of the Intercolonial railway should be disposed of in this way. There was no thought of making any distinction between the Prince Edward Island railway and the Intercolonial railway as such. Later on, the phrase, "The Government Railways of Canada," was adopted by an amendment of the Act, but the intention of every one connected with the measure of 1910 was that a new policy should be laid down by which, instead of driving claimants to the Exchequer Court with all the expense and difficulty that would attend upon such a procedure, jurisdiction should be conferred upon the county courts along the line of railway, so that, in regard not merely to the Intercolonial railway but to all Government railways, these matters should be disposed of in that way. That is the history of the manner in which this measure was introduced, and I think the minister ought not to raise the technical point when it was a mere matter of phraseology that caused the Prince Edward Island railway to be omitted from the Act at that time.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Hughes:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Buchanan,	Marcile (Bagot),
Copp,	Michaud,
Delisle,	Nicholson,
Fortier,	Oliver,
Gauvreau,	Pacaud,
Graham,	Papineau,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),	Sinclair,
	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Lanctot,	Turgeon,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turriff,
Loggie,	Verville,
Macdonald,	Warnock.—24.
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong (Lambton),	L'Esperance,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Macdonell,
Ball,	Meighen,
Bennett (Calgary),	Merner,
Best,	Morphy,
Blain,	Morris,
Bowman,	Munson,
Boys,	Paquet,
Brabazon,	Porter,
Broder,	Reid,
Burnham,	Rhodes,
Clark (Bruce),	Roche,
Clarke (Wellington),	Rogers,
Currie,	Scott,
Descarries,	Sexsmith,
Edwards,	Smith,
Fisher,	Steele,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),	Stevens,
Foster (Sir George),	Stewart (Hamilton),
Girard,	Thompson (Yukon),
Glass,	Walker,
Gray,	Wallace,

Hartt,	Webster,
Henderson,	Weichel,
Levallée,	Wright.—50.

PAIRS:

Government.	Opposition:
Messieurs	
Alguire	McMillan
Arthurs	Truax
Baker	Kay
Barnard	McCraney
Boyce	German
Bristol	Bickerdike
Bradbury	Cruise
Burrell	Douglas
Casgrain	Lemieux
Chabot	Beland
Clements	Knowles
Crothers	McCoig
Davidson	Chisholm (Antigonish)
Doherty	Marcil
Fowler	McLean (Sunbury & Queens)
Green	White (Victoria)
Guilbault	Brouillard
Hazen	Pugsley
Hepburn	Molloy
Jameson	Power
Kemp	Robb
Lewis	Cash
McLeod	Carvell
Middlebro	Guthrie
McCurdy	Maclean (Halifax)
Nickle	Martin (Regina)
Rainville	Seguin
Sharpe	Ross
Smyth	Tobin
Stanfield	Pardee
Stewart (Lunenburg)	McKenzie
Taylor	Carroll
Tremain	Chisholm (Inverness)
White (Renfrew)	Devlin
Wilson (Wentworth)	Wilson (Laval)

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Not noticing the absence of my pair, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. McCurdy), I inadvertently voted, and I desire now to recall my vote.

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

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was paired with the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. SEGUIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Rainville). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Had I voted I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. DEVLIN: I was paired with the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. G. White). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McCOIG: I was paired with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was paired with the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Stewart). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was paired with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: I was paired with the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLES: I was paired with the hon. member for Comox-Atlin (Mr. Clements). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Amendment negatived:

Main motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Telegraph and telephone lines, Quebec—improvements to repair service, $3,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the Government still the owner of the telephone line in the county of Charlevoix running from a point near Murray Bay to Chicoutimi? If the minister will let me know how many miles of that line the Government controls. I shall then air a little grievance I have.

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the information here, but I can get it for my hon. friend. The Government have not sold any telephone lines for many years.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The reason I mention it is that a business man with whom I am more or less connected was complaining the other day that it was practically impossible to be heard on the long-distance line between Montreal and Chicoutimi, on account of a subsidiary line. As this subsidiary line does not belong to the Bell company I thought perhaps it was a Government line. It is really in bad order; I am not referring to the poles, but to the wire, which is not up to the long-distance standard. My hon. friend might perhaps inquire whether the line belonging to the

Government on the north shore below Quebec is in proper order, whether a report has been made lately concerning its inefficiency and whether repairs could not be made so as to facilitate business between Montreal, Quebec, and the Saguenay river. I have heard some people simply shrieking over the line from Montreal to Chicoutimi in order to make themselves heard, simply on account of the bad condition of the wire. I do not know that this is a Government line, but it is certainly not the Bell line, and I do not know of any subsidiary company. Perhaps my hon. friend will see what can be done to improve matters.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend will appreciate that it is impossible for me to give him any information at the moment, but I shall be very glad to inquire into the matter.

Harbours and rivers, Saskatchewan and Alberta—Sturgeon river improvements, $9,500.

Mr. OLIVER: How much was spent on improvements in the Sturgeon river last year?

Mr. ROGER: We did not spend anything there last year. This amount is required for the removal of weeds and log jams, and the construction of a dam on the Sturgeon river. There is a growth of weeds in the Sturgeon river that requires to be removed, and also a log jam in the same river, in the vicinity of Devil's lake, Onoway, and Lac Ste. Anne that will also have to be removed in order to create a current and thereby reclaim hay lands for the settlers. The dam is proposed to be built about one mile east of St. Albert, a village on the Sturgeon river, and is for the purpose of raising the water in the river and in the Big Lake, a couple of miles west of the village, so that navigation for pleasure craft may be had at any time during the open season. The work is necessary in the interest of navigation on the Sturgeon river, which under the existing conditions is at a very great disadvantage, and it has been asked for by the district engineer.

Mr. OLIVER: Can the minister say how much money has been spent altogether upon this project up to the present time? He says that nothing was spent last year, but there have been expenditures in previous years.

Mr. ROGERS: I have no record before me of any expenditure on this particular work. There may be something in the department, but it was not last year nor the year before, or I would have had it before me.

Mr. OLIVER: There has been some expenditure on the same Sturgeon river, although it may have been under a different heading or have been given a different description. I had occasion to bring to the attention of the minister, by correspondence and also at a previous session, the complaints of certain farmers owning land along the stream whose fences had been taken down and whose bridges had been blown up by the officers or employees of the department in the work of improving the navigation. I supposed that this vote was simply a continuation of that work.

Mr. ROGERS: I have nothing to show that here, but I shall be glad to get the information from the department for the hon. gentleman; if there is any there at all. I will ask the deputy to send it to the hon. member.

Mr. OLIVER: The point is that there was money spent, I do not know what amount, on a project that, while we are all glad to see money spent in our constituencies, is unique in this, that while it purports, according to the statement made by the minister, to lower the level of the water in one lake in order to create hay land, it includes a project to raise the water in another lake, and thereby flood hay land, I presume to, at any rate, a corresponding degree. While I do not wish in any way to discourage the idea of money expenditure, especially in that particular constituency, I would respectfully suggest to the minister that he look into this matter somewhat carefully, and find if there is not some other place where an equal expenditure could be made with better results than draining the hay land of one lake and flooding the hay land of another. I would think that under all the circumstances it would be in the interest, not only of the treasury, but of the country, to leave the matter severely alone if there is no other object to be attained, and, I am bound to say, I do not know of any other object to be attained. I am aware that the people who own hay land at the outlet of lake Ste. Anne would be pleased to have that hay land drained by the lowering of the level of the water, but I am not at all sure that the people owning shore front on lake Ste. Anne at other points would be pleased to have the level of the water in the lake lowered, thereby giving them a frontage of mud, whereas at

the present time they have a frontage of water. The minister would be well advised to go over this whole project again, and, unless there is some better reason for it than has as yet been given, it would be well to leave it alone. I do not wish either to prevent the expenditure of money in the Edmonton constituency or to guard the Government against mistakes; but this is such an obvious case that I do not think I would be protecting myself if I did not take the opportunity of drawing attention to the fact that the proposal, as stated by the minister, is to drain the one lake and to raise the other, clearing hay land in the one case and flooding it in the other. My interest, of course, was principally in regard to the improvements which had been made to the course of the river in past years, and which had brought the officers of the department in collision with the owners of the land in connection with the matter of fences and bridges, and I wanted to know what the status of the project was, that is, whether the Government had still in mind the making of this little water course a channel by interfering with the rights of the farmers who owned land on both sides of it.

Mr. ROGERS: This is one of the items that we do not intend to spend during the coming year, so that we shall have plenty of time to look into the matter.

Mr. OLIVER: In that case I would certainly advise the minister to look carefully into it.

Mr. ROGERS: We will have another report made.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will the minister say how an item such as this appears in the estimates at all where apparently the member for the constituency thinks it an absolutely absurd manner of expending money? Can the minister say who applied to have the work done.

Mr. ROGERS: It was recommended by the district engineer at Edmonton.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have never before heard of such a proposal as the draining of land by the Dominion Government unless there is some question of navigation connected with it. It appears to me that the proposal is altogether irregular. It would be a different matter if the minister were embarking upon a project of draining all the swamps and low places in the country.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. ROGERS: The dam is proposed to be built about one mile east of St. Albert, a village on the Sturgeon river, and is for the purpose of raising the water in the river and in the Big Lake, a couple of miles west of the village, so that navigation for pleasure craft may be had at any time during the open season. The work is necessary in the interest of navigation on the Sturgeon river, which under the existing conditions is at a very great disadvantage, and it has been asked for by the district engineers. The estimated cost is $9,500. St. Albert village is located about ten miles north of Edmonton on Sturgeon river. The river and Big lake are a considerable attraction for campers and boating parties from Edmonton, and this attraction will probably be increased next summer, as a suburban electric railway has been built to St. Albert, and no doubt large industries will be established at Lake Ste. Anne. Both points are located in a well-settled farming district.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the report give the depth of the water?

Mr. ROGERS: I am just reading the report of the engineer.

Mr. NESBITT: Is the minister going to spend the money this year?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. NESBITT: In that case, what is the use of discussing it? I have a grove on my farm to which the people come very frequently. There is a river which is crooked, and it would be a great advantage if the minister would straighten it, so that the people could indulge in boating.

Mr. ROGERS: Will there be an electric railway there?

Mr. NESBITT: I will have one built. The people drive up in their motors and camp in the grove. I think the case is as good as the other one, only there are no weeds to pull up because the bullfrogs have got them all cut out.

Mr. OLIVER: With regard to the item of $3,500 for an office and dwelling at Dunvegan, is it the intention of the minister to place this office at the river bank, or where the present office is located?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $3,500 is required for the purchase of a site and the erection of an office at Dunvegan on the Peace river line. The estimated cost is $3,500. It is asked for by District Superintendent Macdonald who, in a telegram dated March 6, 1912, states as follows:

Present quarters at Dunvegan are inadequate; a building similar to one under construction at Grouard should be provided. As the cost of the material delivered would be somewhat higher, an appropriation of $3,500 would be required.

Superintendent R. C. Macdonald, in a letter dated Nov. 8, 1915, states the following:

Having reference to the appropriation of $3,500 for an office dwelling at Dunvegan, at the request of the Conservative Association permission was given to have this appropriation diverted to a building at Waterhole.

Nothing has been done; the matter stands.

Mr. OLIVER: This is not at all in the same class as the other expenditures that I was mentioning. There is a peculiar geographical condition there that I think attention ought to be drawn to. The valley of the river is about 800 feet deep. It is a navigable stream, and the stores of the Hudson Bay Company and Revillon Bros., the steamboat landing, of course, and the ferry crossing, are down at the river. The telegraph line crosses there, but the telegraph office is on the hill 800 feet above the river and a mile or two back from it. It is not as far away as Waterhole is, but unfortunately it is too inconveniently situated to be of any benefit to those navigating the river. I would be inclined to believe that the proper place for the telegraph office is at the river crossing, at the ferry, where it would be of convenience to the people crossing and going up and down the river. There is a rented telegraph office at Van Rena, eight miles or so from Dunvegan. This office is in charge of a farmer, who, I assume, gets a small salary for handling the business. With the office at Van Rena for the accommodation of the adjacent upland territory, and Waterhole being not inconveniently situated from there, if the Government is going to erect a permanent building the proper place would be in the river valley, at the ferry crossing, where the business places are located.

Mr. ROGERS: We will have that looked into.

Md. OLIVER: There is an office called Van Rena, is there not?

Mr. ROGERS: We have no note of that here.

Mr. OLIVER: It is a rented office. There are telegraphic facilities at Van Rena which serve a reasonable radius of upland country, extending, I suppose, as far as the place called Waterhole. There does not seem to be necessity for two offices so close together, especially when that leaves the valley without a telegraph office.

Mr. ROGERS: How far is the valley from Waterhole?

Mr. OLIVER: About five or six miles. It is the difference in level that has to be considered: what is on the hill is not convenient for anything in the valley and what is in the valley is not convenient for anything on the hill. To have two offices on the hill and none in the valley seems to be hardly a fair division.

Mr. ROGERS: I will have it looked into before we make any expenditure.

Mr. KNOWLES: I understand that when the shortage of money occurring by reason of the war was fully impressed on the Government, they did not enter into any new contracts for the erection of public buildings. May I ask whether that policy was put in force decisively and in clean-cut fashion as of one date throughout all Canada, or was it put in force at one time in some places, and later in others?

Mr. ROGERS: When war broke out we did not decide definitely not to go on with public buildings for some time, but as conditions grew more pressing and as our expenditure in connection with the increased number of troops recruited at various places kept creeping up, we kept on refusing more largely, every day almost, the extension of public buildings. I do not know that there was any specific date, but in the year 1915, the latter part of it, at all events, we were very definite in our refusals to go on with any public buildings.

Mr. KNOWLES: With regard to tenders that were in a few days prior to the breaking out of war, were these accepted and contracts closed?

Mr. ROGERS: We had a number of tenders in; a large number of them we did not go on with. Wherever we could possibly find an excuse for not proceeding with the work, we have not gone on with it. Wherever there was evidence that the locality could get along without it, we have delayed the expenditure.

Mr. KNOWLES: That policy was put in force, then, to a degree, at any rate, from the hour that war broke out?

Mr. ROGERS: Not so much in 1914. We did not then think that the war was going to be so serious.

Mr. KNOWLES: With regard to tenders that were in, say, by the first of August, before war broke out, were they all accepted and the contracts closed?

Mr. ROGERS: Oh, no, they were not all accepted.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not understand, then, how the minister can say that it was not until after end of 1914 that there was any embargo on the construction of public buildings.

Mr. ROGERS: Well, there was a considerable embargo, but not so complete as it was made later.

Mr. KNOWLES: I suppose where the hon. minister found the pressure of his friends or his enemies to be strong enough, he went on with the work; otherwise he did not.

Mr. ROGERS: We do not do that sort of thing.

Mr. KNOWLES: I would not think any less of the minister if he did. We are all human, and the minister is not yet ready for wings. If that was not the guiding star, then what was? In some places work was gone on with despite the war, until the pressure became so strong that a general policy was adopted. What was the guiding principle during this transition stage, if it was not political influence or anything of that kind, as the minister says?

Mr. ROGERS: We were guided by the position of each locality and the necessity for public buildings. Very few public buildings have been gone on with since the outbreak of the war. In some cases tenders had been called for and contracts let, and we were perhaps more considerate of those than of others where tenders had not been called for. But there has been no definite or fixed rule.

Mr. OLIVER: I see two items here—Grand Prairie office, $3,500, and Dunvegan office, $3,500. Is it the intention of the Government to make any expenditure at either of these offices this year?

Mr. ROGERS: We have an idea that we should go ahead with them. They are marked as items to be proceeded with, and there is a pressing necessity for them.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister said that they were considerate of those buildings for which tenders were called before the war. I take the case of the Prince Rupert public building. Tenders were to close in June, but the time was extended for some reason and the contract was not let. The time for receiving tenders, as originally set, expired early in the summer. This was an important building, to cost somewhere between $60,000 and $90,000. A very large sum has been expended for a site, such as it is, and the minister is paying out money every month to pump the water from it so that he will not be sued for damages for maintaining a nuisance. Why was that building stopped?

Mr. ROGERS: Of course, it is not the only one. But let us take Prince Rupert as a fair sample. That would be one of the first places where we would delay construction, because the population is not very large and is of rather a floating character; and when war broke out the population became rapidly less. So I think we were perfectly justified in delaying the construction of a public building there, under present circumstances.

Mr. KNOWLES: Could the minister let us have a list of the cases in which at the time of the outbreak of the war tenders were called for and not accepted, and have not since been accepted, and the other cases where tenders were in and were accepted despite the war?

Mr. ROGERS: I think we could get a statement of that sort.

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 96, for the relief of David Whimster Rhodes—Mr. Boys—read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Mr. OLIVER: At six o'clock I asked the minister if it was the intention of the department to proceed with the construction of dwellings and offices at Grand Prairie and Dunvegan. I understood him to say

that these were expenditures that were listed to be made?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice that the amounts are similar in the three columns, and that is why I asked whether the expenditures were to be made. Grand Prairie may now be considered a fixed point. The railroad has been built to Grand Prairie City, which certainly seems to be a proper and desirable place at which to establish permanent office accommodation for the government telegraphs. The Dunvegan Railway Company are not, I understand, establishing a commercial telegraph system. They propose to operate by telephone, which leaves the commercial business for the government lines. Therefore, it seems quite in order, now that Grand Prairie City has become a railroad point, and indeed, a railroad terminus, that the Government should make that expenditure upon permanent offices there.

At six o'clock I was speaking with regard to Dunvegan. The situation there is not at all the same as at Grand Prairie. The office, as at present situated, is entirely inconvenient. It is not convenient for anybody, and it is a Government building. It is not a large building, though quite adequate for present purposes, but it is not conveniently situated; it was placed where it is now, I think, in promotion of townsite speculation, which, of course, has fallen entirely flat. At the moment, there is no railroad development on the north side of the Peace river, and, until there is railroad accommodation, permanent points of business cannot be established. Therefore, it would seem to me that, unless there was plenty of money available to meet all demands, it would hardly be the part of wisdom to make an expenditure for a permanent establishment at a point that might in the end, and within a year or two, be left aside from railroad facilities which might be established nearby. There is a prospect of railroad construction on the north side of the Peace; it is a prospect which we hope will be realized, but it is not an immediate prospect, and, until it becomes a definite prospect, it would seem to me to be hardly wise to make a large expenditure on a permanent building at a place that might practically be of no value after the railroad was constructed.

I have this suggestion to make to the minister. For the time being telegraph facilities can be maintained without any larger permanent expenditure than has been made at present. On the north side of the river there is as I have said a toll office at Van Rena. I do not know whether there is an office at Waterhole. There is an office at the top of the hill overlooking Dunvegan where it is not convenient for any body, and there is no office at the fort in the valley where the Hudson Bay and Revillon Bros. are. That could be established as a toll office without going to any capital expenditure, waiting the time when, by the construction of the railroad, permanent centres of business on the north side of the river will be established.

By reason of railway construction, a new centre of business has been established on the south side of the river, that is to say Spirit river. Spirit river is practically at the junction of the Grand Prairie branch with the main line of the Dunvegan railway. For the time being, it is the terminus of the main line of the Dunvegan railway. It is situated about 15 miles south of Dunvegan itself, in the centre of a very fertile piece of country, and is rapidly becoming a business centre. Of course, if the minister has plenty of money to spend north of the river as well, I would be very glad, and would not like to put any restriction upon the expenditure. But if he has only $3,500 to spend on permanent telegraph accommodation in that vicinity, I would certainly suggest that Spirit river, having become an important railroad point, is the place that should receive that accommodation at the present time. It has become a fixed centre of business by reason of railway construction, and therefore the minister could rest thoroughly assured that an expenditure made at that point would be of permanent value and would not by any possible chance be left as it were on the side track and of little value in proportion to the expenditure made. I urge the building of an office at Grand Prairie. I suggest the giving of accommodation at the actual site of the fort of Dunvegan in the river valley, and that any permanent expenditure of this character be made at Spirit river.

Mr. ROGERS: I quite appreciate the importance and the immediate necessity of providing a building at Grand Prairie by reason of its definite location and of the definite condition existing there. I agree in great measure with what my hon. friend says regarding the location at Dunvegan, by reason of the fact that apparently it is not a definite centre yet. There are Water-

hole and the Crossing, two points which might have temporary accommodation. As far as Spirit river is concerned, if my hon. friend will look at the Supplementary Estimates that came down to-day he will see that we are providing for a building there for immigration, and I was in hopes that we would be able to use a portion of it, temporarily at all events, for the telegraph and telephone services. It will supply the needs of Spirit river this year, at all events, or until we are able to go on with something more permanent. As far as Dunvegan is concerned, we will not spend any money unless we are able to locate at a point that is going to be a definite centre for all time to come, something we have not been able to do up to the present moment. So far as Grand Prairie is concerned, we are going ahead. At Spirit river we will go ahead with the immigration building and find accommodation temporarily for the office there. In the meantime we will not settle anything with respect to Dunvegan.

Mr. OLIVER: If it is possible to make arrangements to have an office at the site of the old Dunvegan fort, which is in the valley of the river, it will be an advantage. I do not urge the building of an office, but now that the railway has actually reached Peace river at the Crossing, there will be a large amount of navigation up and down, in the promotion of settlement, and it would be a great convenience to have the facilities of an office at the river instead of up on the hill, 800 feet high and two or three miles back, where there is no particular reason for it.

I desire to call the minister's attention to another matter. There is a Government telegraph line from Edmonton to Athabaska and from Athabaska a branch line to Edmondville and Lac la Biche. That branch line, I think only extends to Lac la Biche Mission. Since that line was projected the Waterways railway line has been constructed. This railway is to have its first divisional point north of Edmonton, on the Hudson bay property at Lac la Biche, which is a considerable number of miles distant from the Lac la Biche Mission. The Government telegraph line that runs from the town of Athabaska to Lac la Biche Mission might very well be carried on a few extra miles to Lac la Biche railway station. That line would then be in a position to get whatever commercial business would arise at Lac la Biche and no doubt a very considerable amount of business will arise there. Under ordinary circumstances the railway company would establish a commercial telegraph system but I understand that is not their intention as they intend to operate by telephone and do not contemplate establishing a telegraph line. In that way the Government line would have whatever business there was at this now presently important and, in the near future, very much more important point. There is a minimum service being rendered by the line, which, as I understand, at present extends north of Plamondonville and Lac la Biche.

Mr. ROGERS: How many miles would that be?

Mr. OLIVER: Not more than ten miles at the outside. It would give a maximum service on a minimum extra capital expenditure. I would urge that upon the minister's best consideration. It is an extension that might be made at any time.

Mr. ROGERS: I have not heard of the desired extension mentioned by my hon. friend but I will get a report from the department and see whether it is possible to do it. We have no special vote for it and as this is only 8 or 10 miles we might be able to provide for it.

Mr. OLIVER: That was my idea. In regard to the McMurray telegraph line, I take it for granted that it is the intention to operate that line continuously now that it has been completed.

Mr. ROGERS: The Fort McMurray line —yes.

Mr. OLIVER: What are the points at which operators are to be maintained along the line between Athabaska and McMurray?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid I have not that information here. My deputy will send it to my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: If it will be convenient the deputy might send it to me privately.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

British Columbia mainland telegraph and telephone lines—general repairs and improvements, $14,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: There was nothing under this item last year.

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required for repairs and improvements to the mainland telegraph and telephone lines as follows:

Resetting poles Kamloops to Merritt 61 miles	$ 2,000
Douglas Lake line, 5 miles of poles required on this line which was run on fence posts when constructed in 1913	600
Rebuilding line from Fairview to Princeton, 64 miles. (Reset two years ago but must be rebuilt next year)	9,000
General repairs Kamloops-Vernon 75 miles	700
Resetting poles and general repairs on Marron Lake spur 10 miles	300
General repairs on Nakusp Edgewood line 57 miles	500
Extension across North Thompson river to Black Pines	300
Resetting poles and general repairs on Lumby line 16 miles east of Vernon.	600
	$14,000

Public Works — miscellaneous—Architectural Branch—salaries of architects, clerk of works, inspectors, draughtsmen, clerks, and messengers of outside service, $60,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that outside of the Civil Government staff?

Mr. ROGERS: That is outside of the Civil Government staff.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is the chief architect under this heading?

Mr. ROGERS: Chief Architect Horwood.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does he not come under the Civil Government vote?

Mr. ROGERS: These are his outside officers. Take, for instance, Charlottetown, P.E.I.: J. J. Macduff, $800.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many people would there be on that staff?

Mr ROGERS: Thirty-one.

Mr. GRAHAM: What position does our old friend, Mr. Ewart, hold?

Mr. ROGERS: He is consulting architect for the whole thing—our general walking boss. He has been of great service to us this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has not Mr. Ewart prepared and submitted a plan for the Parliament building?

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Ewart has been of great assistance to the architects in the preparation of the plans, and has given them ideas that to my mind are very valuable. He also prepared a sketch plan, some of which at all events has been used. The architects consider that he has been of very great assistance. He has done splendid service in every way.

Public Works—miscellaneous — Engineering Branch—salaries of engineers, inspectors, superintendents, draughtsmen, clerks and messengers of outside service, $435,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How big a staff is that?

Mr. ROGERS: There are 280 on the staff. It includes engineers all over Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is the staff of engineers looking after public works all over the Dominion?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, and the vote is the same as last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are building inspectors included in this staff?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: They would be in the outside service. I do not mean special inspectors.

Mr. ROGERS: This vote has to do with harbours and rivers, and has nothing at all to do with inspectors on public buildings.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: How many engineers are in the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. ROGERS: There are five districts there. The one I can recall at the moment are North Sydney, Halifax and Shelburne.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: I notice in the Auditor General's report for the year ending March 31, 1915, that the cost of the office at Antigonish was $14,689.18, and the one at North Sydney $11,593.64, or a total of $26,282.82. In 1909 and 1910 there was one office for the Island of Cape Breton and the counties of Antigonish, Pictou and Guysborough, the office for the whole district being in Antigonish. A few years ago another office was established at North Sydney. I find that for the year 1909 the total cost for the whole district of the Island of Cape Breton and the counties of Antigonish, Pictou and Guysborough was $8,409.68 (p. 310-V Auditor General's Report). For the year 1910 the cost was $10,384.86, and for 1911 $13,632.80. The average cost for the whole district for the three years 1909, 1910 and 1911 was $10,782.45. The cost for the whole district at the present time—there are now two resident engineers' offices in the district—is $26,282.82, an increase of over 150 per cent. It is well known that during the years 1909, 1910 and 1911 the engineers in that district were kept pretty busy; wharves, breakwaters, and harbours required a great deal of attention and there was a large amount of work to be done. In those years, when business was booming and work was being carried on, the

average yearly cost was only $10,782.45, while the cost in the last year for which we have the Auditor General's report and during which, as the Estimates show, there has been practically no work done in the counties I have referred to in the way of improvements to harbours, wharves, breakwaters and such like, has been $26,282.82. I should like the minister to explain how it is that the cost has gone up so enormously, while the work has been going down practically to a minimum? There has been really nothing for the engineers to do; the breakwaters and wharves are allowed to tumble into the dock, and yet the cost has increased. As there has been no new work the engineers could simply turn in the same reports they made the year before. I should like the minister to explain how it is that the expense of looking after that section of the country last year,—$26,282.82—when there was no work doing, is so very much greater than the average cost for the three years 1909, 1910 and 1911, when a great deal of work was being done?

Mr. ROGERS: The increase is due to the fact that shortly after this Government came into power a new district was formed at North Sydney. Prior to that, the North Sydney district was looked after by the engineers stationed at Antigonish. This new district formed about 1911, accounts largely for the increased expenditure to which my hon. friend has referred.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM: I could readily understand that the fitting up of buildings and offices and the cost of heating and lighting them would cause an increase, but the expenses I have referred to have nothing at all to do with the buildings. I am referring to an increase in the salaries and expenses of the engineers when they are out on duty. When two offices were opened it was only natural to expect that the number of engineers and assistants in each office would be very much smaller than when there was only one office. They surely would not have to double the staff simply because they opened a new office. For the district attended to by the engineer for Antigonish, we will say, that is, the counties of Antigonish, Pictou and Guysborough, surely not such a large staff would be required as was required to look after those three counties and the whole island of Cape Breton as well. But the fact is that the office at Antigonish alone cost $14,689.18 last year, as against an average for the three years 1909, 1910, and 1911, of $10,782.45, before the change was made. One would suppose that when the two districts were created and the two offices established, the expenses of the Antigonish office would have fallen off very considerably, as the territory to be looked after was not nearly so large, and the work had been reduced practically to a minimum. Instead of that we find that the cost of the North Sydney office alone was $11,593.64 or more by $1,000 than the cost of the Antigonish office when it attended to the whole island of Cape Breton as well as the three counties of Antigonish, Pictou and Guysborough. So the explanation of the minister cannot be accepted as explaining this increase. To recapitulate, when the whole island of Cape Breton and the three counties of Antigonish, Pictou and Guysborough were under one engineering district, with a central office at Antigonish, the average cost previous to 1911 was $10,782.45. In 1911 the district was divided and two offices were established.

We find that the cost of the Antigonish office alone was $14,689.18 last year, or nearly 50 per cent more than when the whole island of Cape Breton was attached to the Antigonish office. We find, also, that the cost of the North Sydney office of looking after the island of Cape Breton alone was $11,593.64, or nearly $1,000 more than the average cost when it was all in one district. The explanation of the minister is unsatisfactory in that regard. Surely an increase of 150 per cent should not take place.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend can readily understand that when you establish a new district the engineers in charge of that district feel themselves as important as the old ones, and look for the same condition of affairs, and, of course, there is naturally a large increase as soon as a new district equal to the old one is established. That accounts, so far as I can see, for the increased cost. I have not before me the detailed figures which my hon. friend appears to have, because I have not had occasion to look the matter up.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: Will the minister explain to what extent the salary of the resident engineer was increased when he took charge at North Sydney, as compared with the salary he was receiving

when he was assistant engineer at Antigonish?

Mr. ROGERS: We do not appear to have the details of any increases. The chief engineer at Antigonish gets $2,700; the chief engineer at North Sydney gets $2,500.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What did the latter get when he was assistant engineer at Antigonish?

Mr. ROGERS: We are not sure about that. The deputy thinks he got $2,100.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That is an increase of only $400, and yet the total increase is, as I have stated, $16,000. The fact of the matter is that the office at North Sydney and the office at Antigonish are filled with office-seekers irrespective of what work there is to be done. The office at Antigonish has to-day more employees than it had when that office had to look after the whole island of Cape Breton and the counties to which I referred. The office at North Sydney has to-day as many employees as Mr. Milledge had when he had charge of the whole district. They fill the office with office-seekers irrespective of the necessities of the case.

Mr. ROGERS: Probably you were not doing the same amount of work then.

Mr. CHISHOLM: There is no work to be done there. As the minister knows, they are doing nothing. The amount of money spent in Antigonish, Guysborough, and Pictou counties, outside of East River, Pictou, is a negligible quantity, and has been for the last two or three years. They did not require all that staff. Assistants and assistants were appointed when they were really not needed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In Guysborough county not a blow has been struck for the last four years.

Mr. ROGERS: A lot of money has been spent.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Not a single dollar has been spent in Guysborough county on public works during the last four years. Only one wharf has been built since this administration took office, and that has been humbugged so that it is of no use. The site was changed so that the boats could not reach the wharf on account of there not being a sufficient depth of water. That is the only thing that the department during the present Administration has done in my constituency, which forms a large part of this territory. I sympathize with the attitude taken by my hon. friend, although the trouble is not confined to the offices in eastern Nova Scotia. I pointed out the other day that it was general throughout the Dominion, and I gave the statistics supplied by the department itself showing that, taking the whole Dominion, the increase in the staff is enormous. The minister has not yet justified that increase and I question if he can.

Mr. ROGERS: I have no recollection of my hon. friend ever presenting any desire on the part of the people of Guysborough for the expenditure of any money by the Public Works Department.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am afraid my hon. friend's memory is not good.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend the other night undertook to support the statement of the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I., (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in respect to increased expenditure, additional staff, and so on, but I did not then have the figures before me. I took occasion, however, to look up the matter in order to see what justification there was for the statements made by those two hon. members and one or two more, and I shall be very glad to supply my hon. friend with the information in order that he may better understand the administration of the Department of Public Works which he undertakes to condemn. During the last three years of the late Government, 1909-10, 1910-11, 1911-12, $330,000 was spent in Prince Edward Island. It is true that a certain increase has taken place in the number of employees, but during the three years, 1912-13, 1913-14 and 1914-15, we have spent in Prince Edward Island $764,178.59 or $434,178.59 more than was spent in the three previous years. My hon. friend from Kings said the other night that they had only one man in the office of Mr. Hegan. I have looked up the record and I find that at that time there was a Mr. Hegan, a Mr. Hyndman, a Mr. Miller, a Mr. White and a Mr. Matthews, or five men. We were condemned the other night because we had eight employees during the last three years, although the increased expenditure in that province for that period amounted to $434,178.59, which, I am sure my hon. friend will agree, justifies the appointment of two or three additional employees. I desire to be fair in the statements which I make in respect to the department, and I always endeavour to give hon. gentlemen opposite full and complete information. I have not the in-

formation which my hon. friend from Antigonish has asked for to-night, but as in the case of my hon. friend from Kings, P.E.I., I shall be glad to look the matter up, and I venture to say I shall be able to supply him with a statement that will justify the department and the statements that I have made. I am sure my hon. friend from Guysborough understands the necessity of increased help when one is spending $434,178.59 additional to assist in the betterment of conditions in a province like Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not familiar with the expenditures in Prince Edward Island, and I am not in a position to discuss them; but it seems to be useless to appeal to the minister for economy or for reduced expenditure, because he is actually boasting that in the last three years he has spent over $400,000 more in Prince Edward Island than was spent by the former Administration in the previous three years. He looks upon it as a creditable thing to have done during the hard times when it was found difficult to borrow money. I think his memory must be short in regard to the other matter to which I referred, because I have frequently asked him for improvements along the coast line of my constituency. I made an appeal to him in this House not more than two or three days ago in regard to the wharf at Cole harbour, and I did my best to induce him to spend money that had been voted by the former Administration and had been kept standing ever since, although the public work at that place is very much needed.

I have not bothered the minister very much about public works, but I have presented several requests to him, and have always failed to move him. So far as my constituency is concerned, I see no necessity of keeping a large staff at Antigonish or anywhere else as long as the minister maintains the attitude that he and his party have maintained in regard to expenditures in my constituency; that is, they are not making any. The minister has not given any explanation as to the large increase in his staff throughout the Dominion. The figures as to the staff of the Public Works Department, which were furnished, I assume, by that department, showed last year an increase of some 700 employees since the present Government took office. If you allowed these 700 new employees a salary of $1,000 each, that means $700,000 a year which is taken from the people of this country in order to find places for friends of the Administration. Everyone knows that the expenditures in the Public Works Department during the last two or three years have been very small indeed in the Maritime Provinces. The items are kept standing from year to year and almost nothing is done; in the meantime, the number of employees has enormously increased. Can there be any justification, after making allowance for dismissals, deaths and superannuations, for an increase in the staff to the extent of 700 persons? I do not think there can be. $700,000 is a very large sum of money to add to the yearly expenditure of one department.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: The minister has certainly the virtue of consistency. It is not surprising to members of Committee that he should boast of the increased expenditure in Prince Edward Island. As against $11,807,035 expended in 1910-11 under the late Government, $29,283,316 was expended in 1914-15, during eight months of which there was war. Undoubtedly that is an enormous increase. You find also that there was an increase of $1,291,979 in the expenditure of the year 1914-15 over that of the year 1913-14. The minister, therefore, is quite consistent so far as expenditures are concerned; he has a right to boast of how he makes the money fly. I do not want to be in the same position as the hon. member for Guysborough; I do not want the minister to taunt me hereafter by saying that we did not ask for appropriations in Antigonish county. We realize that the war is on and if the minister practices economy in every other part of the country, we are quite satisfied if during these critical times we are denied the conveniences that are afforded by wharves and breakwaters, but we expect to be treated as other parts of the country are treated. I may remind the minister that on December 28, 1912, when he wrote a letter through his secretary to the man in charge of the patronage in Antigonish country, he promised that an expenditure of $200,000 would be made in that county. He has not kept that promise. The money has not been expended; the same items have been in the Estimates year after year. The people have been waiting patiently, longingly, hopefully, I was going to say—no, they have lost all hope. They have come to the conclusion that the minister intended to use this letter merely for election purposes—there was a by-election on in the constituency at that time.

If the minister has money to expend I would remind him that he is in honour bound to redeem that pledge that he made. It is true that it amounts to $16 per head of the population of Antigonish and to about $85 per voter. Although that is a large amount, the minister promised it; the pledge is there. The letter reads:

> Your letter of the 24th instant, addressed to the Minister of Public Works, received, and in accordance with your request I am enclosing you herewith a list of the items which have been placed in the Supplementary Estimates for Antigonish county for 1913-14.

It is true that the Supplementary Estimates were not prepared at that time or for some months afterwards. It is true that the main Estimates were not prepared at that time; yet that letter was sent broadcast all over the country and there were people who believed that the minister was sincere in making that promise. Practically nothing has been spent; the promise has not been kept. The minister told me the other evening that it was not the intention to spend any money down there this year. The same was the case last year and the year before, these items were in the Estimates, but not a dollar was spent. I make a modest demand that the minister carry out his pledge, and I hope that I shall not be taunted as the member for Guysborough has been taunted on the ground that he did not ask for anything. I would ask the minister to refer to the letter which he wrote; he will find the items there. I have no doubt that he recognized the propriety of the expenditure, or he would not have made the promise that he did on that occasion.

Mr. ROGERS: The statement of my hon. friend is additional evidence of my great regard for the representations of hon. members in the House. Shortly after the letter to which my hon. friend refers was written, when the House reassembled, such strong opposition was presented by the member for Antigonish in regard to these items that I hesitated and am hesitating still. Judging from the statements made by the hon. member on that occasion, I felt that a mistake had been made.

Mr. GRAHAM: In writing the letter.

Mr. ROGERS: If any person is to blame, I am sure that my hon. friend will be willing to share the blame with me in respect to expenditure in Antigonish county. He dealt with the matter so fully during the session after that famous letter was written that great care has been exercised to see that no expenditures should be made that would grate upon the feelings of the hon. gentleman or disappoint him in his desires and hopes as the official representative of the constituents in that county. I think that my hon. friend will be good enough to share at least to some extent the blame in respect to the non-fulfilment of the promise made at that time.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: I am surprised that the hon. minister should take the course that he has taken. He adopted the same course in replying to the remarks that I made in 1913 on this question. It would be called, in common parlance, a bluff, but the bluff did not work on that occasion. Let me quote the words I then used, so that we may see how much justification there is for the statement of the hon. minister that I threw cold water on the proposition to have these moneys expended. I quote from Hansard:

> It is quite true that these items amount to a large sum in bulk even without taking into consideration the dredging and other repairs referred to in that letter. These supplementary estimates alone amount to $195,000—$16 for every man, woman and child in the county, or $81 for every vote polled in the election. It is true these sums bulk large. But, as I have pointed out, if those had been voted and expended last year or the year before as they should have been, the vote would not have bulked so large in the estimates of this year. But that is not the question; you should not consider what it amounts to for each individual, what you should consider is: Are these works necessary and proper? I submit that these works should be built. Let me ask the minister then, that when the estimates are brought down every one of these items will be found there and that the money will be spent. It is right and proper that the money should be voted and spent. He owes that to the people; he owes it to himself; he owes it to the reputation of Senator Girroir. It is true that the Conservative workers in that county had to drink a cup of humiliation that was filled to the brim. If the Minister of Public Works wishes to give an antidote to the political poison these people had to drink, he will see to it that all those items are provided for in the estimates.

Is that language that indicates that I was opposed to the expenditure of these moneys? On the contrary did I not endorse every single one of the items and ask the minister to spend the appropriation? I urged and importuned the minister to spend the money, and yet he stands up this evening and in that calm, bland, assuring way of his, states that in deference to my remarks in regard to these Estimates, he did not expend them. Is that not the most absurd thing you ever heard of?

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not here the other night when the Public Works Estimates were up. Would the minister tell me the position of the work on the East river, and whether the depth of water in the upper lock is sufficient to permit vessels to pass up to Trenton and New Glasgow, or whether there is any change in the plans?

Mr. ROGERS: There is no change in the plans. Vessels will be able to go up to New Glasgow. There is some dredging to be done at the entrance and on the way up to the point where we are now preparing for the lock gates. My hon. friend will see an item in the Supplementary Estimates which finishes all the work. Tenders are being called for the lock gates.

Mr. MACDONALD: Were not the tenders called for some time ago?

Mr. ROGERS: A short time ago, but they have not yet been considered.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the minister expect the work to be completed this year?

Mr. ROGERS: That is our intention and our hope.

Mr. MACDONALD: And this vote in the Supplementaries of $66,000 is to complete it?

Mr. ROGERS: Completes everything.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the work, when completed, include a channel to deep water and the construction of locks to enable vessels to be taken up to the town of Trenton? Is that the general scope of the work?

Mr. ROGERS: As I understand it, it includes a channel as far up as New Glasgow.

Mr. MACDONALD: Trenton is not as far up as that.

Mr. ROGERS: It is to go to New Glasgow.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where is the dredging to be done?

Mr. ROGERS: At the entrance. I know there was a report the other day that there was a necessity for some dredging, but not a very large amount.

Mr. MACDONALD: Nothing has been done in the way of improvements farther up the river, above the town of Trenton. The dredging of which my hon. friend speaks is below the locks, and in order to facilitate the entrance to the locks from the deeper water of the harbour.

9 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: That is correct.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is there any proposition to go on and dredge the river from Trenton up to New Glasgow, which is above where the improvements are now being made?

Mr. ROGERS: I was not aware that any dredging was required between Trenton and New Glasgow. We have not with us the report which we had the other evening, but I shall be glad to send my hon. friend a copy of it.

Monument of His Late Majesty King Edward VII, $10,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where does the minister intend to erect that monument?

Mr. ROGERS: It is proposed to erect it at the corner of the East block, overlooking Connaught place and the post office.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to congratulate my hon. friend and the Government upon the decision arrived at. The old rival of England, France, has erected in Paris and Nice, two cities which in his lifetime the late King Edward visited, and where he was facile princeps, if I may use the expression, monuments in his memory. His late Majesty was perhaps more beloved in France than in any other country in the world, although he was the most popular sovereign of his time. I may say that he was a benefactor to humanity, the father of the entente cordiale between France and England. It was just and fair that a monument should be erected in his memory in old France. The citizens of Montreal, a few months after his death, decided that a monument in his honour should adorn Phillips Square, and I am pleased to say that the artist on that occasion fairly exceeded his own reputation by giving us a splendid statue of the old King. It is a work of art which is admired by all who come to Montreal, and I am glad to learn that the Dominion Government have decided to have this statue erected at a very central place, so that the sight of that monument may be a real inspiration for all Canadians who love France, who love England, and who love Canada and the British Crown.

Mr. ROGERS: I am very pleased indeed to endorse all that the hon. member has said, and to join with him in the view that the name of our late honoured King

Edward should never be mentioned in any assembly without the highest possible feeling of respect and admiration for the great services he rendered to the Empire and to the world. I am glad to say that I was one of those present at the unveiling of the monument in Phillips Square, Montreal, and certainly I appreciate the great work that was done by the artist in preparing that monument. It is a credit to the artist and to the city of Montreal, and a source of pride to all who realize the importance of cherishing the memory of our late beloved King Edward. I am glad to know that the location which we have selected for the monument in Ottawa is one which meets with the approval of my hon. friend. I trust that we shall have the same success that they had in Montreal, and shall have a monument that will be a credit to the city of Ottawa and to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the minister going to ask Canadian artists to tender for this monument?

Mr. ROGERS: We have had a competition already, and Mr. Allward has the contract.

Construction and operation of water storage dams on the Ottawa river and tributaries, surveys in connection therewith, and settlement of land damages, $115,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would ask the minister if the work of providing storage dams upon the upper Ottawa and its tributaries has been successful. When the project was started I was Minister of Public Works and I took a very great interest in the work, believing it would be of great advantage. I would like to know whether my expectations have been realized, and whether the dams have had the effect of steadying the flow in the Ottawa and of giving a greater depth of water during the dry season, which was one of the principal objects of the undertaking.

Mr. NESBITT: Will the minister explain what these storage dams are for?

Mr. ROGERS: They are for the purpose of storing surplus water.

Mr. NESBITT: For drinking purposes?

Mr. ROGERS: No. For the navigation of the Ottawa river it is necessary to store the water from the heavy freshets and preserve it in order to have continuous navigation on the river.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And for increasing the water-power on the Ottawa.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, for increasing the water-power also. I am glad to be able to inform my hon. friend from St. John that the arrangement made some years ago has proved very satisfactory. We have had continuous navigation that would not otherwise have been possible. I look upon this as a splendid work, which has rendered great service to the city of Ottawa especially, and to transportation and navigation on the Ottawa river.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very glad to hear that. It is a matter of great importance.

Mr. HUGHES: A few evenings ago, when the Estimates of the Department of Public Works were under consideration, I pointed out to the minister the large increase in his staff that had taken place in Prince Edward Island. He said he was under the impression that the department there was doing far more work now than it did some years ago, and that he would have a statement prepared, a copy of which he would give to me. I understand that the minister has already referred to that matter tonight, but I happened to be out of the Chamber at the time, and perhaps he would kindly send me a copy of the statement.

Mr. ROGERS: I will do so.

International Commission, river St. John, N.B., $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is this about finished?

Mr. ROGERS: This finishes it. I presented the report to the House the other night.

The National Gallery of Canada, including the purchase of paintings by the Board of Trustees, $25,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister intend to spend this amount this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Not if we can help it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not think there is very much need for buying paintings for this gallery at the present time, or during the ensuing year.

Monument to Lady Latour at St. John—contribution, $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is evidently an error in the title given to Madame Latour. I think that "Madame" should be substituted for "Lady." She was undoubtedly a lady, but she had no such title.

Mr. ROGERS: I beg to move that the word "Madame" be substituted for the word "Lady."

Motion agreed to.

Georgian Bay Ship Canal Royal Commission, $25,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would ask the minister to see that the interim report on the Georgian Bay canal is translated into French. The reason why I suggest that is that the people of Montreal, and in the Montreal district generally, are very much interested in that project. I am quite sure that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Descarries) has received many requests for it from his constituents, who take a great deal of interest in that project. The sooner we have the translation the better.

Mr. ROGERS: I am glad that my hon. friend has mentioned that matter. I quite appreciate the necessity of printing the Georgian Bay Canal Report in French. The deputy minister informs me that we have already provided for French copies.

Telegraph and telephone lines—Saskatchewan, $44,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I have the minister's permission tc revert to a little matter in connection with the northern telegraph lines again. I just wish to say that there is a system of Government telegrapn lines extending in the north country long distances. Of course it is not a money making institution but these lines are of very great benefit in the development of the country, and one way in which their usefulness would be increased would be as a means of transmitting news from these outlying points to the business centres. The suggestion I take the opportunity of offering the minister is that he arrange a rate on press messages from points on the Government system in the north that would be less burdensome than that prevailing at the present time. There is, I believe, a reduced rate for news matter but it is on a basis that makes it decidedly too burdensome to be carried out. It must be understood that news from Fort McMurray or Fort St. John will not carry as heavy a tariff as news from New York or the seat of war. It has to do with matters of trifling general importance, although of very great importance to the people interested and of very great importance in the development of the country, but still not of such importance that a newspaper could afford to pay a very large amount for the use of the lines. These lines are not overworked and it would be undoubtedly in the interest of the greater usefulness of the system, of the development of the country and the bettering of the conditions generally, if a press rate proportioned to the conditions were established so that the people on the outside could have the advantage of knowing what was going on in the north, thereby circulating interesting news, advertising the north country, drawing attention to it and promoting its settlement.

Mr. ROGERS: We have such a rate as my hon. friend suggests in connection with the Yukon service. This was brought to my attention a short time ago, and I have already taken the matter up with Mr. Keeley, the head of the telegraph department, with a view of trying to adopt a similar plan in the Peace river and north country, where we have our telegraph and telephone lines. I will take it up to-morrow, and urge that the suggestion of my hon. friend shall be carried out far as it is possible, because I think it is very desirable in war time that they should have a service up there in order to get the news as rapidly and cheaply as possible. We will do everything we can to meet that situation.

Mr. OLIVER: Has an office been put in at Beaver Lodge on the line from lake Saskatoon to St. John and Hudson's Hope?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not remember that. My deputy will find out and let my hon. friend know.

Mr. OLIVER: When I was there last summer, although the wire passes through the settlement, in which there is a store, post office, blacksmith shop and an illustration station of the Department of Agriculture and which is to a certain extent the nucleus of a village with a very prosperous settlement, there was no telegraph office and the people had to go 20 miles to the nearest office at lake Saskatoon and much further in the other direction. If an office has not been established there I would urge that the matter be taken up. I am sure that an arrangement could be made with some of the local people to take the office and it would be a very great convenience to the people of the settlement and be of great use in the promotion of settlement in that area.

Mr. ROGERS: We will take note of it.

Mr. OLIVER: It is a very important settlement in the Peace river country and it forms the western part of the Grand Prairie settlement which is about 25 or 30 miles west of Grand Prairie city. It is on the line of telegraph from lake Sask. atoon to Pouce-Coupé, St. John and Hudson's Hope.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: I rise to supplement the remarks made by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and to say that I took that matter up with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works some time ago, and that he was good enough to assist us in getting a war news service for the Yukon. It was very much appreciated, and in these outlying districts to which my hon. friend from Edmonton refers, we who live in cities, cannot appreciate the advantage of having the news from day to day over the wires operated by this Government. I am glad to know that my hon. friend from Edmonton is bringing this matter to the attention of the minister in behalf of the Mackenzie Valley because a news service of this kind will be very much appreciated in these outlying districts.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I see there is an increase in the Saskatchewan vote of $7,000.

Mr. ROGERS: New offices are being established and extensions made.

Mr. MARTIN: What I am trying to find out is whether there have been extensions to the line to the value of $7,000 over the Estimates of 1915-16. The cost of maintenance last year was $37,000, and this year we are voting $7,000 more for maintenance, and I want to know whether any new lines have been built.

Mr. ROGERS: We have now a central office in Saskatoon, whereas formerly Saskatchewan and Alberta were bulked together. We thought it wise to make this change.

Mr. HUGHES: There is an error in the statement the minister has sent me giving the number of employees in his department in Prince Edward Island. The names of Mr. McDonald and Mr. O'Brien, who are now in the service of the department, do not appear in this memorandum, and as there is one error in it there may be others, particularly in the figures. If the minister would let me have a list of the works that have been constructed under the management of his department in the province of Prince Edward Island for the periods he used in his comparison I should be much obliged. He is certainly astray as to the number of employees.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think I am astray. We were dealing with the engineering department in Prince Edward Island, and I supplied the names of those connected with that department. Mr. McDonald and Mr. O'Brien are connected with the Dredging Department, not with the Engineering Department. A good deal of dredging has been done there lately.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Hegan did the work that McDonald and O'Brien are doing now, in addition to carrying on other work that fell to him as the engineer of the department. Mr. Hegan was the engineer who looked after the dredging before Mr. McDonald and Mr. O'Brien were appointed. Consequently, these two men are additions to the service.

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend is mistaken; the dredging was looked after from St. John before.

Mr. HUGHES: The minister is in error. There was a superintendent of dredging at St. John, who visited Prince Edward Island perhaps once or twice a year; but Mr. Hegan was the man who actually did the work. The superintendent at St. John was a supernumerary, and had practically nothing to do with the dredging. I know he was supposed to have some kind of general oversight over the work, but it was Mr. Hegan who did the work that McDonald and O'Brien are doing now.

Mr. MORRIS: Perhaps I might be allowed to say a few words on this item with regard to independent telephone companies throughout Canada, particularly one in the province of Quebec. These companies are receiving no recognition from this Government. I have felt in the past that if ever I had the opportunity of bringing the matter before the House, I would call the attention of the Government to the work these companies are doing; they are of great benefit to our country. In the counties of Chateauguay, Huntingdon, and Beauharnois we have the Farmers' Independent Telephone Company. This line is in operation for 150 miles, and is giving splendid service. The line is absolutely independent; it is receiving no support from this Government or any one else; and I feel it my duty, as a representative of a rural district, now that other institutions

are receiving so much aid, to call the attention of the Government to what this telephone company is doing. The farmers could not get the telephone service they wanted, and so they got together, and without any assistance from the Government or anybody else, furnished the capital, and built the line; they did this in opposition to one of the greatest corporations there is in our country, and I think the service they have rendered to the farmers in my constituency should be recognized by the Government. The company has received no assistance from the Government or anybody else. But, like the Canadian Northern at the present time, it is perhaps in a little difficulty. The proposition is a big one for the farmers when they get no support from any one. We are doing this work absolutely on our own responsibility; we have asked nothing from any one; and I feel that the Farmers' Independent Telephone Company should be recognized, because what the farmers are doing is in the public interest. Previous to the organization of that company there were, away in the back concessions, many men who did not know what was going on. Now they have simply to ring the telephone bell in order to learn what is happening in the outside world. They will know to-morrow what has transpired here to-night, and my friends at all events will rejoice to know it. I am not coming here begging; we did not come to this Government nor to the Government of Quebec begging; we went down into our pockets and furnished what was necessary. Unfortunately an hon. member opposite who has helped us out in this matter is not here, but I am here as a representative of that county, an important county in the province of Quebec; I am representing an independent people. The proposition is a difficult one, and it is up to this Government to come to our help. All we ask of them is a little encouragement in a public work that I feel is worthy of this Government and of the country.

Mr. McKENZIE: I must congratulate my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Morris) on his very eloquent and splendidly presented speech. I am sorry he did not tell us earlier in the speech the amount that he wanted, because I am sure we would all agree to give it to him. I am sorry I have not very much hope that he will get much money from this Government. I have looked through the Estimates and I see nothing there for Chateauguay. Some things were done for that county some years ago, but there is nothing visible anywhere in these Estimates.

The hon. gentleman has spoken to the minister of things the like of which have never happened before, and I take this opportunity to mention to the minister for about the twentieth time something about something else the like of which has never happened before.

The county of Victoria is another rural district which I am proud to represent just as my hon. friend is proud to represent his constituency. We both represent rural constituencies, and therefore have a bond of union and a somewhat sympathetic feeling in regard to farming districts. I wish to bring to the notice of the minister something that happened with regard to telegraph lines in the county of Victoria in February, 1912. I brought it to his notice before and received plausible smiling promises that something would be done; but I am afraid that those promises, like many others of this Government, have gone the way of all flesh—nothing has come of them. We have in the county of Victoria a Government telegraph system which is of great service to that county. We have no railway communications there, and the telegraph line is really the only connection we have, particularly during the winter season, with the pulsations of the outside world. Private as well as public business goes over that line, and therefore it is of supreme importance that it should be properly conducted; that the messages should pass through the hands of independent men who will take care of the secrets that are thus put into their possession. At the time of the election in 1912, the whole system, some 120 miles or more of telegraph line, was placed entirely at the disposal of the Conservative candidate. All the ramifications of that line, all the officers, and everything connected with it, were for at least three weeks or a month placed entirely under the control of the Conservative party. Everything that was said on our side of the line was open to the public; we might as well have posted our telegrams on the side of a barn as to hand them to any of those agents, because every one knows what we were sending. The chief operator in the business, who is still the prime mover of the whole system, took upon himself, without any authority from the department—I say that in fairness to the minister—to place the whole system as it was at the disposal of the Conservative party. Since then he has given evidence under oath in the election

trial, and that evidence is at the disposal of the minister. He swore that he took upon himself to place the service at the disposal of the Conservative party and that, while tons of literature were going over the line, he never collected one cent for it. Although he is still in office, the money has never been returned to the department, and nothing has been said about it. Is it fair to the public in the county of Victoria, who are paying their money for service over that line, that such a man should be handling their business, private and public, and some of it necessarily political? Is it fair that a man of that character should be able to say that he was never asked to make any return of the money? From that day to this the money has never been returned to the department, and it was put at the disposal of our opponents in the election. The matter is getting old, but no change has been made. The day is not far distant when we shall have another local election in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. ROGERS: Can you give us the date?

Mr. McKENZIE: I can assure my hon. friend that it will be within the next six months. That will give my hon. friend plenty of time to put this telegraph line in proper order, so that he has no excuse. To my hon. friend, who is not only Minister of Public Works, but Minister of Elections as well, we with confidence appeal, that the proper machinery be provided, that that telegraph line be used properly, and that no man dare in future under his administration to use the property of the Government in such a high-handed and improper manner as it was used on the occasion to which I have referred.

Mr. ROGERS: I deprecate what the hon. member has had to say with respect to the use made of this line by whoever the gentleman was in charge of it, and especially his statement that this gentleman admitted on evidence that he had thrown the line open for the opponents of my hon. friend. That to my mind is a very serious condition, and one of which I myself will certainly complain. I will take notice of what my hon. friend has said, and I assure him that when his local elections come on he may depend absolutely upon the line being safe for the sending of messages. I will see that proper men are being put there, men worthy of confidence, so that my hon. friend need not be afraid to use the line for any telegraphic communications that he wishes to have with his friends in the various portions of Victoria county or elsewhere. I certainly believe that the telephone and telegraph lines should be managed in the interests of the public, and that the most absolute secrecy should be maintained in connection with their operation. Complaints of this kind are not confined to the Government lines in Canada. I myself have had occasion to complain, with respect to the larger lines in the Dominion, that very serious leaks had taken place. I think that this is a good notice to serve on all telegraph and telephone lines in Canada to the effect that this circumstance is observed by gentlemen on both sides of the House. As far as our power to deal with it goes, I shall be glad to join in seeing that it is corrected, and that all lines in Canada, whether under the control of the Government or not, shall be required to exercise that care for their messages and respect for their customers that they should exercise.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: I was not in the House the other night when the public buildings of Saskatchewan were dealt with, and I assume that I have permission to refer to one or two matters connected with these public buildings before this resolution carries. I want to ask the minister a question with respect to the construction of a proposed armoury and drill hall in the city of Regina. In 1911, before the late Government went out of power, an Estimate was passed for the construction of an armoury in that city, and plans were actually prepared. The understanding was that we should get exactly the same kind of armoury as was proposed to be built and has since been built in the city of Edmonton. The years 1912, 1913 and 1914 came and went, and each year an item was put in the Estimates for the construction of that armoury and drill hall in Regina. The war came on in the month of August, 1914, and we were faced with the condition that we had no accommodation for soldiers in Regina. The city itself very kindly provided the winter fair building there, which has been used since August, 1914, and is being used at the present time for recruiting purposes. If the Government had done its obvious duty in 1912, 1913 and 1914, we would have had some means of properly accommodating the numerous soldiers who have been recruited in the city of Regina and the surrounding country. I am not finding fault with the min-

ister for not building this armoury since 1914. I recognize the great desire for economy on the part of the minister and his department, and of necessity he could not very well have constructed an armoury in the city of Regina since the war began. But I do criticise the minister and the Government for not having taken some step to construct that armoury and drill hall prior to the commencement of the war. There is a very well defined rumour in the part of the country from which I come that the minister will not construct anything at all in the city of Regina. I must say that in that respect he has not treated that city very lavishly. I do not know why, because whenever he comes there, which he does not do very often, we try to use him properly. I can say also that if the minister sees fit to come there again, we shall try to use him properly. But as the representative of that city I think I am justified in finding a little fault with the conduct of the minister in connection with the construction of the proposed armoury and drill hall. I would like to know if the minister has any explanation to offer for not having taken some steps to construct that building the first three years that he was in office as Minister of Public Works?

Mr. ROGERS: My hon. friend probably understands that the Public Works Department undertakes the construction of armouries in the various cities of Canada when urged to do so by the Department of Militia and Defence. I have no recollection of what caused the delay in so far as Regina is concerned. I am sure that if the necessity for the immediate construction of the building had been represented to us by the Department of Militia and Defence, we would have gone on with it as we did with buildings in various other places. This is not a matter of which we have full control in the Department of Public Works. I confess that when I was in Regina last autumn I did recognize the necessity for an armoury in that city, in view of the large number of soldiers who were enlisting and preparing to serve their country. I am pleased to recognize here, as I did in the city of Regina, the generous treatment accorded to our soldiers by that city in their contributing the winter fair building. In all my travels I have not witnessed a more perfect location or more comfortable quarters than those which our soldiers were enjoying in the city of Regina. I appreciate the kind reception that I received from the civic authorities there; I am sure that I can have no other feelings but those of the very kindest towards that city. I shall be glad at all times to lend any assistance that I possibly can in the public interest in the matter of the construction of the buildings that are required for the public services. Regina is a growing place and deserving of everything that can be done, and as soon as we are operating again in the way of construction of public buildings, in so far as they come within the control of my department, there is no doubt that Regina will receive the fairest possible consideration at my hands.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: What the minister says may be all right, but to the chief question that I put there is no answer at all. In 1911, an estimate was passed in the House for the construction of an armoury and drill hall in the city of Regina. That was before the late Government was defeated. Plans were actually prepared in the Public Works Department—I saw them myself—by which we were to have exactly the same kind of armoury as they were getting in the city of Edmonton. The city of Edmonton got their armoury, and we got nothing. I do not know how the minister can explain that. He says that the fault was with the Minister of Militia and Defence. I asked the Minister of Militia and Defence in this House in 1912 or 1913 what steps were being taken in connection with the construction of an armoury and drill hall at the city of Regina, and whether it was true that plans had been prepared in the year 1911. He answered yes, it was true, and that the reason why they had not gone ahead on the old plans was that those plans were not considered ample or good enough for a city of the importance of Regina. As a matter of fact, at that time we were perfectly satisfied to get the same kind of armoury as they were getting in the city of Edmonton. During 1912, 1913 and 1914 this matter was absolutely neglected by the Government—whether by the Militia Department or the Department of Public Works, I care not; the fact is that the Government was negligent in its duty in the matter of providing accommodation for recruiting in Regina. I am not criticising the Government for not building during the past two years. From the statement of the minister I do not imagine that he has any intention of proceeding in the immediate future.

With regard to the question of the con-

struction of a Customs examining warehourse in the city of Moosejaw, I see that there is an Estimate of $90,000 for this building. Do I understand that this $90,000 includes the cost of the purchase of a site?

Mr. ROGERS: That, I understand from the deputy, includes the site, but I do not remember the facts.

Mr. MARTIN: If it includes the site I do not know what the $90,000 is now in for, because the site for the customs examining warehouse in Moosejaw was purchased two years ago, and must surely have been paid for before this.

Mr. ROGERS: In that case this would not be for the site, but for the building.

Mr. MARTIN: The site for the customs examining warehouse at Moosejaw cost in the neighbourhood of $62,000. It was purchased from a strong party friend of the minister in that city. I do not know if the minister is acquainted with him. That property was purchased by this gentleman not very many months before at $39,000 or thereabouts, and the statement is made throughout that part of the country that the condition on which this particular man was allowed to sell was that he would make a contribution to the Tory newspaper in Moosejaw of $5,000. That is a matter which the minister should investigate. I have not any direct evidence that that is the case, but I am satisfied it can be proved if it comes before a proper committee of this House. It is generally believed in Moosejaw and Regina. Will the minister investigate and see if there is anything in the rumour?

Mr. ROGERS: It is evident that it is impossible for me to satisfy my hon. friend in so far as Regina is concerned. So far as I can recollect the facts, an armoury was proposed some years ago in Regina, but, unfortunately for the province of Saskatchewan, there are four great centres, Regina, Moosejaw, Saskatoon and Prince Rupert, all rivals for first position, and there was always a difficulty owing to the division of territory and the rivalry of these great centres. Then there was the further fact that Regina and the territory tributary to it as a military district, belonged to district No. 10, with headquarters at the city of Winnipeg. I do not know how it would be possible for any one to have been more fair to Regina than I have been. After my visit to Regina last year, when I had an opportunity of seeing the conditions, I continuously urged on the Department of Militia and Defence the advisability of dividing district number 10 and establishing a headquarters at the city of Regina. It is seldom that a member representing a constituency such as it is my privilege to represent, the city of Winnipeg, takes such a position as that. I have taken every care to do everything I possibly could, in the common interest of all, for Regina and other cities in Saskatchewan. I conclude that the reason why an armoury was not built at an earlier date was this division of territory, coupled with the fact that Regina was on the outskirts of military district number 10, which extended as far east as Fort William, Winnipeg being its centre. We have established in Saskatchewan a military district for that province, with Regina as its centre, which I think was a creditable move on the part of the Government. It was one which from the very first I urged on the Minister of Militia and Defence, with the result that it was accepted and carried into effect.

As to the purchase of the site at Moosejaw, I have no knowledge of the circumstance; in fact, I do not really know whether a site has been purchased or not; but in view of the statements the hon. member has made, I will make inquiry and ascertain what facts it is possible for me to secure.

10 p.m.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: The minister speaks of the establishing of Regina as the headquarters of a military district. I am very glad the minister had something to do with making Regina the headquarters of a military district. The citizens of Regina appreciate that very much. But it is a peculiar thing that the militia business of the country is under the charge of the Minister of Militia, and when I spoke of the non-completion of the armoury, the Minister of Public Works blamed the Minister of Militia or the Militia Department.

Mr. ROGERS: I did not say that.

Mr. MARTIN: The Militia Department has to shoulder the onus for an armoury not being constructed.

Mr ROGERS: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr MARTIN: But when it comes down to the question of establishing a military

centre, for which somebody deserves some credit, obviously it must be the Department of Militia, because that department controls affairs of this kind. But the minister chooses to say he did that himself. Where anything occurs for which some one should be blamed, the minister places the responsibility on the Militia Department; but where credit is to be given for anything that is done, the minister takes that credit to himself.

Mr. ROGERS: I did nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman should not make statements which are not in accordance with the facts. I said nothing of the kind, and nothing approaching it.

Mr. MARTIN: I can understand pretty well the English language, and if the minister did not say that I have no quarrel with him; but I am satisfied that is what his words meant. A site for a public building was purchased by the Department of Public Works in Swift Current in March, 1914, and the Government paid $25,000 for it. Any person living in western Canada knows that in March, 1914, and throughout the year 1914, the real estate boom had burst and a financial stringency was upon us. This particular site, lots 19 and 20, block 55, in the town of Swift Current, had been bought some time previously by the man who sold it to the Government, Mr. Mountain, and on January 13, 1913, he registered title in the land titles office, and swore that the value of one of these lots, lot 20, was $6,000; and two years previously, in registering title to lot 19 in plot 55, he swore that its value was $1,300. I do not pay much attention to the valuation given in 1911, because that was some years ago; but in 1913 this very man who sold the two lots to the Department of Public Works for $25,000, swore that the reasonable value of one of them was $6,000, at a time when the real estate boom was at its highest. Property in the first six months of 1913 was higher than at any time before or since, in all parts of Saskatchewan. It was at this time that Mr. Mountain swore that the value of one-half this property was $6,000. The next year the value of property decreased by leaps and bounds, still he sold it to the Government for $25,000. If that is thought by the Government to be an economical way of purchasing sites, they are much mistaken; and the great majority of the sites purchased in Saskatchewan are on exactly the same basis: the Government have paid in each case from 25 per cent to 50 per cent too much for them, to my personal knowledge.

Mr. ROGERS: In view of the fact that the Government of the province of Saskatchewan had purchased a site in Swift Current some time previous to the date when we purchased the site in that city, and in view of the inflated price which they paid, we found very great difficulty in securing a site at a normal price. We exercised very considerable care and reduced the price very much in comparison with that paid by the Government of the province of Saskatchewan for the site they purchased, and with regard to which my hon. friend understands a great deal more probably than he would make clear to this Committee. I do not propose to deal in detail with that matter however, because it does not concern the committee. But I do say that care was taken in the purchase of a site at the price named by my hon. friend in connection with the Department of Public Works, and I am satisfied that we had the best judgment and the best advice of our officers in the province of Saskatchewan in arriving at the price which was paid by the department. I remember well the difficulty we experienced by reason of the abnormally high price which had been paid by the Government of the province of Saskatchewan in the purchase of a site close to the one purchased by this department.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: The hon. minister always takes a fall out of the Government of the province of Saskatchewan. I do not know why he should be so much interested in the Government of that province. I know both of the properties in the city of Swift Current referred to. The property purchased by this Government is two blocks further east from the property purchased by the Government of the province. I am not here to discuss the prices paid by the Government of the province of Saskatchewan, but I know that as between the two properties, that purchased by the Provincial Government was more valuable than the property purchased by this Government and it is better located from a business standpoint.

Mr. ROGERS: That is not our information.

Mr. MARTIN: Then the minister has not got the proper information. For the site purchased by this Government for post-office purposes, if that is what is meant by the public building mentioned in these Estimates,—I understand that it is; if I am

not correct the minister will put me right—this Government paid at least 50 per cent too much to this man. I do not know what system the minister follows in ascertaining what properties are available for sites in the various towns. I presume it is left largely to some local patronage committee.

Mr. ROGERS: It was left to Mr. Mallard, of Regina; the hon. gentleman probably knows him.

Mr. MARTIN: Anything that Mr. Mallard would recommend to the Government would be perfectly bona fide. He is an official who has been employed by the Government for a good many years.

Mr. ROGERS: We purchased on his recommendation.

Mr. MARTIN: If the minister purchased on his recommendation he got very good advice. But that does not alter the fact that the Government purchased from this man that property for which no person in the world would have paid $25,000 at that time. The property purchased by the Government of the province of Saskatchewan was purchased in 1913, before the boom in real estate had broken, and there was a vast difference between the values in 1913 and those in 1914. The minister probably knows that by bitter experience in connection with real estate that he has in Winnipeg. Nobody knows better than he that it was in the beginning of 1914 that the real estate boom broke, and he cannot justify the purchase of that site by dragging in the name of the Government of the province of Saskatchewan.

The minister says he has done a great deal for the city of Regina. As a matter of fact, he has done nothing at all for that city. He takes credit to himself for having made Regina the headquarters of the military district, but he did not do that; it was the Minister of Militia who did it.

Mr. ROGERS: That is right.

Mr. MARTIN: Apart from that, what has the minister ever done for the city of Regina during the past four or five years? He has placed two or three items in the Estimates; he has purchased two sites for buildings from political friends in that city. One site was purchased as early as 1913 for a customs examining warehouse, but not a sod has been turned up to the present day, and there is no indication of a building. He purchased from another political friend a portion of the old Leader building for the office of the Receiver General, and I see that a large amount of money was set aside to pay for that building. However, I understand that the Exchequer Court has not decided what value should be placed upon it. That is all the Minister of Public Works has done for the city of Regina. I do not know why he should have his knife out for that city. He does not come to Regina very often. I remember that he came in 1912 with a great blare of trumpets. The whole front page of the local Conservative newspaper was filled with an announcement of what the minister was going to do for the city. It was just before the provincial election, and I presume that if another provincial election comes along the Minister of Public Works will visit Regina again with a greater blare of trumpets. But since 1912, on only one occasion has the Minister of Public Works deigned to put in an appearance in the city of Regina. He passes that way going west to other cities, and I can assure him that if he stopped off he would find the people even more friendly to him than before.

Mr. ROGERS: That would be impossible.

Mr. MARTIN: I hope that, when the minister comes west, he will not forget to drop off at Regina. We will entertain him as well as any city in the Dominion.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will there be any further Supplementary Estimates for public works in Nova Scotia?

Mr. ROGERS: There will be no more than are in the Estimates placed on the Table to-night.

Mr. SINCLAIR: They are all in now for the present session, are they?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The reason I ask is that certain active politicians in Nova Scotia are using the minister's name and the name of his department for the purpose of obtaining political support by promising additional public works. There was a convention of the Conservative party in the county of Inverness a few days ago, and it was attended by Mr. A. B. Crosby, of Halifax, who is well known to the minister.

Mr. ROGERS: A very good man.

Mr. SINCLAIR: On that occasion he undertook to make a speech, and he is

reported in the Conservative paper to have said:

> He assured his hearers that the defeat of the Murray Government was an absolute certainty and that Inverness would be in the right column. He gave his pledge to the audience that Gallant and McLean, whose election was a foregone conclusion, would have his cordial co-operation and support in securing subventions in the way of public works and railway construction for this noble county of Inverness.

Mr. ROGERS: He was talking about railways.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Railway construction does not come within the Department of Public Works, but public works do. The minister will notice that Mr. Crosby undertook to make a prophecy without having the knowledge that is necessary for a prophet. He stated that the Murray Government was to be defeated, and that after its defeat he was going to influence the minister to give—

Mr. ROGERS: Railways.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Public works. Now, it appears that my hon. friend does not intend to give any public works to the county of Inverness for the present year. Mr. Crosby is depending on subventions; he has no policy. He does not pretend to have any public question to put before the people. The only thing he referred to was subventions, which he expected to get from the Minister of Public Works, but the minister now tells us that he does not intend to give any subventions; so I presume the prophecy will have to go along with the failure to get subventions.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I draw the minister's attention to a matter of which I spoke on a former occasion? I happen to be a member of the special committee appointed to discuss pensions, and during the discussions of the committee the matter of dealing with permanently disabled men has come up. This will require the establishment of permanent institutions, which means the erection or acquiring of buildings. I suggested to the minister that, in view of the events now occurring, there is every necessity for provision being made at an early date for this contingency that must be faced. I think the minister said that the matter would be taken up and if possible provision would be made in the Supplementary Estimates. I do not see anything in the Supplementaries, and I take this opportunity of again bringing the matter to the attention of the minister and of urging that it is a matter of very pressing importance, and that there should be no avoidable delay in making suitable provision. I would say that in each section of the country provision should be made for the care of those who are so seriously disabled as to be a burden on relatives, if they have relatives, and of those who have no relatives, and who would be in an even more unfortunate position.

Mr. ROGERS: We will appreciate the importance of providing for the returned and disabled soldiers, but my information at the present moment is shortly this, that the committee who have been looking into that matter find that returned soldiers, when they come to a city like Winnipeg, or Edmonton, generally like to find their way to their own old homes from which they started out. While in some of the larger cities there are a number who require special care and provision to be made for their comfort and keep, it is surprising how few after all by comparison are in that position. When they land they are always apparently very anxious to go back to the location from which they came and they usually have some friends or connections waiting to receive them and make them comfortable. It is true that in some of the larger cities, and probably this need will increase from time to time, provision is necessary for returned soldiers, but we have felt that under the present conditions it is possible to secure rented buildings that will be very suitable and will provide the necessary accommodation. Every care will be taken to see that in every single instance provision shall be made for the care and comfort during convalescence of every returned soldier who is not able to find a comfortable home. The various Provincial Governments have taken an interest in this matter and are endeavouring to secure employment for returned soldiers and to assist in every possible way in co-operation with the Dominion Government. Everything possible will be done in conjunction with the provinces to add to the comfort and care of our returned soldiers.

Mr. OLIVER: Certain information came to the committee that I fancy has not been put before the House and cannot have reached the Government generally. While it may be in some degree premature, I feel that I shall be excused for placing it before the committee at the present time. It is in regard to those who are afflicted nervously or mentally and who now receive care in

lunatic asylums. An expert appeared before the committee and gave his opinion that such a course was very detrimental and that it was in the last degree important that men suffering in this way should not be in the environment that necessarily surrounds them under present circumstances. It is suggested that there should be accommodation provided for such cases where they would have special treatment and be under special conditions. He advised that under those circumstances there would be a very large proportion of complete recoveries, whereas, under present circumstances, his opinion was that many cases that, under favourable conditions, might recover, would become chronic and therefore hopeless. I am taking this opportunity, possibly somewhat out of order, to bring the matter as pointedly to the attention of the Government and of the Minister of Public Works as I can, as I am sure that everybody will agree that this gentleman's opinion is entitled to very great weight; and, if the opinion he expresses is correct, certainly no action can be taken too quickly or too thoroughly to meet the views that he placed before the committee.

Mr. ROGERS: I can quite understand what my hon. friend says in respect to this condition. Let me give him an idea of the situation in the city of Winnipeg, and I am sure that similar conditions will be found to exist in other cities, especially in western Canada. At Winnipeg we have made provision in the immigration shed for the reception of returned soldiers. We have a small hospital in the immigration building with twenty or thirty beds where returned soldiers suffering from nerve trouble receive treatment. That provision was made for returned soldiers for the first day or two after they arrived. The committee in charge of this work at Winnipeg have secured Deer Lodge, which was a hotel previous to the introduction of the prohibition measure in Winnipeg and which is a very suitable place containing about 100 beds, and such invalided soldiers as my hon. friend refers to are being cared for at Deer Lodge. This place has been provided in order that invalided soldiers may find rest and quiet. Those who are strong and do not need as much care remain in the immigration shed at present. But the same condition will apply to the various cities in western Canada. Most of the hotels in different places throughout the western provinces that are comfortable and suitable for such a purpose, are available at a very cheap rental and my hon. friend and the country can depend upon it that every care will be taken of invalided soldiers and that provision will be made in order that those who are incapable of looking after themselves, and especially those who are suffering from nerve trouble, may have rest and quiet.

St. John Harbour—improvements, $1,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This, I suppose, will include certain works which are still going on on the western side of the harbour, and also the work at Courtenay bay. I should be glad if the minister would make a short statement with regard to the work at Courtenay bay, and for this reason: Owing to the fact that the agreement which has recently been come to between the provincial Government and this Government in regard to the Valley railway cancels the original contract for the construction of the railway all the way from St. John to Grand Falls by what is known as the eastern route, so far as the last 30 miles of the road nearest to St. John are concerned, there is an apprehension on the part of a good many people in St. John that it is not intended to utilize, to any large extent at all events, the facilities which it was proposed to provide at Courtenay bay. When the plan for the development of Courtenay bay was laid out some years ago, the late Mr. Hays, who was president of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, was consulted with reference to the terminals there, and he gave his hearty approval, being of the opinion that the new Transcontinental railroad would require at St. John all the facilities that could be provided at Courtenay bay; and he was very much averse, from a railway standpoint, to being compelled to use the facilities which the Canadian Pacific are now enjoying upon the western side of the harbour. I should be very sorry indeed if the Government contemplated either discontinuing or curtailing the work of development at Courtenay bay, and I am sure it would be a very great disappointment to the people of St. John. I think it would be well if no changes were made in the plans, so far as the development of Courtenay bay is concerned. Perhaps the minister might make a short statement to reassure and encourage the people of St. John.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not think that any proposed changes in the railway situation in the province of New Brunswick will in

any way affect the development of Courtenay bay. On the contrary, the proposals that have been presented will have the effect of stirring up, if that were possible, the Department of Public Works in order to prepare for the reception of traffic as soon as the road is completed. There is no doubt in my mind that the connection of the Valley railway and of the Transcontinental will be with Courtenay bay. My hon. friend will agree that both sides of the House thought the original contract for the development of Courtenay bay was very desirable, but, unfortunately, the principals engaged in the work became absorbed in other undertakings, and latterly, on account of war conditions and their other enterprises, they have not devoted that attention to their contract which is desirable in the public interest. As a result, we expect to transfer the contract in the very near future, in order that the work may be gone on with as rapidly as possible, and we hope that the successors to the present contractors will make much better progress than has been made during the past year. This arrangement for transferring the contract has been practically completed, and when it is consummated I do not think there will be any delay in going on with the work. A considerable amount of work has been done on the breakwater, and in excavating for the dry dock. Nothing has been done in regard to the wharves as yet, because it is claimed that a sufficient amount of dredging must first be done to enable the men to carry on the work at low tide; but these are matters of detail. Generally speaking, the work is not as far advanced as we should like, but we are hopeful that under the new arrangement the work will be gone on with more rapidly, and will be completed in sufficient time to take care of the rapidly increasing trade of the port of St. John. I fancy there is a great deal more shipping at that port to-day than ever before, and we are fortunate in having the wharves on the west side to take care of the increased traffic, pending the completion of the Courtenay bay development work. I again assure my hon. friend that every effort will be made to complete the work as rapidly as possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very glad to hear the reassuring statement which the minister has made. Of course, the House will understand that the question of making proper improvements at the port of St. John is one not merely of local interest but of national importance, because St. John at the present time is one of the two important winter ports we have in Canada. It is of course of the very greatest national importance that Canadian exports and imports should pass through Canadian seaports and that as much as possible Canadian traffic that now goes to American ports should be diverted to the seaports of our own country.

If I might venture to do so, I should like to make just one suggestion to the minister. During the session I have on more than one occasion called the attention of the members of the Government, particularly the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to the desirability of doing at once something in Canada for the encouragement of shipbuilding, so that, to as great an extent as possible provision might be made for the carrying of Canadian products to the markets of Europe, particularly in view of the necessarily great scarcity in ocean tonnage, which is becoming apparent from month to month and even from week to week. At St. John, as in many other places, of course, there are wonderfully good opportunities for the carrying on of shipbuilding. If the plans which I had prepared when I was minister, having reference to the development of St. John, had been carried out, there would at the present time have been a dry-dock with a ship repairing plant, and my idea was to be as liberal as possible in the specifications for the ship repairing plant so that with very little extra expense shipbuilding might also be carried on. As my hon. friend knows, this was the case with the Vickers-Maxim plant situated near Montreal, where some shipbuilding has been carried on since the war began. For instance, the building of submarines has been undertaken there. At the dry-dock and ship-repairing plant at Port Arthur, in addition to ship repairing, very considerable shipbuilding has been carried on. In connection with this work at St. John—and I do not speak from any sectional standpoint, because the same thing might be done in other sections of the country—I would urge that as soon as possible some arrangement be made whereby, in connection with the dry-dock and the plant which would necessarily be established in connection with it, some provision might be made for shipbuilding; if not for ships of a large size, for ships of

reasonable tonnage, ranging from three thousand to five or six thousand tons, suitable for the transportation of goods across the Atlantic. I think the matter is somewhat urgent, and I have hopes and indeed believe that the Minister of Public Works is alive to the necessities of the situation and will be be disposed to do anything he can to give encouragement along those lines. I bring the matter to his attention, at the same time regretting the fact that so many years have been lost since the late Government went out of office. I do not think at all of holding my hon. friend the minister responsible. The circumstances have been unfortunate, but I think that something ought to be done in the way of encouraging shipbuilding, and there is a very excellent opportunity at Courtenay bay, where these improvements are now being carried forward.

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid I cannot agree with my hon. friend that anything has been lost by the downfall of the late Government in so far as shipbuilding or anything else in Canada is concerned. I am not, of course, very familiar with the question of shipbuilding, because that matter is in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Trade and Commerce; but I know that they have been paying considerable attention to the question during the past few months, and I have had the privilege of attending several meetings with them and discussing the matter in some detail. I can assure my hon. friend that the matter is receiving the most careful attention possible, and I am hopeful that in the near future action will be taken with a view of going on with the shipbuilding industry at one, two or three points in Canada. I quite agree that St. John would be a desirable place, and according to the plans originally adopted for a dry-dock there, I think my hon. friend will admit that we are making as much progress as is possible under the circumstances. I will undertake for the Department of Public Works, to urge the completion of a dry-dock as soon as possible; I will at all events carry out my end of the work and prepare for shipbuilding. At Port Arthur we are now ready for shipbuilding or ship repairing, and I hope that in the near future we shall be ready also at Vancouver. We have a dry-dock at Prince Rupert, and I trust that before long we shall have one at Victoria and one at Vancouver. There is a desire on the part of the Government to inaugurate a policy of shipbuilding as soon as it is possible to reach it, and every care and consideration is being given to the subject by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries along with one or two of the other ministers.

Mr. WRIGHT: I wish to call the attention of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) to the fact that there is a war on, and that nearly every night he has been putting forth efforts to induce the various ministers, when presenting their Estimates to the committee, to practise economy. If he would put forth a little effort to reduce the vote for St. John say by $25,000 or $50,000, I am sure we on this side of the House would assist him in that regard.

Mr. PUGSLEY: For the gratification of my hon. friend I may say that St. John is very patiently bearing its share of the burden so far as cutting down expenditures for improvements is concerned. The expenditure this year as compared with that of last year has been reduced by $500,000. I am not able to point to many other places in Canada where the people have consented to such a large reduction, and the people of St. John have consented very patiently and loyally to that reduction.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will this complete the work at St. John?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How much does the minister expect to spend to complete it?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract is $7,500,000, of which we have spent about $2,500,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would like the minister to tell the committee about this dry-dock at Halifax. Is it owned by the department or by private people?

Mr. ROGERS: The present dry-dock is owned by private parties. We are proposing a first-class national dry-dock there.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is this for a new dry-dock, or for repairs to the old one?

Mr. ROGERS: For a new one.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will it be owned by the Government?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Where is it?

Mr. ROGERS: In Tuft's cove in Bedford basin.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is on the Dartmouth side?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it for naval purposes?

Mr. ROGERS: Largely, yes. The Admiralty requested that we give consideration to the erection of a dry-dock at Halifax.

Mr. MACDONALD: How far is it from the town of Dartmouth?

Mr. ROGERS: Right beside the Intercolonial.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Intercolonial runs along the waterfront all the way.

Mr. ROGERS: It is up near the neck of that bay.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Narrows?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I presume this is preliminary to embarking on the construction of a Canadian navy.

Mr. ROGERS: This is preliminary, yes.

Toronto harbour improvements, $600,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: During the last year or so there has been a great deal of discussion about these harbour improvements. The minister, of course, does not forget the difficulties that have been encountered by the department in the work in the Toronto harbour. If I remember correctly, some dismissals of officials engaged in the inspection of this work took place. A good deal of the work was improperly done and had to be replaced. I believe that an investigation was held, and the contracting firm, the Canadian Stewart Company, I think, were asked to rebuild a portion of the work. A big loss was entailed on account of the work being inefficient. Will the minister tell us what the investigation was, the result of the investigation, and the position of the Government as to the contract and the contractors?

Mr. ROGERS: A contract was let for the works at Toronto to the Canadian Stewart Company, Limited, who were the lowest tenderers. We had dismissed several of the inspectors whom we found at fault in not reporting defects in the work. We appointed two engineers and Mr. Roger Miller to make an investigation, which they did in a thoroughly full and complete manner and to the entire satisfaction of the Harbour Board of Toronto and of the City Council, who are taking a very great interest in the work. They recommended that a certain portion of the work be entirely rebuilt. The contractors have agreed in writing to do this entirely at their own expense, so that it will not cost the country a dollar. The contractors are making the necessary improvements and rebuilding the work in accordance with the report of the commission of which Mr. Roger Miller was the chairman. Everything is now started again, and I am satisfied that the work will be carried on in a satisfactory manner. Our engineer in the first place apparently was not suitable; he did not look after the work as he should have done. He was an old employee of the department, but for some reason or other he did not give the care to the work that it absolutely required. This has been corrected, however, and as the contractors felt that they were in fault they agreed to put the work in proper shape and to carry it out in accordance with the recommendations of the commission. This is being done and the work will go on as rapidly as possible. The Harbour Board of the city of Toronto are lending their assistance and giving supervision to the work. Every precaution is being taken to care for the interests of the work and to see that it is carried out in a manner satisfactory to the city of Toronto and to the department.

Mr. GRAHAM: What was the value of the work that they have to reconstruct?

Mr. ROGERS: Several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. NESBITT: The other day I saw a pamphlet issued by some of the papers in Toronto saying that they proposed spending $24,500,000 on the harbour there. Is this Government supposed to spend all that, or does Toronto pay part?

Mr. ROGERS: About $5,000,000 is our part of that work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is the harbour of Toronto controlled by a commission, or is it under the control of this Government?

Mr. ROGERS: A commission.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It strikes me that we are drifting into a very extravagant policy with regard to these large expenditures on harbours. I see here $7,500,000 for improvements in harbours, and the committee are not giving very much attention to what these improvements are to be or why we are voting this large sum of money. A few years ago when we voted money for the

harbour of Montreal we took very good care that security was given. The shipping business of the port of Montreal paid the interest, and the aid given was no special liability on the country. But we now seem to be putting a million here and a million there all over Canada, on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic. The position of Canada appears to me to be different from that of any other country that I know of. The harbours in Europe are under the control of local harbour boards. At Glasgow, for instance, the Clyde Trust looks after the harbour; they borrow money on the security of their property at a very low rate of interest. They do the dredging and build the docks and the shipping business of the port pays for it. We are apparently embarking on a policy which, if continued, will involve the country in the expenditure of very large sums of money. I do not know whether it is the policy to collect anything from the shipping business or whether we are to get any security for all the millions that we are putting in the harbours on the coast. Would the minister tell us in a few words what the policy of the Government is in regard to these very large expenditures?

Mr. ROGERS: In view of the fact that the Canadian people have devoted great energy to the construction of a national Transcontinental railway in order to develop traffic and trade, it becomes the duty of this or of any other Government to see to the development of our national ports. In many cases assistance is given to these works by the city where they are located. Considerable assistance, I believe, has been given at Halifax.

Mr. MACDONALD: Halifax gave nothing.

Mr. ROGERS: Did they not assist in some way in the earlier days?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think so.

Mr. ROGERS: I know that in the case of St. John the people contributed very largely some years ago to the development of their national port with a view of attracting the trade of the country to it. St. John is looked upon as our great winter outlet, at all events for the western provinces, and it was the duty of the Government to undertake the construction, for example, for the harbour improvements at Courtenay bay. A contract was let for something like $7,500,000, the works in connection with which are now in course of construction. The only regret we have is that this work has not been carried on more rapidly. Take the port of St. John as an example. That port is in a very congested condition to-day. Two or three times more shipping is being handled there to-day than at any previous time in its history. We are behind in the development of our national ports. The same thing applies to Quebec. Quebec is a great port and one on whose development a very considerable sum has been spent. It is a port that properly should be developed and will continue to be developed, by the Government of the country. That principle has been recognized by both Governments in the past, and I am sure will be in the future, as the trade of our country grows. Then take the port of Montreal. What my hon. friend has said of that port is quite correct. But I do not know that ports developed in this manner really save very much money in the end to the Canadian people, as the charges incidental to the handling of freight through such a port as that are somewhat of a drawback to the general interest. The same thing applies in the case of Toronto, which is a great inland shipping port and a very large and growing city, the second largest in Canada. There are at Toronto great possibilities for the development of an inland port. An estimate has been made by those interested in the city for the expenditure of something like $24,000,000, and the Government of Canada are contributing only $5,000,000 in connection with the portion of the work they have undertaken. Then at Port Arthur and Fort William, where we have probably the largest shipping port in the Dominion of Canada to-day, a great deal of money has been spent in the past and, of necessity, large sums will continue to be spent from year to year at that port because the industries are developing there. We have large elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, and a great amount of dredging will be required from time to time to keep up with the development of the trade. Similar conditions exist in Vancouver. This is probably the second largest ocean port in Canada to-day, yet very little money had been spent there until a few years ago. It will be the duty of the Canadian people to contribute a considerable sum to the assistance of that particular port as a national port.

The development of our national ports is properly the duty of the Canadian Government and of the Canadian people, and must be carried on if Canada is to become the

great country we expect it to be. It is not a matter of assistance to particular localities, not a matter of local conditions in Halifax, or in St. John, or in Quebec, or in Toronto, or in any other place; it is a matter for the common good of the whole people of the Dominion of Canada, who are interested in the development of the traffic of our country. It is for this purpose and to this end that large sums are being spent to keep pace with the development of trade at these ports through the construction of the different transcontinental railways we have already built. For example, we will have to assist to some extent in the development of a port at Prince Rupert, to meet the requirements of the terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific at that point.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a fine natural harbour.

Mr. ROGERS: A very fine natural harbour, a splendid harbour in that sense. All of these are works that are necessary in the public interest, and the only fault that could be found by the Canadian people generally and those interested in the traffic and in the development of our country, is that we are rather behind in the development of our national ports than in advance of the requirements. My hon. friend must bear in mind that it will be necessary, for some years to come, for this Parliament to be called upon, session after session, to vote large sums of money to provide the necessary assistance to develop those ports in order to keep pace with the growing traffic and growing conditions that are bound to follow in the course of the development of a young and growing country such as our Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend has made an interesting speech, but he has not answered my question. I do not wish to be understood as opposing the development of our national ports. I feel as much interested in that question as my hon. friend, and I should be very glad to support any policy towards that end, and have always done so. What I wanted to know from my hon. friend was whether the Government has any policy on which they spend and propose to spend these large sums of money. Is it all done by rule of thumb, or are we to have any system about it? Are we going to develop one port and leave out the others, or are we going to insist on the port itself bearing some part of the expense of its development? I think we should. I think the system my hon. friend refers to as being followed in the city of Toronto is a good one. He says the development of that port will cost $24,000,000, and that $5,000,000 of that money will be furnished by this Government. If that is the basis on which the expenditures are to be made I have no objection. That is about one dollar in five furnished by this Government. But is that the policy in Quebec and Halifax? We are told that Halifax as a city has not contributed anything towards the development of that port. The city of Montreal has contributed large sums towards the development of the harbour of Montreal, and the city of St. John has likewise contributed to the development of the harbour of St. John in a large measure. Has the Government any policy to cover the whole question? Will they formulate any policy such as we have in regard to the subsidizing of railways? When a railway comes to the Government for a subsidy the Government tell the company that if it will build a railway costing $15,000 a mile the Government will contribute $3,200 a mile; if the company builds a railway costing $20,000 or $25,000 a mile, the Government will double that subsidy. We know then what our liability is, and I think we should have some system of that kind in regard to the development of our national ports. Otherwise there will be no end to the money that will be asked for. These commissioners at the various ports will always want money, as my hon. friend says. There will be asked, year after year, millions and millions of dollars for the development of these ports. If the Government could devise some system by which part of the expense will be borne by the people in the cities at the ports, and the shipping trade will contribute a certain amount then we will be able to conduct the public business in some kind of a systematic way. The minister told us some interesting things about the development of the various ports which we all know, but he has not told us whether the Government have arrived at any system by which they are going to distribute this money in the future.

11 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: I think my hon. friend will appreciate the fact that it would be very difficult to have any fixed policy that would have the same application at the various ports in Canada. Take the port at Halifax. It is the terminus of the Intercolonial railway, and that railway undertakes the development of the port in which it has a direct interest. In the case of St.

John, the situation is rather different. The St. John people undertook, through their own enterprise in the early days, to spend a large sum in the development of that particular port; they feel that they have contributed their share, and now that there is necessity for the development of St. John as a national port for the common good of the people of Canada, it becomes the duty of the Canadian people to contribute largely in the development of that particular port. The same applies to the city of Quebec, although there the harbour commission has the matter in hand, and is spending large sums of money in the development of that port under conditions similar, at all events, to some extent, to those at the port of Montreal. Of course, in the case of the city of Toronto, that port is not so much a national port as are the ports of St. John, Halifax and Quebec, by reason of the fact that it is an inland port. Therefore, the Harbour Board of Toronto are undertaking perhaps a larger share of the expense of developing that port. When you go to Fort William, the conditions are different. The people of Fort William and Port Arthur are not so specially interested in the development of their ports by reason of the fact that it is required for the carrying of the grain of the country, and has to be developed by the central government of the country if we are to have the accommodation for the carrying of our grain. Vancouver is a great national port, and a harbour commission has been established there. I am in hopes that we will not have to spend so much money there, and that the work will be undertaken by the harbour board and carried out by them within a very short period. They have started now, and they give promise of being a board capable of carrying out the development of that national port in a manner that will be very satisfactory to all and a credit to the city of Vancouver. So that my hon. friend can see that it would be impossible, or next to impossible, to have any set policy or fixed arrangement for all the ports. Conditions and circumstances vary at the different ports, which have to be dealt with upon their individual merits. I do not find that there is much criticism, or much jealously or complaint in regard to the treatment of the different ports of Canada. The people interested in them have studied and understand the development of the sister ports, and I have yet to hear much complaint as to favoritism, or as to larger sums being spent on the development of one port than upon another. It has been the general policy of all governments to develop the ports as rapidly as possible in keeping with the public interest and without any set plan or set policy. I do not think a fixed plan would be workable owing to the diversified conditions which prevail at the different national ports at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very glad that my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) brought this question up. It is well to have it discussed, and I think it was desirable that the Minister should take the opportunity to make the statement he has made with regard to our national harbours. There is one matter which, I think, ought to be kept in mind; that is, that it is desirable in the interests of Canadian trade to keep the harbour charges, anchorage dues and other charges ordinarily imposed on shipping, to as low a figure as possible. When I was Minister of Public Works, I took occasion to send Mr. Coste, who had been a long time connected with the department, to Europe, to visit the most important harbours there, and I remember he spoke particularly of the port of Hamburg, which is practically a free port where there are no harbour dues, and where the trade had grown with wonderful rapidity, largely as the result of there being no harbour dues which are generally regarded as more or less a burden on shipping. When I was minister, I adopted what I thought was a very good plan, and I am glad to see that the present minister has followed it; that is, when the Government decides that a harbour has attained such proportions as may be regarded of a national character, any expenditures upon works of that character should be placed in the capital account. That was a very good change, and it will be found on page 56 that the expenditures for Halifax, St. John, Quebec, Toronto, Port Arthur and Fort William, Vancouver and Victoria are all chargeable to capital account.

Mr. NESBITT: Why?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Because they are regarded as national harbours.

Mr. NESBITT: Is Toronto a national harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, Toronto is a national harbour. I think I was the first to put it in capital account, and I did so for the reason that there are large manufactories in Toronto and there is an enormous trade between that city and the prairies.

Mr. NESBITT: Why should the expenditures be charged to capital account?

Mr. PUGSLEY: For the reason that it is one of the great ports.

Mr. NESBITT: Why should any of them be charged to capital account?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would be prepared to argue that they should be.

Mr. NESBITT: We do not own them.

Mr. MACDONELL: Certainly we own them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The expense of improving them is such that the expenditures might fairly be charged to capital account, as distance from the expenditures on small harbours throughout the country where wharves are built. In respect to these great harbours, I think that the expenditures should be charged to capital account, and I am very glad that the minister has followed that principle.

With regard to St. John, the people there, when they were making a great fight some years ago, the first fight that was ever made in Canada to divert the traffic from Portland in the state of Maine to a Canadian port, met with great disappointment and discouragement, and they had to put their hands in their pockets and spend close upon a million dollars in providing the requisite deep water accommodation in the hope that the Canadian trade would be diverted to St. John in the winter season. The experiment proved a great success. The winter port business has developed with enormous rapidity, but in St. John we think that the harbour dues are somewhat of a burden on shipping, and we are hoping that the time will soon come when the Government of Canada will recognize that the port should be taken over and made a free port. We believe in St. John that this is the true way to develop our harbours and that when the Government recognizes that a harbour has attained proportions of a national character, and that its development is of national importance, that harbour ought to be taken over by the Government and made free. That view has been presented over and over again in this Parliament during the past 15 years, and has been generally accepted. It was favoured by the commission which was appointed under the late Government, and which made a very valuable report, and I am looking forward to the day when that idea will be carried out. I am glad to see that the Minister of Public Works the dues are sufficient to enable the har-

So far as Montreal is concerned, of course the shipping there is very large, and the dues are sufficient to enable the Harbour Commissioners to pay the interest, but, although they have a harbour commission at Quebec, and although the commissioners borrowed money, if I remember rightly, they have not been able to pay the interest, and the Government has practically, remitted the interest, and very properly so. That has been done for a number of years past, because if an attempt were made to exact the interest it would prove a very great burden on the shipping of the city of Quebec. As I have said, it is a very good rule to treat national harbours as being in the national interest, and they should be made, as far as possible, free to the general commerce of the country.

Mr. NESBITT: If we control these harbours, who gets the dues?

Mr. ROGERS: The Harbour Commissioners get the dues, and the Harbour Commissioners at the various ports are under the direct control of the Government. Whatever property they own indirectly belongs to the Government and the rates they charge are fixed by the Government.

Mr. NESBITT: Why should you charge the custom building on Sussex street to consolidated fund account, or to expense account, and charge these things to capital account? We own that building, do we not?

Mr. ROGERS: It is built out of capital.

Mr. NESBITT: Did we not pass an item for that building on consolidated fund account? You have numerous items charged to consolidated fund besides that all over the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, but the main buildings are all charged to capital account.

Mr. NESBITT: If you build a post office does it not belong to the Government? I do not understand your system of bookkeeping. You really do not own these harbours, but you charge them to capital account.

Mr. ROGERS: We own them all.

Mr. NESBITT: You do not own Toronto harbour.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, the Harbour Board is appointed by the city of Toronto and by this Government.

Mr. NESBITT: And the Toronto people have no control over the harbour?

Mr. ROGERS: The Harbour Board are put in charge and they control the harbour. The property they own is indirectly under the control of the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: The city selects a number of the commissioners of Toronto harbour and the Government the other portion.

Mr. MACDONELL: A joint board.

Mr. NESBITT: What about the harbour in Montreal?

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is owned by the Government. Under the Act of Confederation all those harbours which were of a public character at the time of Confederation passed over to the Dominion.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Government does not own the harbours any more than it owns buildings in cities. If you tie your boat up to a wharf at St. John you pay so much to the man who owns the wharf unless you go to a Government wharf. Harbours in that sense are owned by the proprietors, but the governing body is the board that is appointed by the local authorities and the Government. They are not the owners. They are simply the governing body that makes rules and regulations for the harbour, but the harbour itself and the property in the harbour are owned by the people who live in the cities, and they ought to contribute something towards the maintenance of the harbours, because they get the profit. If we spend a million dollars in improving the harbour of Montreal every man who has a tract of land on the water front receives an advantage, because his property is worth that much more. It is the same at St. John and Halifax; all these expenditures raise the value of property in the vicinity of the harbour very much and consequently the minister ought to have some policy by which these different ports shall contribute something towards their maintenance and equipment. That is the proper idea in dealing with this question. It is all very well to say that we ought to have national ports, but why should the farmer out on the western prairie pay his taxes to equip the harbour of Toronto and give additional value to property in Toronto if the people of Toronto themselves will not do anything? I do not know any good reason for it.

Mr. NESBITT: The people of Toronto are doing something.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In the case of Toronto, they are going to do something, but in some of these ports they are not doing anything and the minister does not seem to think that they should.

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid that I cannot agree with my hon. friend. He mentions the case of St. John. It is true that if you tied your boat up at certain wharves at St. John you would have to pay something for it. St. John spent a large sum of money in the early days on the wharves referred to by my hon. friend, they are controlled by the city, and, of course, they have a right to make a collection. But it all comes back to this, that we are behind in the development of our national ports. We discuss day after day in this House the fact that a great portion of our trade is diverted to American channels. We have built three transcontinental railways in the hope of keeping our trade within our own country, but this cannot be done unless the Government undertake to meet the requirements and the development of our national ports for the carrying of freight in as convenient a manner as possible and in order to discourage shippers from diverting their traffic to American channels. That is the reason why the obligation rests upon the Government to see that out national ports are developed even more rapidly than they have been in the past and more rapidly than they are being developed to-day. If we are going to make a success of our transcontinental railways it is absolutely essential that we should have our ports and their development keeping pace with the conditions because a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. The people who are snipping over our railways do not get the accommodation, the connections and the services at our national ports that they should get and that they do get through American channels, with the result that trade is lost to the country. I agree with my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that the time has now arrived in Canada when we should have a new policy in connection with our harbours. We first of all must arrange for such a development as will ensure traffic and trade passing through our own channels and when we can do that it will be time enough to sit down together and see if we can exact a sufficient charge to pay the interest on the capital which we have expended and which must be considered

necessary for the develpoment of our country.

Mr. MACDONELL: The minister has touched upon a point that is essential in the Toronto case. The opening of the new Welland canal will mean that lake Ontario will be placed upon the same traffic basis as the upper lakes and that will make the development of harbour facilities at Toronto essential. Up to the present time practically no public money has been spent on Toronto harbour——

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is scarcely correct.

Mr. MACDONELL: Very largely.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When I was minister we had dredges at work there and a very nice breakwater was built out at the island.

Mr. MACDONELL: It was only very partial work that was done there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It was needed.

Mr. MACDONELL: Of course, it was needed. Public property was being washed away and the breakwater served a good purpose in the past but there was no real dealing with Toronto harbour in a serious way.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, it was very serious.

Mr. MACDONELL: Merely to protect it but not to develop it. Now, the local harbour commission have taken the matter in hand and they are proceeding to spend a very large amount of money—quite the amount of money that was mentioned by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). This Government money is being strictly expended on harbour work. The Toronto Harbour Commission is paying out an immense amount of money, part of it on real harbour work that is generally done by the Government and part of it on collateral, adjacent works that altogether will comprise the completed Toronto harbour. The Government is not doing more than its share. The harbour commission, locally, is spending many millions of dollars on real harbour work. The opening of the Welland canal will make it necessary to have some great port on lake Ontario. That is why the trade has heretofore gone by American channels and through American harbours. Buffalo gets a very large proportion of the entire freight of the upper lakes. When this new work is completed it is expected that a very great portion of this traffic will come to Kingston, Toronto and other ports on lake Ontario. This work is essential and is being carried out in a proper manner. The Toronto people, through their harbour commission, are spending many millions of dollars, and when the work is completed we shall have a harbour that will be equal if not superior to any on the American continent. It is expected that the work will be completed about the same time as the Welland canal, if not before. With regard to harbour dues, which have been mentioned to-night, all the docks, shipping facilities and privileges of Toronto harbour will be vested in the harbour commission, and there will be no possibility, as the hon. member for Guysborough suggests, of a boat tieing up at A's dock or at B's dock and being charged dues at a more or less arbitrary rate, which, I suppose, is what the hon. gentleman had in mind. All the docking facilities will be under the harbour commission, and their charges are under the regulation and supervision of the Dominion Government. As has been stated by some hon. gentlemen, the harbour commissioners of Montreal, of Quebec, and of Toronto are under different Acts of Parliament, and their powers vary. In the case of the Toronto Harbour Commission the Government has the selection of one commissioner, and the nomination of another at the suggestion of the Toronto Board of Trade. The Toronto Harbour Commission is really a Government commission. All harbour regulations, dues and charges must be either fixed by the Government or be submitted to them and receive their approval. In view of these facts harbour conditions at Toronto will very shortly be almost ideal.

Mr. GRAHAM: Under the late Government, and before I was a member of it, I was taken to Toronto to be shown what the Government was doing there. It must be remembered by hon. gentlemen who do not know the great city of Toronto that the harbour is protected by an island which forms a natural bay or harbour. The difficulty has been with what are known as the eastern and western gaps, which are entrances to the harbour. The late Government spent a large amount of money in building breakwaters to prevent the island shore beiing washed away, and also a large amount in completing the eastern and western gaps. The entrances to the harbour are now in good condition, but it must be admitted that for years Toronto harbour was not looked after either by the city or by anybody else, and it has been notorious

among shipping men for having perhaps the poorest loading and unloading facilities of any harbour in the Dominion. Outside of the traffic to which the hon. member for Toronto has referred, Toronto is a great distributing centre for all the freight that comes by water, and that will come more and more from that whole inland country of Ontario as the harbour facilities are developed. I am strongly in favour of this vote, and I would suggest to the minister that we pass this Toronto item and then adjourn.

Progress reported

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Wednesday, May 3, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

CANADIAN NORTHERN AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAYS.

PROPOSED LOANS.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): In connection with the proposed loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which appears in the Supplementary Estimates laid upon the table of the House yesterday, I desire now to lay upon the table the following documents:

A letter dated December 10, 1915, addressed to the Prime Minister by Mr. Alfred W. Smithers, chairman of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

A statement showing the outstanding bonds, debentures, loans and notes of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and of the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, as of January 1, 1916.

A statement showing the interest payments for each month during the year 1915 upon securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, together with an estimate of the deficit in operation for the present calendar year.

A statement of expenses for betterments and miscellaneous purposes for the same year.

A statement showing bonds authorized, issued and outstanding, and the net proceeds therefrom; also interest payable for the years 1916 and 1917 of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Compay.

A statement of advances which have been made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company as of February 29, 1916, to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, to the Grand Trunk Pacific Saskatchewan Railway Company, and to the Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company, Limited, and the security held by the Grand Trunk Railway Company therefor.

A memorandum prepared by the Department of Finance showing the amount of the proceeds of the sales and pledges of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's securities guaranteed by the Dominion Government under the legislation of 1914, together with details of payments made to the Railway Company from such proceeds, accompanied by certified copies of the Orders in Council under which authority the payments were made from time to time.

In connection with the proposed loan of $15,000,000 to the Canadian Northern Railway, which also appears in the Supplementary Estimates, I desire to lay upon the Table the following:

Statement of all securities of the Canadian Northern Railway System outstanding as of April 15, 1916, showing the total securities guaranteed by the Dominion Government and the amounts issued, the total securities guaranteed by Provincial Governments and the amounts issued, and the total amount of unguaranteed authorized and issued securities, and the maturities of all issues.

A statement showing the amount expected to be realized from securities which were available as of December 1913, the depreciation as of December, 1915.

An audited statement of loans and liabilities.

A memorandum respecting the funded debt and fixed charges.

A memorandum respecting contractors' accounts.

A memorandum of interest payable by the Dominion and by Provincial Governments under existing legislation.

I desire also to lay upon the Table a statement showing the proceeds of the sales and pledges of the $45,000,000 Canadian Northern Railway securities guaranteed by the Government of Canada under the legislation of 1914, together with an estimate showing what would have been realized for such securities upon the basis of prices existing before the war; also particulars of the various certificates which have been issued by officials of the Department of Railways and Canals, certifying that payments might be made out of the proceeds of the securities, and showing the balance of proceeds on hand as of May 1, 1916. These statements are accompanied by copies of the certificates given by Major Graham Bell, of the Department of Railways and Canals, who audited the accounts. In connection with the certificates given by Major Graham Bell I also desire to lay upon the Table a letter which he has addressed to me respecting the audit he has made of the books and accounts of the company.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose that is all the correspondence there is in connection with the two proposed loans?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that he have these printed as quickly as possible and distributed amongst the members, because he can readily understand we cannot discuss the matter intelligently with only one copy between us.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I thought my hon. friend might desire that either himself or some other hon. member should look over and select from the statements that have been laid upon the Table those it was thought desirable to have printed, as was done in 1914. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the statements I have presented should be printed as they have a direct bearing on the subjects referred to, and I therefore beg to move that rule No. 74 be suspended for the purpose of enabling me to move that the documents I have laid upon the Table be printed forthwith.

Mr. NESBITT: Is there any statement showing the bonds that have priority over those guaranteed by the Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: All the bond issues of the system are shown in the statement I have presented.

Mr. NESBITT: The proposition in the Estimates is to pay the interest on bonds that have priority over the Government guaranteed bonds.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think all the other issues of the Canadian Northern Railway system have priority over the $45,000,000 mortgage which was executed in 1914. That, of course, was subject to underlying mortgages securing the bond issues of the system. I think the statement I have laid upon the Table will give my hon. friend full information, but if anything further is desired I shall be pleased to bring it down if I can procure it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are any copies of the trust deeds that were executed at the time of the guarantee of 1914 available?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, I shall lay on the Table a few copies of the two trust deeds executed by the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific in 1914. It will not be necessary to print any more of those.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yesterday the Prime Minister said, in answer to a question by the leader of the Opposition, that he presumed there would be considerable correspondence in connection with the applications for these loans, and I think he said it would be laid upon the Table. Might I ask that that be done? Amongst the papers that have been laid upon the Table there is no correspondence at all in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway, and only one letter, from Mr. Smithers, in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I call my hon. friend's attention to that, and I think my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition supposed that the correspondence also would be laid upon the Table.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that all the correspondence has been brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY: These are only financial statements.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is a letter from the chairman of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But nothing from the Canadian Northern?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no written application from the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The letter from the chairman of the Grand Trunk Railway Company is an important communication which sets out the position of the Grand Trunk and of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is there included in this statement anything that would show the expenditure in paying interest so far as securities are concerned? According to the item in the Supplementary Estimates a certain sum of money is asked to be voted for the purpose of providing for expenditures made or to meet indebtedness incurred in paying interest upon securities having priority over the guaranteed securities authorized by chapter 20, Statutes 1914, and also for expenditures on construction and on equipment. Does the statement which my hon. friend has brought down contain anything in detail that would show who made those expenditures and when they were made? Apparently the appropriation is to recoup some corporation for having made those expenditures. If money has been spent on construction, or equipment, or interest since June, 1914, the statement ought to be made in concise form so that the House will know exactly what are the facts. If there have been any sales by the Canadian Northern since June, 1914, of securities which were in existence at that time or which may have come into existence since, the statement ought to show

clearly that those securities have been sold and what has been done with the proceeds.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The statements which I have presented give full information as to the two latter points referred to by my hon. friend. The statement shows the sales and pledges of securities and their proceeds. It also shows all payments made out of the proceeds, together with the certificates upon which they were paid out. There is also a statement showing, in addition to the funded debt, the short date maturities and the temporary indebtedness of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. That shows, with details, the amount of advances upon interest and construction accounts, and it gives I think, full information as to the current obligations of the company. In other words, the statement which I have filed shows the permanent and the current obligations of the company.

Mr. MACDONALD: Exclusive of bonded indebtedness and of debenture securities, what I would like to have made clear is this: the wording of the item seems to indicate that the money is asked to be voted to repay money spent for indebtedness incurred in paying interest. Is the information furnished sufficient to make that clear?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think so. The company borrows money from time to time for its purposes. Its borrowings as they stand at present are shown, I think, in sufficient detail, in the statement which I have laid upon the Table.

Motion agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY ACCOUNTANT.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, laid upon the table of the House on the 28th ult., respecting an increase of salary to Mr. Alfred Carter, Accountant of the Library, was concurred in.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL APPROVED.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior) moved:

That the following Orders in Council, laid on the table of the House on Tuesday, the 25th day of January last, be approved:

1. Orders in Council published in the Canada Gazette and in the British Columbia Gazette, between the 12th of January, 1915, and the 31st of December, 1915, in accordance with sub-section D of section 38 of the regulations for the survey, administration, disposal and management of Dominion lands within the Forty-mile railway belt in the province of British Columbia.

2. Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between the 12th of January, 1915, and the 31st of December, 1915, in accordance with Section 77, Chapter 20, 7-8 Edward VII, the Dominion Lands Act.

3. Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between the 16th of January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, in accordance with Section 19 of Chapter 10, 1-2 George V, the Forest Reserves and Parks Act.

4. Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between the 12th of January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, in accordance with Chapter 5 of Chapter 21, 7-8 Edward VII, the Dominion Lands Survey Act.

5. Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between the 12th of January, 1915, and the 31st December, 1915, in acordance with Chapter 47, 2 George V, the Railway Belt Water Act.

6. Orders in Council passed under Section 18 of Chapter 63, Revised Statutes of Canada, an Act to provide for the Government of the Yukon territory.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: This resolution to confirm certain Orders in Council is the result of a position taken by the present Premier when leader of the Opposition, who insisted persistently on having this procedure followed, namely, that all Orders in Council passed by the Government should be submitted to Parliament for its approval. I do not know that any great purpose is to be served by this procedure beyond the fact that the presentation of the Orders gives an opportunity of informing the House in regard to their purport and, if necessary, of raising discussion regarding them. It is hardly to be expected that the House would under any circumstances reverse any Order in Council that had been passed, because such reversal would lead to great complications. An Order having taken effect from the time of its being passed, for the House to declare that it was invalid or to refuse to sanction it would, of course, create confusion that would be contrary to the public interest.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think the question was quite one of reversal. As I remember the legislation, it is to the effect that the Orders in Council shall be in force until the last day of the next succeeding session of Parliament, but not longer, so that, unless during that session they are approved by the House, they would simply cease to have effect. It is pretty much the same thing.

Mr. OLIVER: The effect would be practically the same, that an action that had

been taken by the Government would be rendered invalid by the inaction of the House. Further, in discussing the merits of the procedure, if information is the purpose of it, I think that there is always the possibility of the House becoming informed on consideration of the Estimates of the department concerned, without the necessity of this formality being observed. The statute, however, calls for it and the minister has followed the statute, and the Orders in Council have been referred to me by the right hon. leader of the Opposition for consideration. While I would not presume for a moment to undertake to discuss the vast mass of material that is contained in these many Orders, having gone through them somewhat carefully, I may take the liberty of drawing the attention of the House and of the Government to certain points as being of more or less public interest.

Order No. 1938 grants an irrigation right in the railway Belt of British Columbia to one Layton. The terms are: $5 an acre, with $2 deduction on account of irrigation work. But Order No. 2378 grants to F. W. Anderson a tract in the same railway belt at one dollar an acre with a requirement of only 35 per cent of land to be irrigated. It seems to me there is no good reason for the difference in the treatment accorded these two enterprises under what appear, so far as the Orders in Council are concerned, to be exactly parallel conditions.

A small matter to which I may draw the minister's attention is dealt with by Order in Council of 27th February. This order provides for the destruction of predatory animals and birds in the Dominion parks, but it does not specify what animals or birds are considered "predatory." Therefore, the tourist who undertakes to exercise what he supposes is his right under this Order in Council is liable to get into trouble with the authorities just the same. I would suggest to the minister that when he permits the killing of animals within the park, contrary to the general principle of protecting animal life there, he should specify exactly what animals or birds may be killed.

An Order dated 15th June, 1915, deals with the question of motor vehicles in the parks, and provides that they may be used on roads from which they have hitherto been excluded. For a long time it was considered inadvisable that motors should be used in the mountain parks, for the obvious reason that the use of motors on the same roads as carriages might result in very serious accidents where horses were not used to the motors. Now that motors have been permitted in the parks on certain roads, now that the necessities of the case require that the privilege be extended to those who use motors, may I take the opportunity of making a suggestion to the minister. That suggestion is, that provision should be made to test the horses employed in the park, to find out whether they will or will not shy at motor vehicles. This is an important matter to those who are interested. We desire to have these parks patronized by all classes of people, we desire to have them used by motorists and also by those who drive horses. But until the horse becomes used to the motor there is the greatest possible danger to life in the use of the two vehicles on the same road. I should think it very unfortunate to restrict the use of motors. But if motors are to be used, horses should not be used unless they have, so to speak, passed an examination in meeting motors on the road.

I observe a general tendency throughout the regulations to relax conditions that were imposed in previous years. This, I think, is a very proper attitude to be taken by the department. A few years ago, when values of all kinds were rising, when speculation was rife, it was necessary that there should be restrictive regulations to prevent the public property from falling into the hands of speculators to be used for speculative purposes purely. But under the benign rule of our friends opposite the values of property in the West have declined to such an extent—and are still on the down grade—that there is no such thing as speculation now either in land, timber, coal, petroleum, or any other natural resource of which I have knowledge. Therefore, there is no necessity for the maintenance of rigid requirements in order to secure ownership that were absolutely necessary a few years ago. I do not wish to approve of an unfair administration of the law or regulations as showing favouritism, but I decidedly approve of a readjustment of the regulations according to existing conditions, which is what I find in those orders that I have noted.

There is an Order dated 17th April which rescinds a prohibition enacted by a previous order with regard to mining of coal under the right of way of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. The former Order was passed during the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, on the application of the railway company, for the safety of the road as it was building. I notice that that

Order is rescinded on the ground that, now that the railroad has been built, it does not matter whether the mining operations are carried on or not. May I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that the purpose of the original order was to assure that the ground under the railroad track should not be undermined. But if it is undermined after the railroad is constructed, the result is just the same as though it had been undermined when the railroad was under construction. Coal seams are very close to the surface in many cases, and if the railroad has no protection in the matter it is quite possible for a man to acquire a coal right, and, by working that coal right, to absolutely wreck the railroad grade it crosses. It may be that such a case would only occur very exceptionally. But to prevent that condition was the purpose of the first order; and I must say, I do not think the minister is well advised in rescinding that order. There is no serious reason why it should be rescinded, and it seems to me there is good reason why it should be maintained.

I notice in an Order passed May 27, 1915, that the boundaries of gas leases, which, under a former Order, were required to conform to a certain base line, are now not required so to conform, the reason given being that as the lessees now do not acquire the surface, there is no reason why the boundary lines should be regular. I submit that it does not make any difference whether the right is acquired on the surface or not, it is just as necessary that the right which is acquired below the surface should be ascertainable with as little difficulty as if it were acquired on the surface. The original regulation that required the boundary lines of gas properties to conform to a certain well understood requirement is just as necessary in the public interest when the right relates only to the gas itself as it is if it relates to the surface—indeed, I think more so, because if it relates to the surface there can easily be surface marks to show where the boundaries are. When it is not related to the surface it is all the more important that every one should know where and in what direction the boundary lines are drawn.

I notice a number of grants to cemetery companies. It has been the custom to make grants of cemetery grounds to churches and municipalities, but I notice that the minister has introduced a system, or practice, of making free grants of land for cemetery purposes to companies. So long as the property is for the purpose of a cemetery it does not make any serious difference whether it is granted without charge or to whom it may be granted. But it is obvious that if a free grant is made to a company that company may later change its character and the purpose that was in the mind of the Government in granting the cemetery property may be defeated. It is perfectly right that cemetery property should be granted, and should be granted free, but I think that it should be granted free only to municipalities or churches which have a corporate existence aside from the business of running a cemetery, and which can be held to an agreement to maintain the property for the purposes for which it was intended. In one case here I notice that a part of a school section has been sold to a cemetery company. That it seems to me, is not an unreasonable proposal. If a cemetery company wishes to acquire land from the Government, it should pay for it at the price that the land is worth and should be subject to all the considerations appertaining to any other company that is doing business with the Government; it should not be on the same footing as a church or a municipality or any other public body or organization.

I notice an Order in Council of August 12, 1915, by which J. A. Fraser, of Portage la Prairie, is granted a hay lease on a quarter section of land at 25 cents an acre. I am not acquainted with the circumstances of the case, but I draw attention to it from the fact that it seems strange that an Order in Council should be required to enable Mr. Fraser to secure exclusive rights on a certain quarter section. It would seem that if one man has an opportunity to acquire grazing rights or hay rights on this quarter section, any other man should have equal opportunity. Either there should be general regulations governing the matter of hay leases or no special grant should be made to a special person. I know nothing about the circumstances of the case, but I suggest to the minister that the finding of such instances in this mass of regulations would indicate that there had been favouritism in the matter rather than a regard for the general interest.

I notice a very remarkable Order of September 17, 1915, and if it would not be out of order, Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to have the minister's explanation later of the purposes of the Order. Under this

Order the Churchill Basin Fish and Traction Company, Limited, are given exclusive rights of occupation of a right of way for a distance of 225 miles. The purpose, as it appears to me, would be to reach some fishing grounds of this company in the north. I am unable by reading the Order to understand what purpose is to be achieved by it, and I hope the minister will be good enough to give us an explanation of its purpose.

I note again an Order dated November 6, 1915, which provides for the auction sale of one school section and of a five-acre piece of another school section, the section to be at the upset price of $7 an acre and the fraction to be at the upset price of $30 an acre. No reason is given in the Order in Council for this special sale being made. It is generally the custom not to sell school lands except in areas; that is to say, the School Lands Branch come to the conclusion that the land in a certain area of townships has reached a good value and they list and put on sale by auction all the school sections within that area. The fact that a large number of sections are on sale attracts buyers and makes the sale important and tends to general success. There may be cases where there is necessity for the disposal of a small parcel of school land. It can only be disposed of by public auction, but I think it is only right that when it is considered necessary to make such disposition the reasons should be stated. No reasons are stated in this Order in Council for dealing with these two pieces of school land in this particular way, and if the minister would be good enough to take note of the matter, I should be glad to have his explanation later on that point.

I notice an Order dated December 9, 1915, the purpose of which is to give protection to the homestead entries made by enlisted men after their enlistment. There are a number of Orders in this bundle of papers making provision for the protection of homesteaders and miners and others holding rights on the public domain who have enlisted in the military forces. These orders are for their protection during the period of their enlistment, and in most cases to give them credit for the work they do for the country or the Empire, as if it were done on their homesteads. Everybody will agree that that is right and proper. This order of which I speak is in a somewhat different class. The former Orders, of which I spoke, gave protection to men who have already enlisted and made their plans of life to occupy either land or mining property, and who have given up those plans and prospects for the purpose of serving their country. This order provides that the man who has enlisted can, after his enlistment, go and make an entry for the land and be protected, and have the benefit of that land as though he had occupied it before his enlistment. That is to say, this Order in Council gives a bonus of a quarter-section of land to the man who enlists. I am not discussing the merits of the case; it may be that that is a desirable policy to pursue, but it is well that we should understand that that is what we are doing, that we are giving the man who enlists now a bonus of a homestead for enlisting without residence or practically duties, as I understand it.

It would be impossible, of course, to deal thoroughly with the vast mass of departmental work that is contained in this file. The file having been brought down, I thought it was only proper that I should draw the minister's attention and the attention of the House, to such points as I happened to be able to notice in an examination of the documents. There are many other matters that might be dealt with, but I do not think that at this stage of the session it would be wise to take up the time of the House at any greater length. But I would be glad if the minister would explain to the House the points to which I have drawn his attention. I shall be very glad to agree to the passing of the resolution.

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): Believing that these Orders in Council would be disposed of in the manner that they have been disposed of every year when submitted to Parliament, and formally approved of, I have not been able to get the information necessary to give an explanation in detail other than is contained in the Orders in Council. I cannot therefore enter into as minute an explanation as otherwise I would have liked to make, but I will refer to a few of the points which have been raised, trusting that my personal knowledge will enable me to reply to the hon. gentleman. The only explanation I can give as to the difference between the prices charged in connection with lands for irrigation purposes in the railway belt is that there was a time when the lands in the railway belt were sold for $3 an acre with a rebate of $2 per acre on the completion of the irrigation works. But these regulations were changed so that we now sell the lands at $5 an acre

instead of $3 as heretofore. That pretty well explains the difference between the two cases, although I am not at all sure as to the dates. There might have been some special considerations in connection with these cases which I will have looked up, and I will afford the hon. gentleman the explanation later on. I quite agree with his suggestion as to specifying the predatory animals and birds in the Orders in Council. Of course, it may necessitate frequent Orders in Council, or frequent amendments in Orders in Council, but that is not a great hardship, and we can easily conform to that.

In regard to the suggestion about examining the horses that are driven in the parks to test them so as to determine whether or not they will shy at motor vehicles, I do not know whether that would be practicable or not. I doubt whether we have jurisdiction over all those horses. No doubt we have jurisdiction to a certain extent over the horses that are allowed in the parks, but I am afraid it would be rather a large order if all the horses were to be examined to see if they were afraid of motor vehicles.

In regard to the grants for cemeteries, we have been granting sites for cemeteries where it was an organized company, a municipality, or a church, that applied, but we make the express stipulation that they are not to be utilized for any other purpose, so that that will bind them down specifically to the purposes of a cemetery site.

Mr. OLIVER: I note that one of these Orders in Council refers simply to the people of Centre View, Rev. John Prior, without any suggestion that a company is being organized.

Mr ROCHE: No doubt that was in connection with a church. Very likely they have a church, and have applied for a cemetery site in connection with it. I quite agree that the school lands stand on a different footing from Dominion lands, inasmuch as school lands are held as a trust, and it is only right that we should not grant them free. They are usually disposed of by public auction or at a valuation. In connection with the hay lease to one Fraser, I have a dim recollection of that case, and I think the explanation is that these were not ordinary Dominion lands but lands surrounding lake Manitoba, most of which were under water. But Mr. Fraser was a stock man with a large number of stock, and not having sufficient land on which to run this stock, he applied for a lease of some of the lands that had been revested in the Dominion from the province. I think that is the explanation of the lease in this case. I do not know that there was any conflicting application, and therefore there would not be any desire to show partiality to Mr. Fraser. With regard to the Churchill Basin Fish and Traction Company's right of way, I understand that that is a road that has a provincial charter, and we dealt with this charter just the same as we do with applications from other railways. An official of the department in a memorandum submitted to me said he saw no reason why he should discriminate against those having provincial charters, and only grant the right of way to those holding Dominion charters. I believe it is a road which joins with the Hudson Bay road on the way to Churchill and therefore it has a provincial charter.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it suggested that this is to be a railway?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: The reason that I drew attention to it was that I understood that it was intended to be a wagon or trail road, and I wanted to know particularly if the rights granted to the Company would prevent other people from using it.

Mr. ROCHE: It is a railway right of way. As to the sale of the school section and of five acres of another section, a municipality may ask to have a particular section put up for sale, for something in connection with municipal purposes, and it may desire to have a sale before the general sales take place because the general sales only take place once every two or three years. Our policy in regard to putting up the school lands for sale is that before the land is offered, we secure the consent of the provincial government and we submit a statement of the lands that are going to be offered for sale and of the places where the sales are going to be held. We have done that in connection with the sales which are to be held this coming summer.

With regard to the protection of the homesteading rights of those who have enlisted, I think the hon. gentleman has probably misinterpreted the Order in Council. He states that we are giving practically the same protection to the soldier who has made his homestead entry after enlistment as we are giving to the man who was the owner of a homestead prior to enlistment.

But there is a difference in our treatment of these two men. The man who had a homestead prior to enlistment has not only protection in so far as not allowing cancellation proceedings to be instituted, but he is also allowed to count as time of residence on his homestead the time that he is serving his country at the front. In the case of the volunteer who makes a homestead entry after enlistment, he is not allowed to count his time but he is protected from cancellation. I will draw the attention of the officers of the department to the suggestions which have been made by my hon. friend in regard to the manner in which some Orders in Council might be improved, and also to the other suggestions which he has made in order that they may have every consideration.

THE BILINGUAL QUESTION.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) laid on the Table copies of the Orders in Council and reports of the Minister of Justice in reference to the Ontario Statute passed at the last session of the Legislature, the reports dealing more particularly with certain petitions for the disallowance of the Act 45 Vic. chapter 45 of that year, and certain correspondence with the Department of Justice.

3 p.m.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

TRURO-MONCTON SECTION.

Mr. COPP:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to change the location of the Intercolonial railway, or building a new line of railway as a part of the Government system, to and from any points on the said Intercolonial railway, between the city of Moncton and the town of Truro, for the purpose of avoiding the heavy grades now existing between said points?
2. If so, between what points on said Intercolonial railway will the diversion be made?
3. Have any proposed routes for such diversion been surveyed? If so, how many?
4. Have any reports of such surveys or recommendations respecting same been made to the Government? If so, by whom?
5. What has been the total cost to date of such surveys?

Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Some surveys have been made.
4. No.

[Mr. Roche.]

5. $37,012.52, for double track and grade revision surveys between Moncton and at or near Truro.

PRINCE RUPERT MILITIA QUARTERS.

Mr. PARDEE:

Is the Department of Militia and Defence renting any quarters from J. E. Merryfield at Prince Rupert, B.C.? If so, what are the premises, and what rental is being paid?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

LEVIS QUARANTINE PROPERTY.

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. How much did the work done on the Quarantine property at Lévis, by J. B. Clouthier during the year 1915-16, cost?
2. What was the cost of materials used, of the work done, as personal expenses and percentages for the said J. B. Clouthier, and all outlay of any other kind?
3. What is the character of the work done?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. $8,216.80.
2.

Cost of material used		$2,778 56
Cost of work done		2,984 67
15 per cent on $4,244.52, made up as follows:		
Material	$1,259 85	
Work done	2,984 67	
		636 68
Other outlay		373 49
Under contract dated 30th June, 1915		1,195 60
Plus extras		247 80
		$8,216 80

3. Roadmaking and draining.

Note.—All the above dealings were with the firm of Clouthier & Trudel, of the village of St. Romuald, P.Q. The department had no dealings with J. B. Clouthier.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS SERVICE.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What steamer is making the service between Pictou, Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen this year?
2. Under what terms is the steamer running as per subsidy contract?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The steamship Amelia.
2. A subsidy contract has been entered into for one year. The amount of the subsidy is $18,000.

BRITISH COLUMBIA LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries chartered a steamer during the present season for lighthouse service in British Columbie?
2. If so, what is her name, dimensions, tonnage, both gross and net, date of construction, name and post office address of present owner and rate per day?

3. Is any part of the vessel's running expenses chargeable to the department? If so, what part?

4. Were tenders invited? If so, what are the names and addresses of the tenderers, and amount of each tender?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. Leebro. Length, 123.5 feet; breadth, 28.8 feet; depth, 11.1 feet; gross tonnage, 323; registered tonnage, 198; built 1908; name and address of owners, Crescent Shipping Company, Ltd., Victoria, B.C.; rate per day, $125. This vessel has been chartered by the department from time to time since 1908 as the exigencies of the service required.

3. No.

4. No.

WENTWORTH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the mail contractor between Wentworth station and Lower Wentworth, Cumberland county?

2. Were tenders called for the performance of this contract in 1915? If so, who were the tenderers, what was the amount of each tender, and to whom was it awarded?

3. What was the amount paid to the previous contractor?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. W. M. Brown.

2. Yes: W. M. Brown, $350; Arthur Mills, $400; Lannis F. Crawford, $400. The contract was awarded to W. M. Brown at the rate of his tender.

3. $339 per annum.

FRED. S. WILSON.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Was Mr. Wilson, Belmont, N.S., appointed as buyer of hay for Colchester?

2. If so, what amount is paid per month to him as salary?

3. Is any commission paid to him?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Mr. Fred. S. Wilson, Belmont, N.S., was appointed as organizer to secure hay for War Office account in connection with the compressing plant at Windsor, N.S.

2. He is paid $5 per day, plus $1.50 living expenses, plus $1.50 per day when he uses a horse.

3. No.

EAST GORE-KENNETCOOK MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who is the mail carrier between East Gore and Kennetcook Corner, Hants county?

2. What is the amount paid him yearly?

3. Were tenders called for the performance of the present contract?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. J. S. Blois.

2. $300.

3. It was the intention of the department, on the establishment of rural delivery in the district, to discontinue this service, but it was subsequently decided to continue it, and a temporary arrangement was made.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, bills, vouchers and memoranda in connection with the repairs to the wharf at Shad Bay, Halifax county, N.S., in 1915.

Mr. A. K. Maclean.—For a copy of all letters, telegrams, bills, vouchers and memoranda in connection with the repairs to the wharf at Upper Propect, Halifax county, N.S., in 1915.

BOUNTIES ON ZINC BILL.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 94, to provide for the payment of bounties on zinc produced from zinc ores mined in Canada, was read the third time and passed.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Acting Ministers of Railways and Canals), the House went into committee, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair, to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide as follows :

1. That the Governor in Council may grant a subsidy to the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company of $3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of Railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated) which shall not cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized; and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway, not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of $3,200 per mile or fifty per cent on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as is in excess of $15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of $6,400 per mile, namely :

(a) A railway from Andover, in the county of Victoria, to Centreville, in the county of Carleton, not exceeding 26 miles;

(b) a railway from Centreville to Gagetown, in the county of Queens, not exceeding 120 miles;

(c) a railway from a point at or near Gagetown to a point on the Canadian Pacific railway at or near Westfield, in the county of Kings, not exceeding 45 miles.

2. That the Governor in Council may authorize and empower the Minister of Railways and Canals of Canada to enter into an agreement with the Government of the province of New Brunswick and the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company, subject to the necessary legislation to that end being passed by the

Legislature of New Brunswick, whereby the company shall construct up to a standard for safe operation the line of railway from Gagetown, or from a point near Gagetown, to a point on the Canadian Pacific railway at or near Westfield, on or before the first day of February, 1917, and shall complete the construction and equipment of the said line of railway in all respects up to and according to the specfications and requirements prescribed, on or before the first day of August, 1917, and shall complete the construction and equipment of the line from Centreville to Andover up to and according to the said specifications and requirements on or before the thirty-first day of December, 1918; and upon the said agreement becoming effective between the parties thereto, the Dominion shall enter into an interim lease of, as and from the first day of April, 1915, and operate, the line of railway from Centreville to Gagetown until the completion within the times hereinbefore specified of all the lines to be leased to the Dominion under the agreement, upon terms and conditions to be agreed upon; and that upon the completion of the line from Gagetown to Westfield, the Dominion will enter into a lease thereof and operate the same pending the completion of the remaining line to Andover, all in accordance with terms and conditions to be agreed upon in each case, including the forty and sixty per cent division of gross earnings hereinafter referred to; and the Dominion undertakes and agrees that as soon as the lines of railway from Centreville to Gagetown, and from Gagetown, or from a point near Gagetown to a point on the Canadian Pacific railway at or near Westfield, and from Centreville to Andover, all shall have been constructed and equipped to the satisfaction and approval of the engineer or engineers appointed by the minister, the Dominion will enter into a lease of the said lines of railway and operate the same upon the terms and conditions agreed upon and to be embodied in the said lease, for the term of ninety-nine years, it being understood and agreed that the Dominion will provide the necessary, suitable and sufficient rolling stock for the operation of the said lines of railway, and will maintain, repair and upkeep the same at its own expense during the whole term of the lease; and when the said lines of railway shall have been fully constructed and equipped as aforesaid, and the Dominion has entered into a lease of all said several lines of railway, the Dominion shall pay semi-annually to the province forty per cent of the gross earnings of the said railways under lease, including forty per cent of the gross earnings received from the operation over the line of railway of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and over the bridge and railway of the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company from Westfield to and into the city of Saint John, in case such running rights are acquired by the Company; and after maturity and payment of all debenture stock and bonds guaranteed by the province, and all bonds and other securities of the province in respect of the construction of the said railways or any of them, all rental as aforesaid shall be paid semi-annually to the company. The Dominion shall have the right to, and may withhold and apply towards the payment of rental due to the Canadian Pacific railway under any lease acquired by the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company, and also towards the payment of rental due to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company, under any lease or leases of running rights acquired by the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company, from any moneys that may from time to time be due and payable under said agreement from the Dominion to the province or company, as the case may be, and may make such payment of rentals from time to time to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to the said Bridge Company accordingly, and any such withholding of moneys and payment of the same for rentals to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or to the said Bridge Company as hereinbefore provided shall be deemed payments under the agreement to the province or the company, as the case may be, in as full and complete satisfaction as if otherwise made under the agreement. Upon failure or neglect on the part of the company to acquire and secure running rights from Westfield to and into the city of Saint John as in the agreement provided, the Dominion may acquire such running rights by lease or leases in its own and sole right and pay rentals therefor, or may construct a line of railway from Westfield to and into the city of Saint John; and in such case or cases neither the province nor the company shall have any right or interest in the said lease or leases, or such constructed line of railway, or be entitled to any revenue acquired through running rights under any lease or through operation over such constructed line, and all revenue in such case or cases shall accrue solely to the Dominion. It is understood and agreed that any expenditure made by the Dominion during the currency of the leases or any of them hereinbefore referred to, as is usually carried to the debit of Capital Account by English Railway Companies, including expenditures for additional tracks, sidings, yards, buildings, alignment and grade revisions, and other facilities required for the economical and efficient handling of traffic, shall be rapid to the Dominion by the Company out of the said forty per cent of the gross earnings payable to the company under the agreement, or by debentures secured by mortgage on the said railways bearing four per cent interest, at the option of the company.

3. The Government Railways Act and the Acts heretofore and hereafter passed amending the same shall extend and apply to any line or lines of railway leased or operated by His Majesty under the provisions of the said agreement.

Any expenditure made under the provisions of the Act to be based upon these resolutions and of the said agreement, shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

5. Any portion of the line of railway of the company that may be constructed upon lands acquired by purchase or lease from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or from His Majesty, in or near the city of Fredericton, may be included for purposes of the subsidy hereby authorized as a part of the total length of the company's line.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister kindly explain this?

Mr. REID: After the resolution is passed I propose to introduce a Bill repealing Chapter 49 of the Statutes of 1912, entitled the St. John and Quebec Railway Act, and Chapter 52 of the Statutes of 1915, entitled An Act to amend the St. John and Quebec

Railway Act. The Act of 1912 provides that under certain conditions the Dominion Government shall assume a liability of $1,000,000 for bridges that were to be erected over the St. John river. This Act was amended in 1914, to increase the liability from $1,000,000 to $3,000,000. We now propose to repeal these Acts for the reason that under the new arrangement the bridges will not be necessary, as the road will follow a different route.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where does the Act of 1914 speak of $3,000,000?

Mr. REID: I have not the Act before me, but that was the estimate at the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Government assumes the liability even if the bridges cost more?

Mr. REID: The Act of 1914 increased the liability from $1,000,000 to $3,000,000, and we now propose to repeal the Acts of 1912 and 1914, for the reason that under the new arrangement it will not be necessary to construct the bridges. The Bill that I intend to introduce will provide that the route of this railway will be from Centreville to Gagetown, thence to a point called Westfield, where it meets the Canadian Pacific railway. Running rights will be obtained over the Canadian Pacific railway, and, until some other arrangement is made by which the line will be extended to St. John, the Canadian Pacific railway will be used from Gagetown to St. John. In addition, a line is to be constructed from Andover to Centreville. The original line was to be from Grand Falls, on the Transcontinental, to Gagetown, thence to Rothesay, crossing the river on the Intercolonial. Since the original work was undertaken, the Transcontinental has been taken over by the Government, and, as the Intercolonial has now connection with the Transcontinental at McGivney junction, it will not be necessary for the present to build that section between Andover and Grand Falls, as we shall have direct connection with St. John by running over the road now owned by the Government between Fredericton and McGivney junction. This changing of the route makes it necessary for us to withdraw the original resolutions, so as to provide for a subsidy on the line between Gagetown and Westfield. We discussed with the New Brunswick Government the advisability of having this road connect with the Maine Central, so that there would be connection between the Eastern States and St. John and the lower provinces. Owing to financial conditions caused by the war, and the necessity of getting our surveys ready, we are dropping that portion of the line between Andover and Grand Falls, but with this exception the arrangement as originally proposed will be carried out. Instead of going to Rothesay, we are going to St. John via Westfield, and in this change there are a number of advantages. I discussed with the New Brunswick Government the advisability of getting into St. John at the earliest possible moment. Engineers who understand the work have told me that it would probably take two or three years before we could get the bridges completed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The bridges would take two or three years to build ?

Mr. REID: Yes. It would take two or three years to put in the foundations and have the bridges ready for operation. There is not only the question of time to be considered, but never in the history of our country have the materials entering into the construction of bridges been so expensive as at present. Iron is very dear and almost impossible to buy; cement, which is required in the foundations, is also high, and so are the other materials; labour is scarce. Altogether, we felt that it would be better to save the extra amount that we should have to pay, under present conditions, for the construction of these bridges. When this road is completed in February next—and it may be ready for operation before that time—I believe it will be of great advantage, not only to the city of St. John, but to the whole district through which it runs. and of that it will be of great assistance to the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental in getting our freight and passengers into the city of St. John. Feeling that this road was likely to give us an entrance into the city of St. John in the near future, I have been able to induce the Minister of Finance to place an amount in the Estimates for an elevator at St. John, the construction of which will be commenced at once; in fact I intend urging its completion as soon as possible in order that we may have the advantage of it next winter. This will be of benefit not only to the railway but to the people of St. John. As hon. members know, we have not had an elevator in that city since two years ago, when the elevator was destroyed by fire. At present, we intend taking running rights over the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is there any power in the Railway Act to compel the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to grant running rights, or must the matter be one of voluntary agreement?

Mr. REID: I do not know whether the Railway Act would compel them to grant running rights.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister propose to take power in this Bill to compel them?

Mr. REID: No, I am satified there will be no difficulty about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: On what ground does the minister base that statement?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Reciprocity.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This Government is opposed to reciprocity.

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that we already have agreements by which running rights on the Government railway are granted to the Canadian Pacific railway and vice versa.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When Mr. Blair was minister, the Government refused to give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company running rights over the Intercolonial between St. John and Halifax, and I believe they have never yet been able to get those running rights. If it is a matter of reciprocity, they may make a deal.

Mr. REID: I do not anticipate any trouble in regard to those running rights. If there is any trouble, I can assure the hon. gentleman we will get into St. John at an early date.

Mr. PUGSLEY: By an independent line.

Mr. REID: The advantage we shall have by running in from Westfield is that we immediately get into the west side. In addition to that, we run right over to the east side where the Intercolonial terminals are. The Intercolonial railway had a great deal of difficulty in taking over their tracks, grain or other freight consigned to West St. John. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company charged such heavy shunting charges between West St. John and the Intercolonial terminals that our freight charges were considerably cut into. By this proposal we can run right into West St. John and over to the Intercolonial terminal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If it is so easy to get running rights over the Canadian Pacific railway, why does the Intercolonial not get running rights from the east side to the west side, instead of paying those shunting charges?

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows quite well that I am speaking of the terminals. When we run over the eleven miles, we run right through their terminal and on to the Intercolonial; we can leave our freight cars in their own yards or at the wharf. There is no trouble about that. Taking the whole situation as I have explained it, I think it is much better that the road should be completed into St. John at the earliest possible date. It is a much better arrangement than the previous one for all concerned, and I hope, therefore, that the resolution will pass.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I regret very much that I am not able to agree with the Acting Minister of Railways in regard to this resolution, nor am I able to congratulate him or the Government on the conclusion which has been finally arrived at. It was a sorry ending to what seemed to be a great undertaking, one which was intended to make the city of St. John the chief Atlantic terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, and the new Transcontinental line which the company was to operate. I also am sorry that I have to charge this Government with having, from the very commencement of the undertaking since this Government came into power, acted, to all appearances, almost designedly, in co-operation with the Government of New Brunswick, to defeat the object originally in view. That is a pretty strong statement to make, but I think this legislation, and the facts, will justify it. Much as I regret to be obliged to make the statement, I feel it is my duty to do so.

What are the facts? When the late Government was in power, we conceived the idea that it would be a very important thing for the Transcontinental railway and also for Canada, that there should be direct connection between the Transcontinental line and the port of St. John. St. John, at that time, had attained such importance as a national port by reason of the accommodation which had already been provided there by the people of that city at a very large expenditure of money, that we believed that its success in that direction had been so marked that it would be desirable in the interest of Canada to have a direct connection between the port of St. John

and the Transcontinental railway, and Grand Falls seemed to be the point where the connection could best be made. We also felt that it would be of very great benefit to the valley of the St. John river which is a most fertile district, one of the best agricultural sections of the whole Dominion, a district which has been settled for upwards of one hundred years, but which for the most part has been without railway facilities. We thought that if the Valley railway could be constructed all the way from St. John to Grand Falls and be operated as a part of the Transcontinental system, it would be of immense national importance and would give very much needed accommodation locally to a most important section of Canada. At that time, I think in the year 1910, owing to a strong desire upon the part of the people of a large portion of New Brunswick that the Valley railroad should be built, a delegation came to Ottawa and interviewed the then Liberal Government; and after hearing the representations that were made, we arrived at the conclusion that the project was so important that it would be desirable that the Dominion Government should make exceptionally favourable arrangements for the construction of that road.

The proposition which was made to us, and to which the late Government cheerfully acceded, was that the railroad should be constructed from St. John, or from a point on the Government railway, to Grand Falls, and that the Government should enter into a lease for the operation of the completed road for a period of ninety-nine years, agreeing to keep the road in repair, and provide the rolling stock, and to pay to the province of New Brunswick, or to the railway company which should construct the line, forty per cent of the gross earnings. That forty per cent was to be applied towards recouping the province for the interest on the bonds which it proposed to guarantee, amounting, if I remember rightly, to $35,000 a mile. In 1910, the late Government was in office, there was passed by Parliament at the instance of the Government an act giving a subsidy for the line all the way from St. John to Grand Falls. That subsidy was in the ordinary form—$3,200 a mile, but with provision for an increase to $6,400 a mile, in case the cost of construction reached something over $21,000 a mile. It was also agreed that the Government should enter into a lease for the operation of the line in sections as completed. That was the condition of affairs when this Government came into office. Now, what is the first instance of departure from that contract, and of breach of faith on the part of this Government in conjunction with the then Government of New Brunswick, led by the Hon. Mr. Flemming? And here I may say that at the time it was rumoured in New Brunswick that Premier Flemming had given assurances—assurances which were quite publicly stated by those connected with the Canadian Pacific railway—that, although it was provided by statute that the line should run to Grand Falls, yet it was never intended to run a line parallel to the Canadian Pacific, but that the line would really stop at Andover. It was also looked forward to that at the southern end it should run to Westfield. So, instead of a line running to Grand Falls, to be operated as part of the Transcontinental, this would be a line beginning at a point on the Canadian Pacific at Andover and running to a point on the Canadian Pacific to Westfield, some fourteen miles from the city of St. John. In 1912, the subsidy from St. John to Grand Falls was renewed in the following words:

> For a line of railway from St. John to Grand Falls, New Brunswick, exclusive of a railway bridge across the Kennebecasis river, at or near Perry point, and two railway bridges across the St. John river, one at or near Mistake, and one at or near Andover; in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 51 of 1910, section 1, item 12; not exceeding 228 miles.

This is in the very wording of the statute of 1910, which was passed when the late Government was in power. While that subsidy was renewed to prevent it lapsing, in the following year we find the hand of Mr. Flemming, then Premier of New Brunswick, showing in the legislation, and carrying out what it was alleged was the assurance that had been given to the Canadian Pacific railway that the line should not be built to Grand Falls but should stop at Andover. The Subsidy Act of the previous year was repealed and the following substituted instead, as the minister will find in chapter 46 of the statutes of 1913:

> To the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, for a line of railway from Andover to St. John, New Brunswick, exclusive of a railway bridge across the St. John river, at or near Mistake, and a railway bridge across the Kennebecasis river at or near Perry point; in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 48 of 1912, section 2, item 2; not exceeding 200 miles.

There we find the first instance of the fact that this Government and the Government of New Brunswick, the latter then led by Mr. Flemming, had decided to abandon that line of the railway which was to extend

from Andover to Grand Falls. That was the first instance of the breach of faith which we find to have taken place. In the year, 1912, the Government, of course, was confronted by the fact that the bridges had to be built and that the railway company could not build them without Dominion aid. It was provided that a bridge company should be formed and that the Government of Canada should guarantee the bonds of that company for a certain period, and also pay the interest upon the bridge bonds for a period of fifteen years. As further evidence of the fact that there was never any bona fide intention, as it appears to me and as the records show, to build these bridges or to build the line from St. John to Grand Falls, in addition to the evidence I have given to the committee we have the further fact that, during all these years and up to the present time, not a blow has been struck upon the railway north of Andover, nor has there been a blow struck upon the railway south of Gagetown. Some surveys were made of the St. John river and the Kennebecasis river, and surveyors' stakes were driven, but not one blow was ever struck south of Gagetown although it is six years since the late Government made the agreement to which I have referred, and there has since been plenty of time to build the whole railway and the bridges as well. Not a dollar has been expended in construction either north of Andover and north of Centreville in Carleton county, nor has any money been spent on construction south of Gagetown. I suppose that this Government and the provincial Government were keeping the matter open until the people of New Brunswick should be wearied with waiting and should be ready to submit to what, I believe, these two Governments have all along intended to do—to make the termini Andover on the north and Westfield on the south. This is what, after all these years of waiting, they are asking the people of New Brunswick to accept as being the final and fixed policy they have arrived at. Better would it have been had they announced this when they came into office years ago, instead of leading the people to believe, as they led them to believe in the elections of 1912, that they intended to build this line as part of the Transcontinental system from the port of St. John to a connection with the Transcontinental at Grand Falls. It is true that the Government did introduce and have passed in this House in 1914 a Bill to give further aid to the construction of the bridges. The minister says that this aid was to be to the extent of $3,000,000. No amount is mentioned in the Act, but it was declared to be the policy of this Government to build the bridges and to pay the interest upon the cost of construction for the period of some fifteen years. The minister says that these bridges would have cost some $3,000,000. Well, they would not have cost any more than they would cost now; I doubt whether they would cost very much more now than they would have cost then. Although provision was made in 1913, and in 1914 for the building of these bridges, no steps were taken to that end; no appropriation was asked for from Parliament for that purpose; the matter has remained in a dormant condition. No work has been commenced upon any of the bridges or upon any portion of the line south of Gagetown.

What was the reason why the Government in 1910 entered upon this large undertaking? We realized that the country was going to the expense of building a great transcontinental railway which was to open up a wonderful country, a country richer in resources than that portion of western Canada which is traversed by the Canadian Pacific railway. Wonderful as is that country, we realized that the new district which was being opened by the Transcontinental railway would soon be settled by thousands, nay, by millions of people, and that over that road would be carried untold quantities of our products for shipment to the markets of the old world, in the way of grain and cattle, which can be produced so satisfactorily upon our western prairies. We talked the matter over with Mr. Hays, late President of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I well remember that there were gentlemen at that time who thought they might be able to convince Mr. Hays that it would be better to bring the line down the western side of the St. John river and utilize the Canadian Pacific railway terminals upon the western side of the harbour. To all these statements Mr. Hays replied: "You talk about our using terminals jointly with another transcontinental line. Look at Fort William, where we are establishing terminals in connection with our transcontinental system, where we have twenty-seven miles of water frontage, where we have elevator capacity of upwards of 30,000,000 bushels. If St. John is to be the freight terminus for our winter business we shall require terminals almost, if not quite, as comprehensive as those which we are constructing at Fort William." He looked over Courtenay bay,

and decided that at that place there was an ideal opportunity for developing a port such as the new transcontinental railway would require. Under the Bill which was passed through Parliament in 1910 we provided that the road should go into St. John upon the eastern side of the St. John river —that it should tap the Intercolonial at Rothesay, run into the city of St. John, and have direct and easy connection with the terminals at Courtenay bay. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had prepared a plan of their terminals upon a most comprehensive scale. They thought that they would require for very many years some fifteen or twenty docks, and ample provision was made in the plans to meet these requirements. The plans showed a very large grain elevator, a large immigration building—indeed, all those requirements and facilities which are necessary in connection with the terminals of a transcontinental railway system. I remember that the plans showed trackage extending along the Intercolonial for some three or four miles. They had in contemplation the building of machine shops and a large roundhouse; everything was designed on the most comprehensive scale. This plan is completely destroyed by the arrangement which has been arrived at to-day, and what is the excuse? The minister says that the Transcontinental line has been taken over by the Government, and that that is the reason for the change. Well, Sir, we have the statement of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that the Transcontinental has not been taken over by the Government. As members of this House know, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company contend that they are not bound to enter upon a lease, because the contract provides that the lease shall begin when the road has been completed, and the road has not yet been completed, as the Government is compelled to admit. All that the Prime Minister has said is that pending the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company entering upon operation of the road the Government is temporarily engaged upon the operation of the Transcontinental system between Winnipeg and Moncton. That is the statement made by the Prime Minister in answer to a question which I put to him at the request of the people of St. John, who have recently been considering the question of the construction of the St. John Valley railway and whether it should be built into St. John on the east or the west side of the river. As a matter of law, not until the Transcontinental has been completed can this Government legally call upon the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to enter upon the lease. When it should be completed the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will be in a position to demand of this Government that they enter upon the lease, which is to be for fifty years from the time of the completion of the Transcontinental system. Is it not absurd for the minister to come forward with the reason that he has for the destruction of the agreement which this Government made with the people of New Brunswick? I charge breach of faith on the part of this Government—that, by their legislation, by their agreement, by their telling the people that they were going to carry out the arrangements that the old Government had made, they have induced the people of New Brunswick to take upon their shoulders an enormous burden amounting to some $35,000 a mile for the construction of that portion of the railway which has been constructed. This portion of the railway could have been built at very much less cost if it were to be used merely as a local road connecting two points on the Canadian Pacific railway. The people of New Brunswick have taken upon themselves this burden, amounting to something like $6,000,000, which is an enormous obligation for a small province with a population of only some 350,000.

My hon. friend says that it would take two or three years to build these bridges. Let me ask him, why did this Government not begin to build the bridges after the legislation of 1912, conjointly with the Provincial Government, when provision was made for them? Why did they not begin to build them when the legislation was changed in 1914? Why, having placed the legislation on the statute book, did they take no steps to carry out the pledge which they made to the people of New Brunswick that they would construct this valley road on the plans which had been originally agreed upon, and that they would build the bridges? If they had begun, the bridges would have been built by this time. Two years have passed since the legislation of 1914, four years since the legislation of 1912 providing for the construction of the bridges; yet the minister tells this committee and the people of New Brunswick that it would take three years to build these bridges; that this would delay the entrance of the Valley road into the city of St. John; that the Government deems it better to

build simply to Westfield and to get running rights over the Canadian Pacific railway. The minister holds out the hope that there is going to be a connection between McGivney Junction and the Valley road at Fredericton. That connection will be some 34 miles in length. Will he tell me what the grades of that road are, that is, between McGivney Junction and Fredericton, what the weight of the rails is, and what is the character of the roadbed.

Mr. REID: The character of the roadbed is first-class; at all events, it will be made first-class. The rails are first-class and equal to any on the Transcontinental. We intend to make the connection between McGivney Junction and St. John equal to any other part of the Transcontinental, that is, a first-class road. That is the intention. It is not the intention to make it a side road. We intend to make the road to St. John, so far as the carrying of freight is concerned, a first-class road.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am glad to hear the minister say that. He has got to give assurances and do a great amount of work in order to recompense the people of New Brunswick, particularly the people of St. John and the St. John Valley, for the great outrage that has been done to them by the breach of faith of which this Government and the Provincial Government have been guilty. I am glad to hear him give strong assurance as to what he is going to do; but he has not told me what are the grades of the railway between McGivney Junction and Fredericton. I am told that they are very heavy, and I am also told that the roadbed is not first-class, but only second-class. The Canada Eastern is a branch line. It was bought for about $8,000 a mile, and it is in very poor condition to be used as part of the Transcontinental system.

Mr. REID: My hon. friend can hardly expect me to know all about the grades of every part of the road; but if my memory serves me rightly, the information I received was that the grades are probably a little heavy on that road, but that they are in the right direction; that is to say, that, so far as the freight going to St. John for export is concerned, the grades are in the right direction. Coming from St. John they will probably not be so good as they are going the other way. We all know that the roadbed and probably the rails on this road were not of the best when we purchased it, but we have purchased other branch lines on which the roadbed was not as good as the roadbed of the Intercolonial or of the Transcontinental. We are now trying to make this connection between McGivney Junction and St. John, and we will make it a first-class road in every way, shape and form, so that we can run our freight over the Transcontinental into St. John on a roadbed and on rails as good as are to be found on the Transcontinental. The hon. member criticises this Government for what it has done for St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY: For what it has not done.

Mr. REID: Since this Government came into power, it has, through the influence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, done more for St. John than the hon. member did during the whole time he was a minister in the late Government. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has looked after St. John, and this Government has done everything possible to improve the facilities and assist in the upbuilding of the port of St. John. The Government has been doing that ever since it came into power, and it intends to continue that policy. Evidence of it is that we are now starting to build an elevator and that we are trying to get a connection with St. John. The hon. member is one of those who object to the paralleling of railways, but to-day he advocates the building of another road side by side with the Canadian Pacific railway between Andover and Grand Falls. Can any one say why we should parallel that road, or why we should have another road running to Grand Falls when we can just as well do the work over the road from McGivney Junction, and so save the people of New Brunswick, whom my hon. friend claims to represent, from spending more money? The hon. member tries to lead the people of New Brunswick to believe that this road between McGivney Junction and St. John—

Mr. PUGSLEY: It does not run to St. John.

Mr. REID: It does, just the same as any other road over which we have running rights. If we have running rights over that portion of the Canadian Pacific railway to St. John, the connection is completed, and we can run through our Transcontinental trains. But if there should be any difficulty, as soon as we can build a line between Westfield and St. John we

will do so. The connection we are making with St. John will be of the very best in the interests of the Transcontinental and of the whole Government railway system, and will be with the view of up-building our terminals and elevators and carrying out the improvements that have been contemplated. I do not think it is fair for the hon. gentleman to try to give the people of New Brunswick any other impression when, sitting in this House, he has seen that that has been the policy of the Government right through and the policy that is being carried out at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very much surprised to see the unusual heat displayed by the minister.

Mr. REID: I am not in any heat.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister has not told me what the grades are on the railway between McGivney junction and Fredericton. He does not know much about that country, because he speaks of that connection as one between McGivney junction and St. John. It is between McGivney junction and Fredericton.

Mr. REID: And from Fredericton to St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is a branch line which this Government bought for $8,000 a mile, and it is not a first-class road. It is only a branch line running now between Newcastle and Fredericton, and that is owing to the construction of another piece of road. The Government took 14 or 15 miles of the Canada Eastern which had been accommodating the people there, because it did not think it was worth while operating, apparently. I would like to have something to say with reference to that great outrage by and by; but what I want to know now is what is the grade of the portion of the Canada Eastern between McGivney junction and Fredericton. I say that it is to-day not only a second-class road but a third-class road. I say that the total cost of that railroad which the Government bought was only $8,000 per mile, which shows that it could not have been in very great condition. The rails are light, and it is not suited to be operated as a part of the Transcontinental. The minister says he is not supposed to keep the grades in his head; but when he comes to us and asks us to undo what this Parliament did six years ago, when he asks us to justify breaking faith with the people of New Brunswick, surely he ought to know whether this piece of road can be operated with advantage as a connection between the Valley line and the Transcontinental. Does the minister not think so? Does he not think that he ought to allow this discussion to stand over until he can give some information on these grades? I am not speaking here merely for myself; I am speaking as the representative of a very important section of this country. Before I can express my satisfaction, and before this committee can express its satisfaction, with the very extraordinary departure which is being made from what has been the settled policy of the Government during all these years, we ought to know what is the condition of this line that it is proposed to operate as part of the Transcontinental railway.

My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals says that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) has done more for the port of St. John since he has been in office than I ever did. Well, I am not disposed to detract one iota from what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done for the port of St. John. All I desire to say is that the port of St. John deserves everything which the Minister of Marine has done, or can possibly do, for it, because St. John stands to-day in the position of having put its hand into its pocket and spent a very vast sum of money in order to put Canada on the right track as far as having its business done through Canadian ports and Canadian channels is concerned. St. John stands to-day before this country as the only city in Canada that has made sacrifices for the purpose of demonstrating and carrying out a great national ideal. Therefore the Minister of Marine deserves credit—I will grant that—for doing what he has done for St. John; but I do not propose to-day to be drawn into a discussion as to what the Minister of Marine has been able to do. The Acting Minister of Railways and Canals will not lead me away from the present question for the purpose of getting me into a discussion as to general improvements which have been made at St. John. No matter how much has been done by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the port of St. John, that affords no justification for the wilful and deliberate breach of faith between this Government and the people of that community.

The minister says that he has no doubt that he will be able to get into St. John and have a much better connection than

the one which I have suggested, and that they will get in quickly instead of having to wait. If the Government had done its duty and started to build the bridges after the legislation of 1912, these bridges would have been built already—in fact, they would have been built within two years—and the whole line might have been operated into the city of St. John and Courtenay Bay. But now the minister says that if they do not make satisfactory arrangements for running rights over the Canadian Pacific they will build into St. John—or is it they may build into St. John. Will they build in? I would like to ask the minister if they will build into St. John.

4 p.m.

Mr. REID: I said to the hon. member that we would endeavour to secure—and I have no doubt that we will succeed—running rights from Westfield into St. John, and if we cannot we will build from Westfield to St. John and make our connection with the Intercolonial railway system. The railway will run from McGivney Junction via Fredericton to the terminals of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am glad that the minister says "will."

Mr. REID: I am also considering, with reference to grades, and such information as my hon. friend wants I shall be glad to get for him and have here before we go on with the Bill. The only object I have today is to get the resolution through, so that I can introduce the Bill. Then we shall have the matter in committee again, and I will be able to give all the information at that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I shall be glad if the minister will bring the information. One thing I want to find out particularly about this Canada Eastern line from McGivney Junction to Fredericton is with reference to the grades; I am told that the grades are quite heavy. Of course, it is quite true that the minister says it is down hill and in the right direction.

Mr. REID: That is what I understand.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I suppose they can go up the hill with a pusher engine, or extra locomotive power. It will be an interesting change for the people after the long journey on a dead level over the Transcontinental railway, when they come to McGivney Junction and find that they can slide down hill without using any motive power. They will be able to speak of that as an interesting feature when travelling down to the Maritime Provinces. Has the minister estimated at all what it will cost to get into east St. John if the Government had to build instead of getting running rights over the Canadian Pacific and from the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company? Remember, it will mean a new bridge across the St. John river, a new track parallel with the track of the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company, the acquiring of land through the city, and getting connection with Courtenay Bay. Has the minister any estimate of what that will cost?

Mr. REID: I have not the information to-day that the hon. member asks for, but I will try and have it when the Bill comes in. My whole object in taking this matter up was this. We have a railway started from Centreville to Gagetown, and I have been anxious that we should get into St. John at the earliest possible moment. The hon. gentleman said that we should have gone on with these bridges. I was not referring to the bridges originally intended to be built. It was the bridge company that was to build those bridges, not we.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But this Government guaranteed the bonds.

Mr. REID: Yes. The hon. gentleman asked why, having guaranteed the bonds in 1912, we did not proceed with the bridges at once. We were only to guarantee the bonds, and the Bridge Company could have let the contract and gone on with them at once, but it did not do so. We were not to blame for the bridges not being proceeded with as originally intended, if I understand the Act aright.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is right as to the Act of 1912; but this is the curious thing: I am charging both the Provincial Government and this Government with conniving—conniving is a strong word, but when you have the evidence before you—

Mr. REID: I do not think you would be accused of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not know; I would be sorry to be. The minister is so pleasant and genial that one would hardly believe that he would be a party to such an outrage as that which has been perpetrated against the province of New Brunswick in connection with this railway. There is no question about it that after years of humbug, after years of deceit—I do not charge individual

deceit—that would be unparliamentary—but collective deceit—after years of collective deceit they come back and try to put us just where the Canadian Pacific said they had Mr. Fleming in 1912. It would simply be a branch road of the Canadian Pacific, beginning at their station at Andover and terminating at their station at Westfield.

There is another difficulty. How is the minister going to utilize the Courtenay Bay terminals coming in from the west side? All the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific say that it would be very objectionable. My hon. friend will see that if the road were built crossing the Kennebecasis river, coming to Rothesay, and in by the Intercolonial railway, the approach to Courtenay Bay terminals would be the most natural and easy. In coming from the west side, and coming through the city, you would have to run on past and have a switchback to bring the trains and cars around the docks at Courtenay Bay. It would involve an enormous expense to approach the docks coming from the western side. That is what the engineers say. Only the other day Mr. Bouillon, the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, expressed that opinion, and I know that Mr. Hays expressed that opinion in the very strongest way possible. Has the minister given any thought to that?

Mr. REID: I have taken that matter up and have been discussing it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister will be able to tell us about that to-morrow. Now, when the minister asks me as to whether it would not be foolish to build a line from Andover to Grand Falls and parallel the Canadian Pacific, I say to him that the Canadian Pacific was there in 1910 and 1912 just as it is to-day. You knew the road to Grand Falls would be paralleling the Canadian Pacific in 1912, when you put through the Subsidy Act in the very terms in which it had been passed when the late Government was in power.

Mr. REID: We are operating the Transcontinental and have our connection at McGivney Junction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am speaking of paralleling the line between Andover and Grand Falls.

Mr. REID: It is not necessary to parallel that line now, because we have our connection at McGivney Junction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister know what will be the cost of the bridge across the mouth of the Nerepis river?

Mr. REID: I shall have that information to-morrow.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The information is very important, for the reason that the Provincial Government has guaranteed the bonds to the extent of $35,000 a mile, and will have to look after that bridge as well. There is another thing as to which there is some slight doubt in the minds of the people, and that is as to the getting of running rights. That is provided for, but I think the Bill is defective in not providing that these running rights shall be subject to the approval of the Government of the province of New Brunswick, as well as of the Dominion Government. I think the Provincial Government ought to be a party to the terms under which running rights will be granted.

Mr. REID: There would be no objection to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The province guarantees the bonds; therefore it ought to be a party to the terms under which the running rights are granted.

It is stated in the resolution that the company may add to the capital expenditure the cost of additional tracks, buildings, yards, etc., on which the Provincial Government would have to guarantee the interest, and some question has been raised as to whether that would apply to any extension —for instance, the extension from Westfield to St. John, in case the Government should go on with that. My own view is that it is intended to apply to sidings only.

Mr. REID: That is all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the minister might make that clear. I have felt it my duty to make these observations, and if it is any satisfaction to the Minister of Railways, I might say that he has the people of St. John and of the St. John Valley and of the whole province in a bad predicament, by the way in which they have been treated during all these years. Now at last the minister comes to us and says: "We have not done anything about the bridges; it would take two or three years to build them; so if you want connection with St. John right away, you must adopt this arrangement." Of course it would be no good for me, as one member from the province of New Brunswick, or indeed for all the members from New Brunswick on this side of the House, to fight this proposition. The Provincial Government has already passed legislation confirming the ar-

rangement that has been made; so it is a case of take this or get nothing; that is the way the matter stands to-day. All the old agreements have been done away with by the Provincial Legislature, and we are called upon now to consider what shall be done. Feeling, as I do, very strongly opposed to the change in policy which has been decided upon, I have felt it my duty to express as briefly as I could the view which I hold. Having done that, I have nothing more to say upon the subject. I shall be very glad, however, to make suggestions to the minister if he is willing to receive them. One suggestion I would make is with regard to the clause about running rights. I am not quite sure but what it would be well, in an important measure like this, to put in some express provision that the company shall be entitled to running rights over that portion of the Canadian Pacific railway which lies between Westfield and St. John, upon terms to be approved, not by this Government, but by the Board of Railway Commissioners. I think that would be reasonable, because my hon. friend must see that if it is this Government's intention to stop at Westfield, and the traffic is then to be taken charge of by the Canadian Pacific railway locomotives and Canadian Pacific railway men, it will add very greatly to the cost of getting the freight to the city of St. John. And I would not limit that to the one company, because when you get to Fairville, you are confronted with another company, the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.

Mr. HAZEN: That has been acquired by the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Only the stock has been acquired. The road is operated entirely separately from the Canadian Pacific railway. If my hon. friend will look at the annual statements of the Canadian Pacific railway he will see that the earnings of the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company are kept entirely separate from the earnings of the Canadian Pacific railway, and form a distinct source of revenue from the ordinary lines of the Canadian Pacific. Therefore running rights would have to be acquired from both companies, and as this is a matter of a public character, as the Government of Canada is going to operate this line, I would suggest that it be provided that the Government shall be entitled to running rights over that portion of the Canadian Pacific railway between Westfield and St. John, and over the line of the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company, upon terms to be mutually agreed upon, and, upon failure to agree, the terms to be agreed upon by the Board of Railway Commissioners. I think my hon. friend will agree in view of the importance of the measure, that it would be very much better to have that provision inserted.

Mr. BURNHAM: It may be in order for me to say a word or two complimentary to the Government upon the masterful manner in which they are gradually developing the system of national highways. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that in 1904 the issue in this country was between the Borden policy of a national railway from ocean to ocean and the narrow sectional Laurier policy which persisted and insisted upon building a portion, and the worst portion, of the National Transcontinental, and leaving the control of the whole road in private hands. It is very extraordinary to-day to hear members saying from their place in this House that they have now some of that national idea, when those very members were parties to the persecution and destruction of that idea in 1904. A great deal of credit is due this Government that, notwithstanding the rebuff they met with in 1904, they have taken up the same idea again and have developed it, presenting it to the people of this country so that it can be understood and appreciated; and beyond all doubt it will be adopted. We have in the Supplementary Estimates an item of $150,000, small it is true, but perhaps sufficient, to find out upon what basis probably two huge railways may be taken over and nationalized. That is the one ray of light in the whole situation. Year by year we have been led along, one might almost say through the Lake of the Dismal Swamp, with regard to these two undertakings.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN: Since 1911.

Mr. BURNHAM: This Lake of the Dismal Swamp was created before 1911, and we have been trying to get through it and out of it ever since, and we are now about to do so. The idea to which I am referring is the acquisition by Canada and the control by Canada of those two huge companies on the principle that national highways, or national transportation systems, or national means of communication or national utilities should be national in their char-

acter and under national control. That is the genius and the spirit of the administration of the Conservative party in Canada. They are not actuated by any a priori ideas, by any principle which they have evolved from their inner consciousness, which is not worth a cent on either side. We want the scientific principle of investigating the facts and adapting ourselves to them. That is the only modern scientific system to adopt. We do not want any more inspirations; we want treatment of facts in a reasonable and proper manner, and it is this fact, that the present Government is now coming round to; this national system that is attracting the admiration of the people and comforting them. Beaten in 1904, it arises again in 1916, notwithstanding the tremendous burden of the war, and this it is that reconciles us all to the unenviable situation in regard to those railways, that in a year or two when the first possible opportunity arises, the Conservative Government will take over and make them what they ought to be, the national instruments of the general prosperity of this Dominion.

Mr. HAZEN: I would like to say a few words with regard to the resolution of the Minister of Railways which is now before the House and upon which, when adopted, a Bill will be introduced. The matter has been already discussed in this House on a resolution for papers moved by my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). I was not present on that occasion, having had to go to Washington on public business, and I was therefore unable to take any part in the discussion. As I may not be here when the Bill comes up, I would like to say a few words to-day upon the question--not speaking at all from a controversial standpoint, because I do not feel like engaging in controversy at the present moment.

The proposition made to the House by the Minister of Railways with regard to the building of this road has already been submitted to the legislature of New Brunswick. Of the 48 members who constitute that legislature, 24 represent constituencies in the valley of the river St. John, extending from the harbour of St. John at the mouth of the river, up to Madawaska. There are at present in the Legislative Assembly 23 members representing those constituencies, one seat being vacant. Concurrent legislation has been introduced in the New Brunswick Legislature, and without one dissentient voice the provincial assembly has approved the action of the Minister of Railways and the agreement which has been brought down to this House, and which was entered into after discussion between the representative of the Government of New Brunswick and Dr. Reid, Acting Minister of Railways. Of those 24 members, 3 represent the city of St. John (in which there is a vacant seat at the present time), and two represent the county of St. John, and those five members have all approved the agreement believing that the action that has been taken is in the interest of the city of St. John, just as the other members of the House without a dissentient voice have expressed the opinion that the agreement is in the interest of the province of New Brunswick. Those gentlemen have the interest of St. John and of the province of New Brunswick at heart quite as much as my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) has or as I have.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are not all those gentlemen who supported the Bill supporters of the Government which introduced the Bill?

Mr. HAZEN: Whether they are supporters or opponents of the Government, I say that they have the interest of St. John and of the province of New Brunswick at heart quite as much as my hon. friend has or as I have. If anything was being done that they believed would be against the interest of St. John or of the province of New Brunswick, I have too high a regard for their patriotism to believe that they would allow party considerations or affiliations to prevent them from doing their full duty and acting in the public interest. Had they not approved the agreement, all of the members of the assembly would not have voted in favour of it and most certainly the members for St. John would not have done so. Of course, in the city of St. John, the press which opposes the Government naturally opposes the proposal and the press which supports the Government endorses the proposal, but on the other hand, that part of the press of St. John that is of a more independent character endorses the proposal made by the Minister of Railways which is unanimously supported by the legislature. In view of all the circumstances, I do not think it can be justly said that a step is being taken which is injurious to the constituency which I represent, or to the province of New Brunswick. I am satisfied that this proposal appeals to the good sense of the people of that con-

stituency and of the province, and I have heard few, if any, complaints made against it from the time the announcement on the subject was made by the Minister of Railways.

It has always seemed to me that it made very little difference to St. John or to the province, whether the railway traversed the east or the west side provided that it made a connection with the harbour that is being created at Courtenay Bay. My hon. friend tells us the opinion of the late Mr. Hays, and no doubt he tells it correctly. At that time it was believed that the Grand Trunk Pacific would operate this road and therefore the opinions of those who represented the Grand Trunk Pacific and who would be responsible for its management ought to have had very great weight with the Government of the day. It was believed that the Grand Trunk Pacific would operate that road, and over that road from McGivney Junction to St. John there was then no connection as there is under conditions that exist now. Therefore there was necessity to have a connection at Grand Falls. That necessity apparently does not exist at the present time, when, no matter what may be said, it is perfectly clear that the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme has practically broken down and that the burden and responsibility of operating and maintaining the Grand Trunk Pacific as part of the Government railways will come upon the shoulders of the Administration. If, however, it is found in the future that there is necessity for such a connection, all that will have to be done will be to get running rights from Andover to Grand Falls, a distance of twenty miles, over the Canadian Pacific railway; running rights which I have no doubt could be easily acquired, because, while the Railway Commission may have no power to give those running rights today, yet governments are more powerful than railway commissions, and if in the interest of the country those running rights should be desirable, they could easily be obtained, which would save the necessity of building another line of railway paralleling the Canadian Pacific from Andover to Grand Falls.

The Grand Trunk Pacific runs through the centre of New Brunswick from Edmundston via Grand Falls to Moncton. At McGivney Junction it crosses the Canada Eastern railway now owned and operated by the Government of Canada. From McGivney Junction over the Canada Eastern, a distance of about thirty miles, it runs into Fredericton where it makes connection again with the Canadian Pacific and the St. John Valley railway, and so to the city of St. John. So, at McGivney Junction, there is the connection between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Intercolonial railway, and at Fredericton between the Intercolonial railway and the St. John Valley railway, the line of railway which will be operated by the Government on the forty and sixty per cent basis, thus furnishing as good a connection with the city of St. John as if the connection had been made at Grand Falls. My hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) has suggested that the Canada Eastern branch of the Intercolonial is not up to the standard of a trunk line railway. That may be true. I do not see, however, how the grades could be very bad going from the west to the east, for the line runs down the valley of the Nashwaak river, the fall being toward the city of Fredericton, so that the grades if that should be necessary, and trains which would cross the St. John river at Fredericton, there connecting with the St. John Valley railway. But it would be a comparatively easy matter to improve the grades if that should be needed, and also to place heavier rails upon the road, such as are necessary for a trunk line. These are matters which will be attended to, and no doubt they have received the attention of the technical officers responsible for the management of the Canadian Government railways in the province of New Brunswick. Now, instead of crossing the St. John river by a bridge which will cost some $2,800,000, and also crossing the Kennebecasis over another bridge, then to run over the Intercolonial to St. John, it is proposed to save the expense of the two bridges and to build the road from Gagetown down the valley of the river St. John to a point in the neighbourhood of Westfield—and I may say that survey parties are at present at work to ascertain where the best and least expensive line can be located so as to obtain running rights over the line of the Canadian Pacific railway, into the city of St. John and West St. John. As I have said, it cannot make much difference to the city of St. John whether the road follows the east or the west side of the river, so long as connection is afforded with the new harbour at Courtenay Bay. That is what this line is intended to do. It is intended to build, if necessary, a new line from Westfield to St. John, also a bridge across the river, and a tunnel under a portion of the city of St. John to reach the present St. John station,

and on to Courtenay Bay where the new terminals are being constructed. Hon. members familiar with St. John know that there are two harbours; that on the west of the peninsula, and that on the east, known as Courtenay Bay, which is now being developed. The business to-day is being done largely over the lines of the Canadian Pacific railway to the harbour and wharves on the western side. It seems to me there is an enormous advantage in having these harbours linked together by a railway bridge owned by the Government, and by having a line of railway which will go from the western side of the river and will afford access to the docks on Courtenay Bay, making it possible for the trains of the Intercolonial, which come in on the east side, to have access to the wharves on the west side. Thus, instead of having two separate harbours, the two would be linked up by a bridge and a railway. That can do no harm whatever so far as the development of the harbour of Courtenay bay is concerned, and it may be a great advantage for the business of St. John harbour, which is increasing by leaps and bounds and will continue to develop in the future. I trust this advantage will accrue in the not very distant future, though it may be impossible to make the expenditures required for the purpose—those expenditures will be considerable—before this dreadful war is over and normal conditions are restored.

Speaking as a citizen of St. John, and as one having some interest in the community, and not as a politician, that is the view I take of this question. I have no idea of entering into a discussion as to whether or not my hon. friend and colleague from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has been able to do more as a minister of the Crown than I have. I have endeavoured to do my best for the constituency; no doubt my hon. friend did the same while he was representative of the province, and whether we may have failed or may not have failed, I think we will continue to do that in the future no matter what may happen.

This question of the St. John Valley railway has been an important one in the province of New Brunswick for many years past. At Confederation, when it was clear that one of the terms of the Union would be the building of a line of railway connecting the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, it was believed that the line of railway would follow the valley of the St. John river, a well-settled country that would afford a good deal of local business. This was, probably, the best route from an engineering standpoint by which the railroad could be carried through the province to the city of St. John. For reasons which it is not necessary for me to discuss, that route was not followed, but the route by the north shore and the St. Lawrence was adopted, and the St. John valley was left without railway communication. From Confederation down to a few years ago, railways built in different parts of the province, some of them feeders to the Intercolonial, ran in other directions, and still the St. John valley, one of the oldest and most fertile portions of New Brunswick, was left without railroad communication. Our people looked forward with hope to the time when another transcontinental railway was to be built, that it would take what seemed the natural way for a railway from the west, along the river to the city of St. John. But when the National Transcontinental was built, their hopes were not fulfilled, for, instead of going by the valley of the St. John by the short route to tidewater, the road was built through the centre of the province, through what was a wilderness, down to Moncton where there is no seaport, though the mileage constructed would have been sufficient to carry it down the valley of the St. John. The hopes of the people of the St. John valley were dashed to the ground by the action of the Government of that day. In 1908 or 1909, when I was Prime Minister of the province, a large delegation came to Fredericton and asked that steps should be taken to give railway facilities to the people along the valley.

Previous Governments had voted subsidies to lines of railway along the river, but these inducements were never sufficient to cause any one to build the road from a point above Woodstock down along the valley through the counties of York, Sunbury and Queens, and Kings, to the city of St. John. When my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) was a member of the Government he suggested after the Intercolonial Railway had acquired the Canada Eastern Railway that it would be well for the Dominion Government to build a branch of that road from Fredericton to Woodstock and from Fredericton to Gagetown. I think at the same session my hon. friend introduced a Bill looking towards the building of a road along the valley of the river St. John running from Centreville to Westfield, the idea being what had been in the minds of everybody

up to that time; that the road should be built to serve the people of the valley on both sides of the river. The idea of crossing the river had never occurred up to that time. My hon. friend has in his mind, I think, the idea that Mackenzie and Mann might undertake the construction of such a line in connection with their railway system. However, they did not do so. In 1908 or 1909, I am not sure which year, when this delegation came to Fredericton, I told them that the work could not be undertaken by the province with its limited resources unless we had some certainty as to the division of profits after the road was completed, but that if the Government of Canada would undertake to lease that road after it was completed on a basis of 40 per cent to 60 per cent, paying to the province 40 per cent of the gross earnings, I would be willing to ask the legislature to guarantee to the extent of $25,000 a mile the bonds of the company that would undertake to construct the road. The delegates proceeded from Fredericton to Ottawa and had an interview with the Government of the day, of which my hon. friend was a member, and the result was the inception of the present undertaking known as the St. John Valley Railway. No crossing of the river had been contemplated until the matter was taken up by the Grand Trunk Railway people; it was at their instance and at the instance of Mr. Hays that the idea of crossing the river was entertained.

This matter was very fully discussed in the House of Assembly in New Brunswick and I would like to read a few extracts from the speech of the Acting Prime Minister, Mr. Murray, when he introduced this Bill. Although this is not the chief objection to building bridges across the St. John river, the cost of building them at the present time would be a great objection because of the abnormal state of affairs that exists in Canada and the enormous burdens we shall all have to bear in connection with the war, and which I feel in a short time we shall have to bear in connection with two other lines of railway which I need not refer to at the present moment. Mr. Murray said in the House of Assembly:

> The features in favour of the Westfield route are:
>
> 1. More economical and efficient handling of traffic both to shipper and Intercolonial railway.
> 2. Less capital expenditure and provincial liability on guarantees.
> 3. Better opportunities to develop local traffic.
> 4. Completed probably twelve months earlier.

In discussing the matter Mr. Murray made reference to the difficulties that existed in connection with the building of a bridge at what is known as the Mistake. I may say that strong protests against the building of a bridge at that point were made by the lumber interests on the St. John river. I think I have somewhere in my possession a memorial that was presented some years ago by Mr. J. Fraser Gregory as president of, I think, the St. John River Lumbermen's Association, protesting that the building of a bridge at that point would interfere very much with lumber operations on the river. That is an objection, however, that could possibly have been overcome. In connection with the difficulty of securing satisfactory foundations, Mr. Murray, after referring to Maxwell's estimate of the cost, says:

> The borings on Maxwell crossing at the centre of the channel give the following results: Water, 60 feet; soft clay, 92 feet; cemented sand, gravel, 16 feet; a depth from the surface of water to rock of 168 feet, or more than 68 feet below limit for establishing a foundation by pneumatic process, and an estimate of cost of any other process is only a wild guess.
>
> The different borings made on this crossing have established the fact that a rock foundation is not available within practicable depths except a short distance from the eastern shore; the deposit of slit and sand in many places is over one hundred feet deep, which in other places is replaced by soft clay, most unstable material on which to establish foundation for a heavy bridge and the load it would have to carry, together with the extraordinary wind and ice pressure it would no doubt at times be subject to.
>
> The soundings on the alternative crossings are equally unsatisfactory.
>
> The obstruction to navigation at crossing proposed by Maxwell would be so serious, it is not unlikely that the Federal Department of Public Works would refuse to approve of the location of a bridge at that point.

Continuing Mr. Murray said that he had been at considerable pains to ascertain the deepest soundings that had been made for bridges that had proved satisfactory, and it appeared that a bridge at Omaha had piers of a depth of 114 feet, and that, he believed, held the world's record at the present time, yet, he said, the Government is asked to build a bridge the depth of piers of which could not be less than 168 feet, and with that the engineers would not guarantee it to stand when built.

He then referred to Mr. Monsarrat's reports, as follows:

> Mr. Monsarrat's plan allowed 500 feet opening. The location of a bridge at Gondola Bluff would be a serious interference to shipping; with a strong wind from Belleisle or Tennant Cove it would be impossible to get rafts turned to run the channel with a bridge at that point. This disadvantage would not apply to a bridge at Dunham's wharf, the location suggested by Mr. Monsarrat.
>
> Mr. Monsarrat on the authority of Mr. J. H.

Duggan, general manager of the Dominion Bridge Company, stated recently that the steel superstructure could not be supplied at prices quoted by Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Monsarrat had to increase his own estimate by a hundred thousand dollars to meet present cost of bridge material. Foundations proposed by Mr. Maxwell were adversely criticised by Mr. Monsarrat on the ground that the depth to which his main piers would have to go were below a point possible to be reached by pneumatic process, and in material impossible to estimate what the cost would be, altogether presenting conditions unique in bridge construction. The pier foundations suggested for the other piers were condemned as unstable and insufficient.

This statement which I have briefly quoted from the speech made by Mr. Murray in the House of Assembly, based on the reports of Engineers Maxwell and Monsarrat, shows the very great difficulties that would have to be encountered and the very great uncertainty that exists in connection with the building of a bridge the piers of which would be 168 feet below the surface of the water. Mr. Murray says that so far as he can ascertain the deepest piers to be found in any part of the world are those of a bridge in Omaha, which have a depth of 114 feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They have piers on the Quebec bridge deeper than that.

Mr. HAZEN: Not more than 168 feet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Much more than 114 feet; nearer 200, I think.

Mr. HAZEN: As was pointed out by Mr. Murray, Mr. Monsarrat, who was an engineer in connection with the Quebec bridge, says that he would not guarantee the safety of such a bridge. In the opinion of Mr. Monsarrat, as of the chief engineer of Government railways, the road, from the railway standpoint, ought to be constructed on the western side of the river. This is the extract from the reports of these two engineers as quoted in Mr. Murray's speech:

Comparing the two routes to St. John, Mr. Brown makes mileage, Gagetown to Union Depot, St. John, via Westfield, 52.20 miles, via Rothesay, 51.29 miles and says further: "In comparing the two routes it will be noted that the mileage is practically the same as well as the rise and fall and curvature.

Mr. Monsarrat in his report says:

I would have no hesitation in recommending the adoption of the Westfield route.

There are many other quotations from the reports here but I will not weary the House by reading them at present. So far as public opinion in regard to this matter is concerned, I may say that, at a meeting of the Fredericton Board of Trade, a gentleman proposed a resolution disapproving of the action of the Government in changing the route from that which was originally proposed, but it was impossible at that largely attended meeting to find any one to second the resolution. It was in exactly the same language as the resolution which was moved at the St. John Board of Trade and which was carried there by a vote of only 18 to 12. Although there are over 300 members of the St. John Board of Trade, only 30 attended the meeting, 30 out of a total voting population in the city of St. John and county of about 12,000 or 13,000. So far as I am able to gauge public opinion in St. John, providing the road goes into St. John, very little importance is attached to whether it goes in by the east side or by the west side. There are some gentlemen, as there are in every community, on both sides of politics, who are influenced by their political feelings. There are others who may be influenced to a certain extent by their personal interests, but I am told that, at the meeting of the Board of Trade of St. John, there were very few, if any, of the leading business men present, and that those who voted for the resolution did not represent the sentiment of the city in regard to the matter. There is no excitement about the question at all. The people are perfectly in harmony with the Government provided that the road is connected with the city.

My colleague (Mr. Pugsley) has expressed an opinion as to the difficulty of making a connection with Courtenay Bay by coming in on the west side, and crossing the river at the falls. I do not claim to have any engineering knowledge, but I have a very good knowledge of the locality, because I have lived there for a great many years, and in my opinion there will be no difficulty whatever, and the expense will be very light in making the connection, after passing St. John Station, with the docks at the Courtenay Bay side. When it was thought that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company were going to operate the Transcontinental, it was only right and proper that every attention should be paid to the wishes expressed by Mr. Hays. Now that it is clear that that road will be operated by the Government, I think that every attention should be paid to the wishes of those who are the expert advisers of the Government of Canada with regard to matters of this kind; and it is the opinion of the General Manager of the Intercolonial railway, of the Chief Engineer

of the Intercolonial railway, and of the engineers of the Government railway service that the interests of the country, the interests of New Brunswick, the interests of St. John, and the interests of the Government railways will be much better served by having the railway on the west side into St. John as set forth in the legislation now suggested by the Acting Minister of Railways. Having discussed this matter fully with those gentlemen, having endeavoured to view it entirely from the standpoint of the public interest, of the province, and of the city which I represent, I have come to the same conclusion, and I feel that it is my duty to state here that I heartily concur in the conclusion to which they have come. A little later, I think we will see, as has been indicated by the general manager of the Government railways, a railway connection between this railway and the systems of the United States; that the Government of Canada will build a road from a point somewhere between Fredericton and Andover connecting with the Maine Central railway so that the products of the Intercolonial and of the government railways in Northern and central New Brunswick may have an independent outlet to the United States. This I believe will be of tremendous advantage to the Intercolonial and to the government railway systems, particularly so far as the lumber business of the country is concerned. The general manager of the Intercolonial does not hesitate to express the opinion that a line of railway running from the St. John Valley railway and connecting in the State of Maine with the American system of railways will be a most profitable piece of railway to all the government railways in the northern and central parts of New Brunswick, and an advantage to St. John. An independent connection with the railway systems of the United States, in addition to the connection which it has now, will, I think, be one of the great advantages that will flow from the legislation which is now proposed by the Acting Minister of Railways. I say once more, Mr. Chairman, and I am speaking to-day because I may not be here when the Bill comes up, and I do not wish my absence to be misunderstood in any way, that the measure before the House has my full concurrence. I think it is very much in the interests of the province from which I come.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. COPP: It is not my intention to discuss this question because it relates to a part of the province in which I am not specially interested, and does not relate to my own particular constituency. But I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has any information as to the cost of the road, if it is built from Westfield to St. John, and as to how it will compare with the cost of the connection originally proposed on the east side of the river.

Mr. HAZEN: Mile for mile, I think it would cost about the same to build the railway on the east side as on the west side. But on the east side there was a tunnel after the railway left the bridge across the river that would have been a very expensive piece of work. I believe that the cost of construction of the road—it has been well constructed, being laid with heavy rails—has been about $37,000 per mile as against about $72,000 per mile in the case of the Transcontinental through the province of New Brunswick. From Westfield into the city of St. John I presume that the cost, mile for mile, will be pretty much the same as from Woodstock to Fredericton and from Fredericton to Gagetown.

Mr. COPP: I would ask the Minister of Railways if this part of the road is built from Westfield to St. John and on to Courtenay Bay, is it the intention that it should be built by this Government or by the Provincial Government or by the St. John and Quebec Railway Company under the bond guarantee?

Mr. REID: The arrangement we are entering into is an arrangement between the New Brunswick Government and the Dominion Government, so far as the railway to Westfield is concerned only. If at any future time the matter is taken up, the Dominion Government will build if the New Brunswick Government still desires; but if the New Brunswick Government thinks it is of any advantage to continue this road, we have no objection.

Mr. COPP: I understand the minister to say that if the road is built from a point at or near Westfield it will be by the St. John and Quebec railway under the bond guarantee by the Provincial Government, to connect with the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. COPP: I understand that, if this Government undertakes to get running rights over the Canadian Pacific into St. John, but if they fail to get running rights, he has guaranteed this committee that they are going to build a line from Westfield into St. John. Is that a guarantee coming from this Government to build that road, or will there be further responsibility put upon the shoulders of the people of New Brunswick?

Mr. REID: This Bill provides that this railway company shall acquire running rights between Westfield and St. John. If they cannot do so, this Government will acquire running rights over the Canadian Pacific into St. John and to the terminals. This agreement is only to Westfield. From that on, if it is necessary, or if we cannot get running rights that are satisfactory, the Dominion Government will build a road from Westfield into St. John.

Mr. MICHAUD: I have listened with close attention to the discussion of this resolution. I am not so much interested in the terminus at St. John as I am in the towns of Andover and Grand Falls. These two towns are situated in my constituency and on behalf of the people of the St. John valley, I feel very much disappointed with the proposal which is now before this committee. I read in this resolution:

That upon the completion of the line from Gagetown to Westfield the Dominion will enter into a lease thereof and operate the same pending the completion of the remaining line to Andover, all in accordance with terms and conditions to be agreed upon in each case, including the 40 and 60 per cent division of gross earnings hereinafter referred to.

I understand that under this resolution, the railway will only be built as far as Andover. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) said that there is no necessity for the present to build a line from Andover to Grand Falls. I see by this resolution that there is an estimate for the building of a line from Andover to Centreville, a distance of 26 miles, and I see also by the resolution that this part of the railway will not be built for some time. I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Railways if it is the intention to build that line from Centreville to Andover this year, or next year?

Mr. REID: I may say for the information of the hon. member (Mr. Michaud) that this Bill will provide that we shall take over each part of the road as it is completed under a temporary lease, which will continue until the whole road is completed, when we will take a 99 year lease of the whole system. They have now completed the road, as I understand, from Centreville to Gagetown. We are operating that under a temporary lease. When they get to Westfield we will take a 99-year lease, or another temporary lease, until they build to Andover. The Bill gives the railway company a certain length of time to build the road between Centreville and Andover, as it does between Gagetown and Westfield. We cannot force them to start, or complete, the road until that time has lapsed. We have urged and insisted that the railway company shall get connection between Westfield and Gagetown at once, or within the next few months, in order that we can operate this line between St. John and the west by connection with the Transcontinental railway. The other road, between Centreville and Andover, we would like to see built as soon as the company can do so, but that is a matter that rests with the company. They must build the road as soon as they can, or at least within the time we have given them under this agreement. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the connection between Grand Falls and Andover. I feel myself that it is not necessary to construct

5 p.m.

that road now in so far as the Government railway system is concerned. The operating of two railways side by side for 25 miles would mean an extra expense, to say nothing of the extra cost of building the line. People can get from St. John to Grand Falls, if they so desire, by simply transferring at Andover to the Canadian Pacific. As has been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen), now is the time to get running rights between Andover and Grand Falls, and thus save the expense of paralleling that line. We do not desire to do any injustice to that section of the country. I would not favour the building of a line between Andover and Grand Falls, knowing that they already have a railway from Andover to Grand Falls, and that this would simply be paralleling the existing line for that distance. We all believe that the time has come when we should not parallel any more railways than we can absolutely help. We can perform this service by getting running rights over the existing railway.

Mr. MICHAUD: I am sorry to hear from the Acting Minister of Railways that he does not see his way clear to build the railway from Andover to Grand Falls. I

am afraid the railway will never be built from Centreville to Andover. It was understood a few years ago that a railway was to built from Andover to Grand Falls, but from what I can gather from the remarks of my hon. friend, we are not going to have that part of the line built. It was the policy of the Provincial Government to build that road from St. John to Centreville, and from there to branch out in the other direction instead of going by Grand Falls. From the observations of my hon. friend, we have reason to believe that this will be done. The people of Grand Falls have been promised by the Premier of our province that this line, in order to be completed, had to be constructed from St. John all through the St. John valley and as far up as Grand Falls. The town of Grand Falls supplies such an amount of freight each year as in the long run would make profitable a railway from Centreville to that point. I was rather amazed at the remarks of my hon. friend when he spoke about that branch from McGivney junction to Fredericton. He says that there is quite a grade and that they can haul a pretty big load because the grade is from McGivney junction down to Fredericton. In that connection he speaks of securing the right to run trains over the Canadian Pacific from Grand Falls to Andover and then from Westfield to St. John. From his remarks I gather that this St. John Valley railway will not, after all, be much of a railway. They are to secure running rights over a part of the Canadian Pacific, running rights over a part of the Intercolonial, and then running rights over the Canadian Pacific from Westfield to St. John, and this road will only be built from one point to another in order to suit people in certain parts of New Brunswick. I am sorry to have to make that statement. In 1912 it was contemplated that this road should be built as a through line from Grand Falls to St. John. Every local member along the St. John river advocated that policy. The provincial election has been carried on that policy, and we know the result. Now, we are told that they are not going to build the line, but that they are going to get a right of way for the St. John Valley Railway Company over the Canadian Pacific and the Intercolonial. We will have a kind of line that will be very unsatisfactory to the people of New Brunswick.

The Acting Minister of Railways has told us that the proposed arrangement of a terminus at Westfield, with running rights over the Canadian Pacific railway, was very satisfactory to the people of St. John. I can tell him that the people of St. John are not so easily satisfied. Not so very long ago the Premier of New Brunswick had a little trouble over this very line of railway, and his supporters had to whitewash his connection with the construction of this line. The people are far from satisfied with this arrangement, but they have to consent to it because they cannot get a better one under the circumstances.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. REID thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 98, to aid in the construction of certain lines of railway of the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company, and to confirm an agreement between the company and the Governments of Canada and New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would suggest to the minister that a very good way of getting over the difficulty with regard to running rights would be to declare this work to be to the general advantage of Canada. It would then come under the Railway Act that was passed this session, and the Board of Railway Commissioners would have authority to grant the running rights. All that would be needed to bring the Bill under the Act would be to insert the words that the work was for the general advantage of Canada. Otherwise there might be some difficulty, because the company was incorporated by the Provincial Legislature and not by this Parliament.

Mr. REID: I am glad of the suggestion, and will take it into consideration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MOUNT ROYAL TUNNEL AND TERMINAL COMPANY.

Hon. J. D. REID (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 95, respecting rentals payable to the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.

Mr. MARCIL: What stage is the work in at the present time?

Mr. REID: I can hardly state the exact position. I understand that the main part of it is completed, and the intention is to have the whole completed at an early date. This Bill is necessary to enable the company to make their financial arrangements.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any hope that the trains will be running during the present year?

Mr. REID: If this Bill enabling the company to make their financial arrangements passes we hope the trains will be running before winter.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

On section 1—whole of rents, sums reserved or payable under lease, chargeable to whole property of lessees:

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister kindly explain this Bill?

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: As this is purely a legal matter perhaps I might venture to give a very short explanation. Under the Railway Act, the earnings of a company are to be applied towards certain objects in a definite order. The first application of the earnings is, I believe, towards fines, and the second, towards the payment of operating expenses.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this company a subsidiary of the Canadian Northern railway?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Strictly speaking, it is, I think, a constituent company. While it is one of the companies that is part of the Canadian Northern Railway system, inasmuch as to a small extent it operates a line, it is a constituent company. The second application of the earnings of a company is towards operating expenses. After that, the applications are towards interest upon bond issues, and thereafter, towards payments of dividends on stock. The Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company is a constituent company of the Canadian Northern Railway system. It was constituted for the purpose of building the tunnel through Mount Royal, and for constructing the terminals at Montreal. In order to facilitate the financing—indeed, in order to make the financing possible—a separate company was formed, and its own bonds were issued. Consequently, they hope to be able to finance on those bonds, they being a first charge on the property of the company, and the property upon which they are a charge not being previously encumbered by all the charges against the Canadian Northern Railway itself. The rentals of the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company come from the Canadian Northern railway, from the Canadian Northern Ontario, and from the Canadian Northern Quebec. In fact, all the properties of the company were to be utilized by these three companies—the parent company, the Canadian Northern Ontario, and the Canadian Northern Quebec. They paid the rentals for these properties in proportion to the use they obtained, and the revenues that were constituted by these rentals were to be the entire revenues of the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company. A bond issue was arranged for sufficient to provide for the building, and the rentals were fixed at a figure sufficient to meet the interest and the sinking fund upon the bond issue. However, in order to make the rentals certain, they were fixed by the original Act of 1914 providing for the issue of these bonds and were made a charge against operation. Rentals are a charge against operation under the law generally, unless they go for the use of a line of railway, and inasmuch as the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company operated a short line, constituting, I believe, about 5 per cent of the enterprise, a special provision in the Act was necessary in order to make those rentals a charge against operation. Had they not operated any line at all the rentals would have been a charge against operation anyway. Consequently in this Act which this Parliament put through in 1914—I do not refer to the main Act, chapter 20, statutes of 1914, but to the Tunnel Act, a private Act, that went through in that session—a clause was inserted providing that those rentals paid by these three companies, the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Northern Ontario, and the Canadian Northern Quebec, should constitute a charge against the operation of the three companies respectively. That made the security a very ample one and made it quite a relatively easy matter to finance the issue of bonds, and it was out of the issue of bonds that the whole institution secured its funds for prosecuting the work.

Then a legal point arose later on, a point upon which there was difference of opinion. In fact, I think, at all events in numbers, the preponderance of opinion was that the Act, as it stood, had the effect that it is now desired to give to it by this legislation, but the solicitors for the bondholders took the ground, that owing to this Act of 1914 being in the nature of a private Act, it was not in its terms strong enough to overcome the general provision of the Railway Act, and that, although the section making those rentals a charge on operation had the effect of making them such as against any future

bond issue of those roads, it had not the effect of making them a charge as against prior bond issues of those roads. It was undoubtedly the intention of the statute that it should make them a charge on operating expenses against all bond issues.

Mr. GRAHAM: That original section is in the schedule here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, this is the section. In this connection it would be clear if I read the section:

> The whole of the rents or sums reserved or made payable under the said agreement or lease shall for all purposes be deemed to be, and are hereby declared to form part of the working expenditure, as defined and provided for in the Railway Act, of the lessees parties to the said agreement or lease.

The contention was that the statute, namely, chapter 28 of the statutes of 1914, being in the nature of a private Act, the effect of this clause, which was in the statute, was not sufficient to make those rentals a charge against operating expenses as against prior bond issues of those three railways. It undoubtedly was the intention that they should be. It was contended, on the other hand, that the Act was not a private one at all; that although it was printed along with the private Acts, the Interpretation Act stated that no Act was a private Act unless it was stated to be a private Act, and that consequently this was not a private Act. However, the fact that the solicitors for the bond holders held to the contrary made the objection of a very practical character, and made it impossible to complete the sale of bonds. This legislation is for the purpose of making it clear that the section in the Act of 1914 was intended to have the effect of making those rentals a charge against the operating expenses of the three railways, even as against prior bondholders. Of course, it must be clear that no one's interests are interfered with by the legislation, because there has been no issue, and there will be no issue unless it is a charge. Consequently there are no prior rights interfered with as yet. It is to make it clear that there never can be that this legislation is necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it not a question of our interfering with the prior rights of bondholders of the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Northern Ontario? It would not be the bondholders of the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have read the Bill over, and the only doubt that I have had —and it is not a very strong one under the circumstances—is as to whether we ought to pass legislation which might possibly interfere with the rights of third parties without their having an opportunity of being heard before the legislation is passed. If the Solicitor General is of the opinion that this does not in effect alter their rights, that, of course, would put it in a very different position. Then there is this to be borne in mind, that without the terminals at Montreal, the securities of the bondholders upon the Canadian Northern system would be very much impaired. No doubt it greatly improves the value of their security to have those terminals, and for those reasons I would be disposed to disregard what I thought at first would be a pretty strong objection to the legislation. I am very strongly of the opinion that we should be very careful to safeguard any private rights and not interfere with them without hearing their side of the case.

Mr. GRAHAM: I remember the discussion that arose on this very point. The legal point is too fine for me to discuss, because I would get all tangled up in the technicalities if I tried to do so. As I understand it, however, this legislation is to make clear the intention of the Act of 1914. The question raised by my hon. friend from St. John is a very important one, and I presume that the Solicitor General has fully considered it. Leaving out the legal side of the case, I think it is very important that nothing at the present time should stand in the way of the company being able to dispose of its bonds for the carrying on of this work. As has been well said, the system is now incomplete and its earning power is retarded very much by the fact that the terminals at Montreal are not completed. Once they are completed, the earning power of the road will be very materially increased. To those who are not conversant with the situation at Montreal, the necessity for the early completion of those terminals will be less apparent than they are to me, as I have been on the ground and have seen the slowness of the work. As I remember it, the intention of Parliament was to do what this new legislation proposes now to make clear.

Mr. MARCIL: I do not rise to deal with the legal phase of this matter. The hope has been expressed not only by the travel-

ling public but by residents that the railways on the island of Montreal will be electrified and the smoke nuisance thus done away with, so far as the railways are concerned. I have read statements in the press that when the Canadian Northern introduces this system in the tunnel, the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk will have to follow that example with their trains generally on the island of Montreal. As the minister knows, the city of Montreal has extended very widely and at present the smoke nuisance is simply intolerable during the summer season. I would like to know whether there is any possibility or probability of the railways being electrified in the near future. Or, is that a matter that rests entirely with the Railway Board? Would this Parliament have nothing to say in the matter?

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that this Parliament can pass a law to do anything within its jurisdiction. But Parliament has given power to the Railway Commission to adjust such matters as that referred to. In addition, there are the provincial laws governing the smoke nuisance. This is the first time the subject has been drawn to my attention and, of course, I could not give the hon. member an answer offhand. But there will be other discussion of railway matters when, perhaps, I may be able to give the hon. member some information.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like, if I am in order, to call attention also to the nuisance caused by the whistling of boats on the Lachine canal which passes through the city of Montreal.

Mr. REID: As soon as this Bill is passed, we will go into Committee of Supply and take up the Railway Estimates. I shall be glad then to hear the hon. member's remarks on the subject and, if possible, to give him an answer.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital —Hudson Bay railway—construction of railway terminals and elevators, $3,000,000.

Mr. MARCIL: I was asking the attention of the minister to the nuisance caused in Montreal by the whistling of steamers using the Lachine canal. The canal goes through the city. It is crossed by many bridges. Many boats come down laden with grain or other cargo and the system is to give three long whistles on approaching a bridge—at least that seems to be the system so far as one can figure it out who lies long enough awake to hear what goes on. If he is not wakeful enough to follow the system, he will certainly be awakened by some passing boat. This nuisance has become almost intolerable and some means should be found to put an end to it.

Mr. REID: This is the first complaint on this subject that has come to my notice. Of course, I can understand that with so many boats using the canal the use of their whistles might become a nuisance. I will take this matter up with the superintending engineer of the canal, Mr. Marceau, and inquire as to the facts and as to whether it is not possible to have the practice stopped, or, at least, made as little annoying as possible to residents. I suppose that a vessel approaching a bridge must blow a whistle as a signal.

Mr. MARCIL: It has been suggested that the signal should be given by means of a flashlight.

Mr. REID: I am informed by the chief engineer that that has been considered, but the whistle is deemed the better signal in the interest of safety.

Mr. MARCIL: It is an awful nuisance to residents. A man, no matter how tired he may be at night, is kept awake by these long whistlings.

Mr. REID: I understand that the difficulty is that a vessel coming round a curve cannot signal by flashlight which would be seen by the man at the lock or at the bridge. A vessel coming down the canal with the wind after her might find the bridge closed or the lock gates in the wrong position to receive her if she did not whistle.

Mr. TURRIFF: The same argument was used some years ago when an attempt was made to prevent the whistling of locomotives in cities. Eventually this was stopped, and the railways have no difficulty in carrying on their business just as well without disturbing the whole city at night with their screeching whistles. Flash lights or signal lights could undoubtedly be used to notify the bridge keepers of the approach of vessels. This matter is well worthy of consideration by the department.

Mr. MARCIL: The bridge keepers could be notified by telephone that such and such a boat is on the way down; anything is better than the present system.

Mr. REID: While it would be a good thing for those living along the canal if this difficulty were removed, the main part of the city of Montreal is just east of the end of the canal, and the whistling of boats in the harbour would continue.

Mr. MARCIL: There is the difference between the river and the canal that the river is a wide expanse of water and steamers are not numerous upon it. This canal is almost in the nature of a street, and the long shrills that are repeated by the vessels at every bridge are a standing nuisance.

Mr. GRAHAM: When the minister takes this matter up he will have to deal with the Marine Association as well as with the Railway Department. The Marine Association, of course, has its own well defined rules and signals, and if vessels neglect to comply with them they are liable for any damages that may occur. Subject to that, I am of opinion that a good deal of the noise could be done away with on the canals.

Mr. NESBITT: What money has already been spent on this Hudson Bay railway?

Mr. REID: The expenditures on the Hudson Bay railway to February 29, 1916, were as follows:

Location	$ 508,157 18
Engineering (other than location)	720,191 46
Rails and fastenings	2,045,890 16
Bridges, trestles and culverts	707,423 34
Track	1,154,959 46
Grading	4,738,009 75
Other expenses	529,550 91
Total	$10,404,182 26

On the port Nelson terminals the expenditures up to February 29, 1916, were as follows:

Land plant materials and supplies	$ 892,915 98
Floating plant	859,458 57
Port Nelson pay rolls	1,550,382 29
Steamships	1,148,019 82
Miscellaneous	411,002 03
Total	$4,861,77 69

The grand total is $15,265,960.95.

Mr. TURRIFF: Would the minister explain further that item of $720,000 for engineering other than location? That seems to be a most outrageous charge for engineering since the locating of the road was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY: With the permission of the member for Assiniboia, I wish to put a question to the minister before he goes into the details of that. Before the late Government went out of office legislation was passed providing for the sale of what were called purchased homesteads, with a view to providing the money necessary, for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. Could the minister tell me what have been the total receipts by the Government from these purchased homesteads?

Mr. REID: I am sorry I have not that information. It is with the Interior Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the hon. minister get it? It is important.

Mr. REID: I will ask the Interior Department for that information and send it to the hon. member.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not object to the minister's sending it to the member for St. John, but I think the House ought to have it. It is a very important item in reference to the whole subject. Some people criticise the Hudson Bay railway as being very expensive and unnecessary; the western people reply that homestead lands were sold in order to build this railway and that the Dominion Government has the money. I would like to know how much money they have got.

Mr. REID: I will make a note of these questions and when we take up the Estimates again I will give the answers and have them go on Hansard.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I assume it is the policy of the present Government to apply the homestead receipts towards the construction of the Hudson Bay railway?

Mr. REID: You are getting into rather deep water, so far as I am concerned. The matter is connected with the Interior Department, and I have not gone into it. However, that is another question that I will answer the next time we take up the Estimates.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend will not get into deep water at Port Nelson.

Mr. REID: Oh yes, we will. The hon. member for Assiniboia asked me about the engineering expenses other than location. The details are as follows:

General	$118,066 15
Pas terminals	12,110 50
Pas Thicket Portage	312,279 39
Thicket Portage—Split lake	119,851 72
Split Lake, Port Nelson	157,883 70
Total	$720,191 46

The chief engineer tells me that all these railway systems figure 7 per cent as a fair and reasonable estimate of the cost of engineering services during construction. The hon. member will see that this amount is even a lower percentage.

Mr. TURRIFF: That country is very level, and once the railway is constructed, I understand that the Government will have engineers on it for inspection purposes, to see that the work is carried out according to contract. There are a certain number of engineers necessary for sections. Perhaps the minister can give us the number of engineers that have been employed there. My information is that many more have been sent out than were necessary, and that when the Government wanted to give a man a job, or wanted to take a man from another job they sent him there.

Mr. REID: I differ with the hon. gentleman. The chief engineer tells me that they have no more engineers on the staff than are actually necessary.

Mr. TURRIFF: How many are on the staff?

Mr. REID: They are all along the line, and at Port Nelson.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does this include the Port Nelson staff?

Mr. REID: No. I cannot give the exact number of engineers at present. The hon. gentleman will see that we have spent on the railway, so far, $10,000,000; I have sufficient confidence in the chief engineer to believe that he would not put on more men than are necessary, and I have the same confidence in the Minister of Railways. He has tried to keep the staff down as low as possible.

Mr. TURRIFF: With poor success.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is the engineer in charge?

Mr. REID: There is a man named Porter in charge of the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. He is in Winnipeg. At Port Nelson there is a man named McLachlan. Mr. Porter has an assistant named Gordon.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is this the Mr. McLachlan who was formerly on the Trent canal?

Mr. REID: That is the man.

Mr. MARCIL: Is any portion of the road being operated yet?

Mr. REID: I understand that the contractor operates it until it is taken over by the Government. He is operating it in a certain way.

Mr. NESBITT: Is the whole road contracted for?

Mr. REID: Yes, right through to Port Nelson.

Mr. NESBITT: What will be the total cost of the road?

Mr. REID: Does the hon. member mean the cost under the contractor's estimate?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes.

Mr. REID: We have a contract with J. D. McArthur to do all the work. He does the grading, but does not furnish the rails which are furnished by the Government. The estimated cost of the line completed is $16,000,000, and the estimated cost of the terminals $10,000,000 making $26,000,000 as the estimated total cost of the road right through to Port Nelson and including the terminals at Port Nelson.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does that include an elevator?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the length of the road?

Mr. REID: 425 miles.

Mr. NESBITT: Does that estimate include the rails?

Mr. REID: Yes, I stated that that was the estimated cost of the road completed and of the terminals. In other words, the road should be completed without any further expense except that of building an elevator or elevators.

Mr. NESBITT: That estimate does not include the dredging of the channel. I am told you will have to dredge around the port.

Mr. REID: We will have some dredging to do near the docks, but, I am informed, it will not be necessary to do any dredging out into Hudson bay. The dredging that will be necessary at the docks is included in the Estimate which I have given.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend has not answered my question as to the number of engineers on that route. If he cannot give me the information at present, I would be glad if he would let me know later.

Mr. REID: I will be glad to get that information.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was under the impression that the original estimate of $26,000,000 included the cost of an elevator. There were two estimates, one, if I remember the figures correctly, of $19,000,000, and the other of $26,000,000. It struck me that the estimate of $26,000,000 included an elevator, but I may be wrong.

Mr. REID: The chief engineer informs me that at the time that estimate was made —Mr. Butler was in charge then—it did include the cost of an elevator.

Mr. GRAHAM: That was my recollection.

Mr. REID: At that time there was only a rough estimate of the cost of the railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it was based on a report from Armstrong.

Mr. REID: Probably. Now that they have got the work pretty well under way, the estimate of the engineer to-day is as I have stated, and it will be necessary to build an elevator at a cost over and above that amount.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister will see that all these things go over the estimate.

Mr. REID: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. NESBITT: I understand from people who have been up there that dredging will be required out from the wharves into the bay itself and that the parts dredged will fill up again. I understood from one party who had been there that such a lot of silt comes down from the river that it will be impossible to keep the channel open without constant dredging, and that it will be like shuffling snow because as soon as one part is dredged it fills up again. Does the minister know anything about that? I got the information from a very responsible man who is not a partisan and who had been there and should have a knowledge of what is going on.

Mr. REID: I have before me the chart of the entrance to Port Nelson. I have not looked it over, but the chief engineer tells me that we have a channel of from half a mile to fifteen miles wide with water at least 19 to 20 feet deep at low tide.

Mr. MARCIL: What is the tide there?

Mr. REID: Sixteen feet is the ordinary spring tide. The only place necessary to dredge is out at the entrance. A channel from half a mile to fifteen miles wide, and with the depth I have stated, I think, should be satisfactory.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister expect to take large grain ships up a channel which has only twenty feet of water?

Mr. REID: That is all the St. John harbour had until 1908.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But they have a very high tide at St. John.

Mr. REID: This has a 16 feet tide and 19 and 16 would make 35 feet. That is the minimum, but that would be ample for Port Nelson.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is the length of the channel from the dock to the bay?

Mr. REID: About fifteen miles.

Mr. NESBITT: Will they go up the river fifteen miles?

Mr. REID: The distance up the estuary from Hudson bay is fifteen miles.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is a strong opinion in the minds of people down here that the channel from Port Nelson out to deep water in Hudson bay is rather narrow and crooked, that the silt brought down in the spring, and also after storms, changes the channel, and that if it is going to be navigable it will have to be continually dredged. One man who has been up there says that a vessel loaded with lumber for the department got stuck ten miles out from the harbour. I would like the minister to give us a pretty full explanation of the condition affecting this channel. I am not unduly criticising this project, because as a western man I want the route to be a success, but thousands of people in the East believe that the channel will be a very unsatisfactory one. I was glad to hear the minister state that the chief engineer says that there shall be a good wide channel. I would like to know if the channel can be depended upon year after year, or whether, if it has been dredged out one year it will fill up by next year.

Mr. REID: Would the hon. member care to take this map, showing the channel, and study it?

Mr. TURRIFF: I have seen the map.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TURRIFF: I should like an answer to the questions I asked before six o'clock.

Mr. REID: I have discussed the matter with the chief engineer and he tells me that the channel is quite safe, with a depth of never less than 19 feet, and he assures me that my hon. friend need have no apprehension as to the sides falling in. The channel widens out from half a mile to 15 miles at the mouth, and there is a rise of 16 feet with the tide. I have here the chart prepared, I think, by the officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department. These charts, of course, are never printed until a thorough examination has been made of the waters. The engineers engaged on this work prepare charts of the waters all over the Dominion; the charts are made with great care, and are very reliable. The hon. gentleman spoke of a vessel that was wrecked at the commencement of the work. As a matter of fact, two vessels were wrecked, one of which went ashore 14 miles out from the bay. At that time we did not have the aids to navigation we have now, but apart altogether from that, there was great carelessness on the part of those in charge of the vessel. Another vessel broke away after she had got safely into the harbour, and went ashore; but her cargo was saved. With the exception of these two accidents, which we attribute to carelessness, vessels have been navigating these waters continually since the work commenced, in perfect safety. The three steamers which the Government purchased have been operated each year between the lower provinces and Port Nelson, carrying as cargo the material required in the carrying on of the work. Several vessels have also been chartered, and since the commencement of the work, with the exception of the two cases I have mentioned, there have been no mishaps, or practically none. I think my hon. friend, after seeing the chart, which I will now lay on the Table, will agree that the channel is safe, and feel justified in contradicting any rumours to the contrary he may hear in the future.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister has said that the estimated cost of the harbour improvements will be $10,000,000. Has the department a plan, showing what these harbour improvements are, their nature and extent, and what purpose they are to serve? If the harbour as it stands to-day is a good harbour, $10,000,000 seems a lot of money to spend on it.

Mr. REID: I would like the hon. member for Assiniboia to have a look at this chart.

Mr. OLIVER: In case of a storm on the bay vessels could not reach the harbour for safety.

Mr. REID: Where the 30 feet of water is, there are mud flats on each side, and these would be a protection if the tide were out.

Mr. OLIVER: If a storm arose and if the tide was out, the vessel would have to ride out the storm the best way she could.

Mr. REID: Not if she got in between the mud flats, where she would have thirty feet of water. The greatest wave is three feet over the mud flats, so that she would be pretty safe from any storm. The channel is very wide; as you go out it extends to fifteen miles wide; that is, with the depth of water that I have stated.

Mr. OLIVER: If the channel is fifteen miles wide and there is no shelter, there is certainly room to raise a tremendous sea.

Mr. REID: The channel starts at about half a mile wide, and as you go out, it extends to about fifteen miles wide; but you can get in close to the mud flats on each side, and the chief engineer says that three feet is the highest wave they have had with the great storms up in that section; so that a vessel drawing not more than nineteen feet of water can get far enough up the river to be out of any great danger in a storm.

Mr. OLIVER: My knowledge of navigation is not sufficient to enable me to argue the point. What I have in mind in discussing the matter is, that the port of Churchill is a shelter harbour, a harbour to which vessels may safely go in storms. There is deep water there, and there is not the enormous expenditure required in order to make the handling of traffic possible. What I am interested in is: What is the advantage claimed for the use of this port of Nelson, which has certain disadvantages, as against the port of Churchill which has certain obvious and unquestioned advantages? I know there is a difference in the train haul, that it is somewhat further to Churchill than to Nelson; but it

appears to me that the difference in the train haul does not anything like compensate for the difference in the advantage of having a deep water shelter harbour as at Churchill, as compared with a very questionable proposition such as exists at Nelson, because no vessel owner is going to risk his vessel on a route where the harbour accommodation is at all questionable. Every one knows that when a vessel gets near land, the shipmaster becomes afraid, and when the port is not of such a character as to lend itself to the safety and advantage of shipping, the shipping keeps away from it. That is a handicap that Nelson will necessarily have to overcome. I want to know why Nelson was chosen in place of Churchill.

Mr. REID: I suppose the Minister of Railways and Canals would probably be better able to answer that than I; but so far as Nelson and Churchill are concerned, there is eighty miles difference in the length of railway which would mean that, if Churchill were chosen, you would have to haul a train 160 miles further each return journey. That, of course, means a large expense in connection with a railway system; it means one division more, and that would be a good reason for choosing Port Nelson, everything else being equal. I understand that while Churchill is a good harbour, there is not the same anchorage for vessels as there is a Port Nelson, that is for a large traffic. The terminal question has been already discussed. The Minister of Railways sent an engineer to look over the situation in order to see whether Churchill or Nelson would be the more suitable, and the reports received by him were that Port Nelson had certain advantages, one of which I have mentioned, that it was a good harbour, and that the channel and so on were quite satisfactory. In addition to that, the minister himself made a trip to Port Nelson and also to Churchill to look after the situation; other officials of the department also examined the different places, and it was after giving the matter every consideration that Port Nelson was finally decided upon. However, rightly or wrongly, the matter has been definitely decided upon and the work has gone on to such an extent that we could not change the port now, and I do not know that there is much use in going further into the matter on that account.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not very clear as to what the minister means in regard to the shelter for ships. From the map, I would think that it is an exposed harbour and that a gale blowing from the northeast or somewhat in that direction would blow right into that harbour. So far as I can see, the fact of a mud bank being on each side of the channel would not be of any assistance. A breakwater would be of value and I believe that before the minister gets through with this harbour, he will have to build one. I suppose he is aware that when a ship comes in from a long voyage, it is usual to let the steam go down and to fix up the grates and get her ready for the next voyage; but ships lying in an exposed place like that would require to keep steam up in order to be safe in case a gale came up suddenly; otherwise, they might be driven on the flats. The harbour itself does not look as if there were much shelter. I am not clear as to the fact of its being narrow. Is there any bend in the river or any protection from the wind that gives the ships any shelter at that point?

Mr. REID: If the hon. gentleman will look at the chart, he will see that there are mud flats on each side. If a northeast gale came right up the channel, the waves on each side of the channel would still be very small, because it is so shallow, and there would not be such a storm in the channel as there would be out in the ocean. The hon. member knows that the tide rises and falls twice a day and it would be only a very short time before a vessel could get right on to the pier that we are building; she would not have to lie out in the channel for any length of time in an exposed position even if a storm arose.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is there good shelter at the pier?

Mr. REID: Right at the pier she would be out of the storm altogether, because the land is on each side. I take it for granted that the hon. member is speaking about eight or nine miles from the pier that we are constructing for the vessels to tie up at.

Mr. OLIVER: There is no doubt that this Hudson Bay route is viewed with a measure of suspicion by a large proportion of the people of Canada. They have doubts as to the wisdom of the expenditure of money on the railroad because they have no faith in the navigation of the bay. There is no doubt that, looked at from a railroad point of view, the port of Nelson is the better port, but looked at from the point of view of the navigator or shipowner, unless it is an advantageous port, then all

the expenditure that is being made is thrown away and the project is discredited. It is a matter of supreme importance that the port shall be of such a character as will attract shipping and not tend to drive it elsewhere. Having beyond any question such a port at Churchill, although the rail haul would be eighty miles further, the cost of construction, at the same rate as the road is now costing, of that eighty miles, would be less than $3,000,000, whereas the improvements at the port of Nelson are going to cost $10,000,000 and may cost a great deal more than that. The point I want to make is that all this expenditure is not properly chargeable to the Hudson Bay railway and Hudson Bay route proposition. $18,000,000 would carry the railroad to Churchill and a moderate expenditure at the port of Churchill would give the necessary facilities for handling traffic at that port. There would be no question then in the minds of shipowners as to the advantage of the route, and once traffic had been established by that route, then, if business increased, you would have the time and occasion to develop the port of Nelson; but at the present time, as it appears to me, we are risking the expenditure we are making and the prospect turning out to be a success, in the effort to create a port where no port now exists. I have taken the liberty of putting this view of the case before the Minister of Railways on previous occasions, and until we are shown, by plans and specifications laid on the table of the House, a well conceived proposal for the development of an adequate and satisfactory port at Nelson, I feel that I am compelled to keep before the public the idea that the Hudson Bay route is not getting a fair chance when Nelson is being used instead of Churchill. It may be that the Government will spend enough money on Nelson to make it a suitable port, but the success of the route depends upon the possibility of port Nelson being made satisfactory to the shipping interests. It may easily be that while that can be done, it may cost too much money to do it, and unless it is done, the route is necessarily discredited. My hon. friend has said that there is no use in discussing the relative merits of Churchill and Nelson with a view to abandoning Nelson and adopting Churchill. Possibly that is true, but my effort is to impress upon the Government that, having selected Nelson to be the terminus of the railroad, they have taken upon themselves the responsibility of seeing that project through and seeing that Nelson is made a port satisfactory to the shipping interests, and that the Government which chose the port of Nelson instead of the port of Churchill must take the full responsibility for that choice, for whatever expenditure is necessary and for whatever success or failure is attained. They must not lay the burden upon the Hudson project or route, they must take the burden upon their own shoulders. If they succeed, we will certainly all give them credit and we will all be glad; but if they do not succeed, the blame must rest upon themselves and not upon the project of a Hudson bay railway and route.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is absolutely correct when he states that the harbour and entrances must be made suitable for shipowners. Any government would have to make them satisfactory to the shipowners, and that is being done up to the present time. Every shipowner who has sent his vessel to Nelson has been well satisfied with the charts that we have at the present time. Up to the present the expenditure made at Port Nelson would be the same as would have to be made at Churchill, because it covers, in a very large measure, the plant that we would have to have for Churchill. Previous to the Minister of Railways taking charge of the department, the whole Hudson bay project was investigated and decided upon by the late Administration, and it was a project that was put forward with the consent of both parties, in the interest of the West. Even if Port Nelson were to cost more money at the present time and be as suitable as Fort Churchill, I claim that it would be much better to spend that money at Port Nelson than at Fort Churchill for the reason that if we had chosen Fort Churchill which the hon. member is now advocating, we would have to haul each trainload of wheat produced in the Northwest eighty miles further to put into a vessel, and we would have to haul that train back the same eighty miles. It costs money to do that and who is going to pay for the 160 miles haulage of that train? Surely the hon. member knows that the additional cost of operation would have to be borne by the farmers in the West in the form of an increased freight rate. Does not the hon. member agree with me that if we can get a port where we can save that 160 miles haulage for all time to come, the amount that would be saved in a few years would pay probably twice as much as the whole cost of the terminus? I do not think there can be any difference of opinion on that.

The hon. member is under the impression that the Minister of Railways and Canals, from information given by his officials and any evidence that he could get, thought that development of Port Nelson would cost a great deal more than would Churchill; and the hon. member for Edmonton is of the same opinion. The Minister of Railways and Canals was to decide which of the two harbours would be of most advantage to the farmers of the Northwest, and which would cost the least money. The opinion that he had up to that time was that to build a railway to Churchill would mean an additional haul of 80 miles each way; that was one thing against it. The information that the Minister of Railways and Canals had before him at that time as to the cost of the work necessary to put the harbour at Churchill in satisfactory condition was as follows: harbour work, piers, dredging, exclusive of lighthouse and buoying, $6,675,000. The cost of the same work at Port Nelson, covering exactly the same items, was estimated at $5,065,000. I do not know whether it was the opinion of the hon. member for South Renfrew himself; at all events it was the opinion of the officials, that Port Nelson was a safe and a good harbour; that the selection of that port would save a haul of 80 miles which would have been a charge on the farmers of the Northwest for all time to come had the other port been selected. Every farmer who had grain to send could save half a cent a bushel on the carriage of that grain if it went through Port Nelson instead of Churchill, and, besides, the difference in the cost of the works at the respective harbours would be $1,600,000.

Mr. HUGHES: Who made that report?

Mr. REID: I was just reading from a report on the Hudson Bay railway, made by Mr. Armstrong in 1909, and revised by Mr. Butler. In connection with cost over and above the amount mentioned, it should be remembered that all the plant is now a charge on these terminals. The officials of the department, from the deputy minister down to every man who was sent there, did their best to get the most accurate figures. From the information I have I believe that Mr. Butler, the deputy minister at the time; Mr. Armstrong, the engineer in charge, and all his officials, came to the conclusion, from the information they could get, that Port Nelson was the right place. Mr. Cochrane sent another man there, and his report was exactly the same. Then Mr. Cochrane himself went there and examined the place, and he came to the same conclusion. Under the circumstances I do not see that any fault can be found with the decision that has been arrived at. The captains who have navigated ships there believe that Port Nelson is the right place.

Mr. HUGHES: The minister said that ship owners who sent ships there were quite satisfied with Port Nelson. For what purposes were these ships sent there?

Mr. REID: We have been running our own vessels with supplies, but prior to our obtaining these we had to charter vessels.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought the minister meant ships that sent there for commercial purposes. The men that the department sent there would be satisfied because they were getting a high price for the use of their vessels. Has any report been received from men engaged in the transportation business in Hudson bay?

Mr. REID: I would like to ask hon. gentlemen in this House if, since this Hudson Bay railway project was commenced, anyone could do more than has been done by the present minister and his two predecessors?

Mr. HUGHES: It was all done by railway men.

Mr. REID: It was all done by officials of the department, and they got the best evidence they could. Vessels of the Marine Department have been going there, and many vessels have been chartered and sent to Port Nelson with full cargoes of supplies.

Mr. HUGHES: How many of them have been lost?

Mr. REID: One was lost 14 miles away from the channel; she had got altogether out of her course. The other vessel that was lost got into port, but through carelessness she was allowed to drift from her anchorage to the shore. Afterwards they supposed that she had been set fire to. The minister in deciding which shall be the terminal port can only take the best evidence that he can get. He sends his engineers to look the ports over; they examine them to the best of their ability; he gets what information he can from vessels that have been in the locality. When a minister comes to a decision under these circumstances, taking the advice of his

deputy minister, his engineers, and considering all available information, even if it should turn out afterwards to be wrong, I claim that he has done his duty. I believe that all available information was exhausted by the present minister's predecessors in determining what port would be the best, having regard to the interests of the people of the Northwest, and I believe that the same has been the case with the present minister. The port has been decided upon, and I sincerely hope that the anticipations of everyone who has had anything to do with this decision will turn out to be well founded. We hope also that the railway will be a success. I stated in this House a few days ago that at first, many years ago, I was under the impression that this railroad would not be the success it is now expected to be, but I have changed my opinion, and I think many other would, if they had the same opportunity as I have had of discussing this matter with the officers who know the whole situation, with those who have been up there, with captains who have navigated the bay, and of hearing from the Minister of Railways and Canals his opinion of what can be done. I believe now that when we get that road in operation, the Northwest will receive benefits which some of us at the present time can hardly conceive.

Mr. TURGEON: The minister knows that I have always favoured the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, but I must say that I had always expected that Fort Churchill would be the terminus of that road. That idea is in conformity with the information which we in the Maritime Provinces gather from old seamen who have navigated Hudson bay, and from the owners of vessels who had traded there. They always expected that when the railroad was constructed, Fort Churchill would be the natural port, because there you have a natural harbour, and the conditions are safer. They looked upon Port Nelson as a problem which might never be solved. The minister said that it would have been necessary to construct some 80 miles of railway additional, if Fort Churchill had been selected as the terminus, but I am not sure that a line further west might not have been selected which could have reached Fort Churchill without necessitating the construction of the extra 80 miles of road. If the conditions are more favourable at Fort Churchill, as is stated by the old seamen who have navigated Hudson bay, that extra expense would have been compensated for by the better navigation facilities, by lower insurance rates, and so on. At any rate, the opinion of these men is that Fort Churchill would have been more advantageous than Port Nelson. Meanwhile, the minister tells us that it is too late to think of Fort Churchill. I do not blame the minister. He must have taken the best advice he could get, and no doubt it was given to him honestly, but it does not agree with the general opinion of the seamen in the Maritime Provinces. If the decision is irrevocable, I would urge upon the minister the necessity of improving the harbour at Port Nelson at any cost, so that it will render the services for which the Hudson Bay railway is being constructed. I have not unlimited faith in the period of navigation. It is limited to a period of three months in the year, but three months in the year for the West, with the development which we may expect, would be of great advantage to the grain shippers and to those engaged in cattle raising. It would give a new impetus to development in the Northwest, and enable the farmers to ship at a greater advantage than they can with the long haul to our eastern seaboard. I would strongly urge upon the minister the necessity of improving that harbour. But the decision arrived at by the department is altogether contrary to the opinion expressed by men from St. John's, Newfoundland, and by other men who have navigated Hudson bay, and who have no political interest in the matter at all. I wish to impress the minister with that fact.

Mr. NESBITT: What became of the dredge that was shipped up there? It was said that it had been broken up and was useless. I think it was shipped from Toronto. Is it in use now? While I am on my feet, might I ask if there are any reports from the men engaged in constructing the railway as to the prospect of western freight, as well as eastern freight, along the railway, or adjacent to it.

Mr. REID: The dredge referred to worked for about nine weeks last year, and it has been working since with perfect satisfaction.

Mr. GRAHAM: Something went wrong with it when it first went up there.

Mr. REID: Yes, it was damaged when it was beached for the winter, but it has

been repaired. It gave good satisfaction for nine weeks, and will do good work during the coming season. With regard to freight going west, that is a hard matter to decide. We all have our own opinions as to that. I am under the impression that there will be cargoes from the Hudson Bay. There will be cargoes of grain going direct to foreign countries—

Mr. NESBITT: That would be eastbound freight. Is there any prospect of westbound freight?

Mr. REID: There are coal, steel rails, and other products that will go West, and there is the possibility of freights from Montreal and the lower provinces.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not mean that; I mean local freight along the length of the railway, between Hudson bay and the Pas.

Mr. REID: Along the railway there is timber, and fish, and minerals. I noticed that they were getting minerals along that line, and I am informed that there is good agricultural country. The information I have is that there is a great quantity of timber and minerals, and of course there are fish.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The timber is not worth very much according to the report.

Mr. REID: For local consumption it is.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In the topographical survey report for 1916, a good deal of the timber is described as pretty scrubby, and a good deal of the land is described as muskeg. There is said to be some clay land fit for cultivation, but a great deal of it is swampy. The report says there are some whitefish and trout in the locality and that only a small amount of tillable land is found in the district covered by forest. Fishing and mining are likely to prove, the report states, most important industries. There is also a paragraph in the report which says that frost occurs every month of the year, excepting perhaps July, and that at the beginning of May, 1914, there were two feet of snow, which had not entirely disappeared before the middle of June, and the frosty nights began on August 20. So that it is a pretty rigorous climate in which to expect any agricultural settlement. According to this report, there are strips of timber on the banks of the rivers, and some clay land, but a good deal of it is swampy, and apparently the climate is very cold.

Mr. TURRIFF: As far as frost is concerned, last summer we had the largest and best crop we have ever had in the West, in Saskatchewan at all events, and there was frost in every month during the year 1915 without a single exception. It does not necessarily follow that because there may be some frost during each month it will not be a good agricultural country. As my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) says, they raise very fine vegetables in the Yukon. There is a large tract of good clay land for agricultural purposes in the Burnt river country. Irrespective of the merits of the road as a through route, it will be a good colonization road and there will be a considerable amount of settlement going in on a part of the line at all events. No doubt for mixed farming it will be found suitable.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I wish to say a word or two with regard to that question of temperature. I have made a considerable study of the Hudson bay route and I have got the best information I could upon the subject. I do not think it is necessary for me to go back over the ground to-day. I do not wish to accuse the East of any prejudice but if the people in this part of the country will just look squarely at the conditions in the West there will not be one word of opposition to the building of the Hudson Bay route or of doubt with respect to the navigability of Hudson bay and Hudson straits. What I rose to reply to was the question to which my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) referred about there being frost in every month of the year except one. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has answered that. In the three provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba there was not one month last year in which we did not have frost. Further than that, in a year when we had one of the best crops that we ever had, we had seven or eight inches of snow on the 12th June and another snowstorm on the 15th September. That is such a wonderful country that all these little obstacles do not interfere with us having good crops, nor will they interfere with transportation out of that country by way of Hudson bay and Hudson strait. It is not necessary at this late day to give proof of the great necessity there is for an outlet from the West such as that road will afford. I want to draw the attention of the House to one or two points. One has reference to the matter of growing wheat. Some people tell us that we can grow apples and fruit in the West. I have an experience since 1882

and my opinion is that while we may grow fruit, the staple articles that the farmer will grow in that country for many years, will be grain and stock. Wheat has commanded a very good price, and at the price that wheat sells for to-day we can afford, perhaps, to send our wheat over this long haul to Montreal and make it pay. I may be too pessimistic about this matter, but when you consider the tremendous amount of wheat and other grain that has to be handled you will see how important the transportation question becomes. When you consider that we have at least 126,000,000 acres that can produce grain, that to-day we only have about 20,000,000 under cultivation, and that this year we grew some 600,000,000 bushels of grain, it gives you some idea of what that country is going to produce. When our production increases and when that of all the other grain-growing countries in the world, now producing enormous quantities, increases, wheat will not naturally be at the price at which it sells to-day. Then we in this Parliament—and I do not care which Government is in control—will have to do our utmost to lighten the cost of transportation, whether by the railways or by the Hudson bay route. I do not need to point out to the committee the great difference there is between the cost of transportation by water and by land. It is much cheaper by water. I do not need to tell you that while in Manitoba we may get along, if you have to provide for the production of Alberta and the Peace river district, which everybody says will grow any amount of grain, the problem becomes still more pressing. I am going to give the figures to the committee to show the difference in the cost of getting wheat out by way of Hudson bay and bringing it down to Montreal. This is not the first railway that has met with opposition. This is not the first time that we have heard about a frozen up country. I will guarantee that when my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) went out to that country he got his life insured for fear he would be killed by Indians, or that he would freeze to death and never reach civilization again. I know that to be a fact.

9 p.m.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER: Not as to the details.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That is the way they talk about this country. There is no question to-day as to the navigability of Hudson bay and Hudson strait. My hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair), who comes from near Halifax, talks about the temperature, but let me tell him that the average from the 11th July until October is 62½ degrees. That mean average temperature for these four months is better than that of ten of the principal stations extending from Halifax, N.S., to Fort Simpson, on the Mackenzie river.

Mr. REID: He does not live near Halifax.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Yes, he lives pretty near Halifax. About two-thirds of the southern part of Hudson bay may be considered to have had that temperature. The United States went through this same thing. They felt just the same as some of our eastern friends feel now—if they do feel that way—and I am afraid, from the little private conversations I have had outside, that some of the eastern people think that this is going to interfere with their business. I have every assurance in so far as I am personally concerned, and I am not an engineer, but I am just as good an engineer as many hon. gentlemen on the other side who talk about this route, that Hudson bay and Hudson strait are navigable for five months in the year. It is a very peculiar fact that no iceberg ever appears in Hudson bay, and no iceberg ever appears in the first 400 miles of Hudson strait. The only icebergs we have in that country come from near my hon. friend's country; they form off the Newfoundland coast, come up the Hudson strait about 100 miles, until the current sets in the other way and they are carried out to sea. It is a fact that there never was an iceberg found in Hudson bay or Hudson strait for the first 400 miles. There was similar opposition and criticism in the United States when the port of Galveston was opened; it was said that the Eastern States would be ruined. But what was the result? Instead of ruining the Eastern States, the opening of that port has been of great advantage to them, because it has given it has given them a tremendous market for their manufactured products.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not think anybody here is afraid that eastern Canada will be hurt.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Why is there always so much opposition then? But I do not wish to dwell on that. Western Canada must have a road to Hudson Bay. With proper aids to

navigation I believe that Hudson Bay will be navigable but if not, it will be a serious thing for western Canada. I should like to give the House a few figures showing the comparative distances from Liverpool, and I think they will be somewhat of a surprise to a great many members. From Fort Churchill to Liverpool is 3,000 miles; from Montreal to Liverpool is 3,220. I am dealing with Fort Churchill because I have always been and still am of the opinion—I am always open to conviction—that Fort Churchill was the place to choose. I am not an engineer, and the engineers may have been able to prove that Port Nelson was more advantageous. But I have to agree occasionally with the hon. member for Edmonton.

Mr. OLIVER: It hurts, eh?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: If Fort Churchill is the better port, and engineers say it is, then to my mind the difference of 80 miles of railway is not a strong argument for changing from Fort Churchill to Port Nelson. I am rather of the impression that hon. member for South Renfrew talked of making this change when the late Government was in power. I may be wrong, but I think my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) was in favour of Port Nelson rather than Fort Churchill. From Montreal to Liverpool is 220 miles more than from Fort Churchill to Liverpool. The distance from New York to Liverpool is 3,057 miles. From St. Paul to Liverpool via New York 4,440 miles; from St. Paul to Liverpool via Hudson bay 4,096 miles. From Duluth via New York to Liverpool, 4,201 miles; from Duluth via Hudson bay to Liverpool, 3,728 miles. From Vancouver to Liverpool via Canadian Pacific railway is 5,868 miles; from Vancouver to Liverpool via Hudson bay 4,568 miles. The Hudson bay route means a saving between Vancouver and Liverpool of 1,300 miles, which ought to mean something. Now let us take the land distances. From Brandon to Montreal the distance is 1,555 miles; from Brandon to Churchill 940 miles; from Medicine Hat to Montreal 2,082 miles; from Medicine Hat to Churchill 1,076 miles; from Calgary to Churchill is 1,256 miles; from Calgary to Montreal 2,262 miles; from Winnipeg to Montreal 1,422 miles; and from Winnipeg to Churchill 945 miles.

Mr. SINCLAIR: By what route?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: By any route, Canadian Northern railway or Canadian Pacific railway. From Prince Albert to Montreal the distance is 1,958 miles; from Prince Albert to Churchill 717 miles. From Battleford to Montreal 1,094 miles; from Battleford to Churchill 876 miles. From Saskatoon to Montreal 1924 miles; from Saskatoon to Churchill 806 miles. From Edmonton to Montreal 2,247 miles; and from Edmonton to Churchill 1,129 miles. These figures have all been verified and can be taken as correct. They show conclusively how much shorter a land haul the Hudson Bay route means without entailing any greater distance by water. I am not going into this question to-night as fully as I have done in the past. I am personally convinced that the Lord placed Hudson bay where it is, to help out that great western country, and we do' not want His followers in the East to try and obstruct Him. I believe that route will be a God-send to the people of the West. We have only to turn to history to see how every enterprise has been opposed. Everybody knows what was said about the Canadian Pacific railway; but no enterprise under the sun has proved a greater success. People talked the same way about the Panama Canal.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Transcontinental will turn out the same.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I believe it will some years hence; and since the hon. gentleman has brought up that point I will state my position. There is plenty of work for the Canadian Northern railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Canadian Pacific railway across the three Prairie Provinces. I do not think we should have had three roads built from Port Arthur east, at all events further east than Sudbury or North Bay. I am also of the opinion that there is not at the present time business for three roads west of Edmonton. But I have every confidence in my country, and I believe the time will come when those roads will all be in successful operation. This country is going to grow, and will have plenty of work for the three roads, and plenty of work for the Hudson Bay road also. I have figures for the last fifty years showing for how many months in the year the bay and straits are navigable. Without giving the figures for each year, the average time during which the bay and straits are navigable is from June 19 to November 8. I have no doubt that when we have all possible aids to navigation, the bay and straits will be navigable for from four to five months; and if we get four months during which the bay and straits are navigable it will be of the utmost

benefit to the country. I am not a prophet, but I should like my words here to-night to be remembered: It will not be very many years, perhaps within ten, when whoever is lucky enough to have a seat in this House will be wondering how any one ever had the courage to stand up in the face of Nature and say a single word against the building of the Hudson Bay railway and the navigability of Hudson bay and straits.

Mr. ROBB: The last remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner), it seems to me, prove that as a grain-carrying route the Hudson Bay route will be good for only about one month in the year. He has told us that the experience of some thirty years showed that the season was from 19th June to 8th November. Now, I would submit this question to the judgment of the hon. gentleman: Who is going to send grain to Hudson bay after the 8th of November and run the risk of carrying that grain until June, at a time when the crops from the southern countries are coming into the markets of the world, and when, as everybody in the business knows, grain begins to get a little cheaper? The only profitable carrying month for grain by the Hudson Bay route will be from the time when the grain starts to move—and it does not begin to move until about October—until the 8th of November. I am not going to debate the advantages and disadvantages of the Hudson Bay route, but it does seem to me that, at this time, when Canada has such great need of money, the Hudson Bay route could well wait for a little while. Let it wait until we have demonstrated that the West can produce year after year such crops as it produced last year. It must be remembered that last year's was a phenomenal crop. For many years before that we had but a limited crop. There is one feature of this argument that appears as a perennial problem to me. For about half the session our western friends put up the argument in favour of opening the markets of the United States, and for the other half they say they want the grain to go North for export. I want to know which is right. Who is going to send grain for storage at Hudson bay, pay freight and banking charges, insurance and storage, from November until June, keeping it there until the wheat of next year's crop begins to come in?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I thought I made that very clear. We can afford to sell our wheat a great deal cheaper when we send it by the Hudson Bay route than when we send it by Montreal, because it will not cost us nearly so much to get it to market.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may be expected that I should say a word or two upon the subject. I am not sure of the correctness of those distances given by the minister. Is the minister sure that from Pas Mission to Nelson is 425 miles?

Mr. REID: That is in the printed report.

Mr. GRAHAM: My recollection is that the distance is 410 miles, but I may be wrong.

Mr. REID: I read it from the printed report, but I have it in the memorandum given me by the deputy minister. I may just read the information it contains.

Mileage.	Miles.
Le Pas to Ticket Portage	185.5
Ticket Portage to Split Lake Junction	68.00
Split Lake Junction to Port Nelson	170.5
Total	424.00

	Miles.
Total miles of steel laid, main line	241
Total miles of steel laid, sidings	24
Total miles of steel laid, temporary track	33
Grading completed (with exception of a few depressed grades)	378
Track surfaced	225

Mr. GRAHAM: These, then, are the revised figures. I had it in mind also that it was not so far from Port Nelson to Churchill as my hon. friend stated, 80 miles.

Mr. REID: That is the official figure.

Mr. GRAHAM: My memory must be at fault. Of course, I disagree with a lot of people, but still I am in favour of the Hudson Bay road.

Mr. REID: So am I.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not, as a member of the late Government, plunge into that project without a good deal of consideration. There are a good many drawbacks to the project; but then we are advancing in dealing with these several difficulties that arise in transportation both by rail and by water, and so I hope that some of these difficulties will be made to disappear as the years go by. It is not very long since we would have laughed at a person who would try to open navigation on the St. Lawrence a few weeks before the ice moved out in the spring—in fact they did laugh at that project at first. If any person

had told us a few years ago that one of the great European governments would send to Canada for a modern ice-breaker or two to show them how to carry on winter navigation, that person would have been laughed at. But we are advancing, and I have strong hopes that the navigation of Hudson straits will be extended for a longer term than that indicated in the reports heretofore made. The straits are not frozen up, as some people seem to imagine, the difficulty is with floating ice coming down through the straits. With our wireless telegraphy, our new methods of signalling and other improvements, it seems to me, a channel can be kept open through the straits for a longer time than formerly, even though that channel may be a little devious. But suppose the season to be short, we must remember that there is going to be a large export from the West outside of wheat. I speak particularly of stock. Those who are acquainted with the northern part of Alberta have been greatly impressed with its possibilities in dairy products. The condition in which the product is taken to market is sometimes almost as important as the freight rate or the speed. Then, those who ship live stock find that one of their great difficulties is to get the stock to the ocean port in the best condition. If the weather be warm, there is a great reduction in the value of the stock before it reaches the point of ocean shipment. But stock to be shipped from the West can be taken from a great many central points to the Hudson Bay port, being kept only about two nights and one day in the car. The nights are cool, even if the day be warm, so that the stock should be placed aboard the ship at Hudson bay in practically as good a condition as that in which it left the point of production. I believe that that will develop stock raising in portions of the West where, probably, it will prove the most profitable product they have. The same applies to dairy products; these can be sent by the Hudson Bay route retaining their original quality. I have not varied for a moment in my belief that the Hudson Bay project will be a success notwithstanding the difficulties that have arisen.

Hon. members must bear in mind that a great many things said against the Hudson Bay route have not been said, in my opinion, accidentally. That western country became a part of Canada after some struggle and some negotiation with a great company; and—I have said it before and I say it again—it is part of the policy of the Hudson's Bay Company to discourage as far as possible the opening up of a new route in that direction. I will not go into details, but that concern was a monopolist for many years and has not yet got over the habit. It has, I think, used every effort, quietly, in literature and otherwise, to discourage the opening of the Hudson Bay route.

Let me say a word about the possibilities along that railway; and in this connection let me explain to my hon. friends from the West that the people of the East are not antagonistic to the Hudson Bay scheme as a scheme; nor is there any idea in the minds of the people of the East that this route will affect their business unfavourably. For my part, I have faith in the western country to believe that it will be large enough and productive enough to give business for all the routes in the years to come. We shall have to develop a return traffic. And these things generally right themselves when we get the streams of commerce flowing. It may not be a matter of theory, but it is a matter of practice that where you sell profitably you will buy to advantage, and so you will get commerce established. So the people of the East do not object to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway and its harbour facilities. Let me instance the case of a railway in the province of Ontario. A few years ago it was decided by the Ontario Government that they would build a railway since known as the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway. There was not more than one man in fifty, I believe, but down in his heart thought it was going to be a great failure. That country was looked upon as a land from which the pine had been taken and that all that was left was a few lakes with some poplars, jackpine, and other pulpwood. But what has been the result of the construction of that line? It has opened up a beautiful tourist paradise into which many people go every summer and which, but for the building of that line, would never have been known. It has made known the fact that in Northern Ontario there are many millions of acres of as good land as is to be found anywhere in the world. But, further than that, the opening of this line, to the surprise of the entire world, has been the means of developing the greatest silver deposits ever known. Had not there been some cour-

age, some energy, some optimism, that road would not have been constructed, and the world would not have known of the rich possessions we have. Along the Hudson Bay railway, I am told, although a portion of it is low-lying land, muskeg, nevertheless there is some timber of more or less value. I am told that not far from the line there is some very good land. And my information during the past two weeks is that gold has been discovered within a very few miles of the railway. I am not speaking at random, for I was told of it by a man who was there and who has brought samples with him on which he has had good reports. And, no matter what may be said, I believe there is an opening for the development of a profitable fish industry in Hudson bay. So, with the outlook we have, I believe it would pay us to build that railway even if we have no export by Hudson bay. We have done that in other parts of the country that were not any more promising than this. But, when you add to all this the possibility of opening a new route of transportation to the old land, I think we are not too optimistic when we believe that it will be a success.

As to the possibility of steamers coming and going, I may say that when I was Minister of Railways I had an offer made to me of a line of railway to run there regularly under certain conditions. That never was developed because, unfortunately for the country the Government changed. But I just mentioned the point to show that there are people engaged in shipping who are willing to make arrangements to run to Hudson bay and to take a considerable chance of trade developing.

Mr. NESBITT: They would want a large subsidy.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said they offered to run "under certain conditions," but the subsidy might not be any greater than that for running to an old established port. There has been drawbacks. I understand that a great part of the work done by the minister one year was carried away by the spring freshets The minister has had a hard experience, but though he lost most of a year's work, if I am correctly informed, and though a bridge did go wrong on the construction of the railway, I do not think we ought to be discouraged

As to the two ports—and perhaps I should not have detained the committee at all had it not been for this question coming up—I did not, as Minister of Railways, come to a decision as between the two ports. Frankly, all the reports I had from the officials were in favour of Nelson, so far as I can remember. I sent one man with a staff and he remained all winter, and his report must be on file. From the investigation he made both winter and summer, his report pointed to Nelson as the best place for a permanent harbour if any great amount of trade were to be developed. I speak from memory and subject to correction. Possibly, if small trade were expected, Churchill might be the best harbour, but it was to a large extent incapable of being developed into a harbour for the large trade. I think that possibly, if I had been left in the department, I should have acted on that information—it was the only method I had of getting information. The only contract given by the late Government through myself extended from Pas Mission to Split lake. This left it open for the Government to decide finally either for Nelson or Churchill, as the railway from that point could be delivered to either. My successor seems to have made full investigation and to have decided in favour of Nelson. I am not in a position to quarrel with Nelson being the port, for the information I had led in the same direction. An official of the Marine Department has made a report —I think it was a report—in which the choice of this harbour is rather deprecated, and it may be that the whole route is not enthusiastically encouraged in that report. I do not know whether the Department of Railways has taken into consideration the report of the officers of the Marine Department in coming to its final conclusion. However, the Department of Railways must take the responsibility for the selection of the harbour. I know that it has had its difficulties. I would like the minister to tell us about these difficulties and about the work in the harbour that was carried away. I am told that the difficulty which brought about that disaster has been done away with and that the work has now been so constructed that a similar accident will not occur again. It is my opinion that the Hudson bay project is one that is well worth entering upon. Notwithstanding all the criticism and objections that have been made, I believe that in the years to come it will prove a valuable addition to our transportation facilities, and that it will be an aid to the West not only in getting out their products, but in bringing in goods in return for those products. No matter what we may say about the Railway Commission, the

public understands most thoroughly that the greatest regulator of freight rates is a water route, even if the amount of grain carried does not assume the proportions anticipated by some people this route will have a salutary effect on the rates by rail to and from the West.

Mr. REID: With regard to the damage at Port Nelson, I understand from the officials that the ice coming out in the spring did some very little damage to a temporary wharf. So far as the work at Port Nelson, is concerned, a memorandum which I have shows that. In general, all development work at Port Nelson is completed; and also the camp, including buildings, shops, municipal works, such as drainage, water supply, sanitary works, light, etc. The trackage and wharves necessary for the conduct of the work and for the reception and distribution of materials and supplies have been completed and a dry dock completed for the repair of the floating plant. The large plant essential to the carrying out of such an undertaking and which, owing to transportation difficulties, had to be shipped knocked down, has been assembled or built out of raw materials at Port Nelson. A breakwater has been constructed which serves to protect the temporary wharves and other shore works during the open season from damage by storms and to protect the large construction fleet which of necessity is laid up on the beach during the winter from damage by ice. The jetty pier leading to the site of the deep water wharves, which is part of the permanent harbour development, has been carried out about half a mile from shore, and a small amount of dredging in the main channel has been done.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would facilitate a more thorough understanding of what has been done there if the Chief Engineer could put a plan on the Table showing the locality of the docks, breakwater, etc.

Mr. REID: I shall lay on the Table a plan which will show exactly what the hon. member is asking for.

Mr. GRAHAM: When does the minister expect the railway to be completed and the harbour works put in condition for the transaction of business?

Mr. REID: We expect to get rails in to Port Nelson in the fall of 1917.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the road be ready for traffic then?

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. REID: We have not enough in these Estimates to enable us to have it completed and ready for traffic, but we will have the rails in, and we will complete it as fast as we can get the money.

Mr. NESBITT: Will the minister spend the $3,000,000 this year?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: When is it expected to have the terminals, the harbour, and the bridge completed?

Mr. REID: About 1918 we expect the road to be doing business.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the weight of the rail?

Mr. REID: Eighty pounds.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the ruling grade?

Mr. REID: The grade is .4.

Mr. OLIVER: Both ways?

Mr. REID: It is .6 westbound.

Mr. OLIVER: Are the rails laid to the second bridge yet; if not, how soon?

Mr. REID: They crossed the first bridge last week, and we have ninety miles of grading ready for rail up to the next bridge.

Mr. OLIVER: When is it expected to have these rails laid?

Mr. REID: They will be up to the next bridge this summer.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to call the attention of the minister to the case of a poor man named Thomas Maloney, who belongs to Newfoundland, and who was injured at Port Nelson last summer. He was burned on board a steamer at Port Nelson and lost the use of his hands. I had a photograph of him, and expected to be able to show it to the minister, but it was destroyed in the fire at the Parliament buildings. He was a cook on board one of the Government steamers at Port Nelson, and, by some accident, a fire broke out in the place where he was cooking, and in trying to put out the fire he was burned so badly that his hands will never be of any use to him again. He called at my office, having heard, I suppose, that I was a member of Parliament, and I found that his finger joints were all gone and that the skin that had grown on his hands was so tender that I do not think he will ever be able to do any work. I had a letter from him to-day from Newfoundland. I lost his address in the fire, and did not know where to write to him, but I have received a letter dated 23rd April in which

he complains that he is absolutely unable to do anything and has to go around looking for charity. He asks me to bring the matter to the notice of the department. He gave me the name of the doctor who attended him, and all the particulars of the case, but, as I have said, I lost them in the fire, and I am only able to give what he states in this letter. I see that in the Supplementary Estimates the Government is providing compassionate allowances for people who have met with accidents of this kind, and I trust that the minister will make inquiry as to the condition of this man. Personally, I have no doubt at all as to his condition, but as to how the accident happened I have only his word, which I have no reason to question. Both hands and arms, up to the elbows, are badly burned. He is crippled for life because he attempted to save the ship, for he might have run away from the fire and escaped injury. In fact, he nearly lost his life, and only saved himself by jumping into the water. I do not wish to name any figure, but in a case of this kind I think that something like $2,000 would be fair compensation. He is a man of about 50 years of age; he is out of business for all time, and he told me he is the father of a family of seven or eight children. I bring the case to the notice of the House and of the minister, and trust that something will be done for this poor man.

Mr. REID: The matter has not been brought to my attention until now, but my officials tell me that the accident was not in any way connected with the work of the department. He was an employee on the vessel, a cook, but according to the information of the department the facts are not as represented by the hon. member. However, at this stage, when all the Estimates are down, there is nothing more that I could do this session. The compassionate allowances referred to by my hon. friend are for the families of persons who lost their lives in the fire at the Parliament Buildings and the amounts are not very large. I understand that no compassionate allowance has been made to this man for the reason that for some time after the accident his wages, hospital expenses, and board were paid. However, I will bring the remarks of the hon. member to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals on his return to the department. Of course, the hon. member will realize that even if the minister did decide to make an allowance it could not be made this session without a special vote and there will be no more Supplementary Estimates during the present session, so far as I know.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would urge upon the minister to make full inquiry into the case because I believe the man was telling me the truth. I would like to have the records fully before the department, so that something may be done for him even though it should be next session.

Mr. REID: I will get the papers together and the minister can look into them if he so desires; but the information I have is that the case has already been looked into and that the department is in no way liable. It was no fault of the department that the man was injured. I understand he has a brother at Port Nelson employed by the department, and that a good deal has been done for the injured man. I will look into the case personally and get it into shape so that I may thoroughly understand it, and then I will hand it over to the minister on his return. The hon. member will have an opportunity of getting the information, and the case can be brought up again.

Mr. HUGHES: When the Estimates were under consideration a few days ago, the minister said that he would have prepared some information in regard to the Prince Edward Island car ferry terminus.

Mr. REID: I have a memorandum and I would like to see if the information which I have answers the hon. gentleman's question:

Car Ferry Northumberland Strait.

The Car Ferry "P.E.I." which is a very fine ice breaking vessel has been delivered by Messrs. Armstrong, Whitworth Company. The docking pier at Cape Tormentine is about completed. There remains some dredging to be done and additional stone must be added to the breakwater. At Carleton Point the approach pier is nearly completed. The concrete cribs for the docking pier are partly in position and partly at Shediac ready to be towed across and placed in positon as soon as the ice will permit. Further stone work is required on the breakwater, and dredging is also required in the turning basin. Work is proceeding at the bridge shops upon the steel works for the transfer bridges required to connect the piers with the deck of the car ferry. While some dredging may remain uncompleted at the end of the season, we shall be in position this fall to institute the regular car ferry service.

Mr. HUGHES: What does "this fall" mean—October?

Mr. REID: I have figured on about the first of October; it may be a little later.

Mr. GRAHAM: Better call it early winter.

Mr. HUGHES: The information which I have received from people living there is to the effect that the contractors—Messrs. Miller—is it?

Mr. REID: Yes, Roger Miller & Sons, I think, is the name of the firm.

Mr. HUGHES: I am informed they are getting along very slowly with the work.

Mr. REID: I know Mr. Miller and I knew him when he was working on the St. Lawrence canals.

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps he was faster then.

Mr. REID: He was always considered one of the best contractors in Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: So he is.

Mr. REID: Roger Miller of Toronto. Does the hon. gentleman know him?

Mr. NESBITT: You bet I do.

Mr. REID: I would consider him one of the best contractors in Canada and if he has got along slowly I cannot understand how it would be any fault of his. He is a very hard-working man and I never heard anything to the effect that Roger Miller would delay work or not do it properly.

Mr. HUGHES: What work is the hon. gentleman discussing?

Mr. REID: The work at Carleton Point.

Mr. HUGHES: A gentleman in the other chamber from Prince Edward Island was speaking on this subject the other day and supporting the Government and I thought he had some inside information. He said he did not think the car ferry would be in operation this winter. I would be very pleased to hear that he was mistaken.

10 p.m.

Mr. REID: Of course, I cannot change his opinion but at the same time the opinion of the officials of the department, who are carrying on that work, is as I have given it to the hon. member. I feel justified in accepting the opinion of my officials.

Mr. HUGHES: The acting minister, during last session, was very confident that it would be in operation last August.

Mr. NESBITT: Well the war has been on.

Mr. HUGHES: The war did not prevent or delay the construction of the pier. However, I suppose the department will hurry the matter along and do the best it can. I see there is an item in the Supplementary Estimates for the purchase of the steamer Northumberland by the Railway Department but there is no item for the operation of the steamer. Will that be necessary or how will it be operated?

Mr. REID: The Northumberland will be a part of the railway service. We give a through rate across the straits to Prince Edward Island and the freight across on the steamer Northumberland is absorbed in the through rate. The operating expenses of the Northumberland will be part of the operating expenses of the Intercolonial system.

Mr. GRAHAM: You will divide it between that and the Prince Edward Island railway?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: Will the Stanley perform the service between Pictou and Charlottetown?

Mr. REID: The Government have purchased the steamer Northumberland and are putting her on the route between Point du Chene and Summerside. The Stanley is running between Pictou and Charlottetown. But the Stanley could not do the freight business between these two points, and we are leaving the car ferry on that route.

Mr. HUGHES: For the summer?

Mr. REID: For the summer time to carry the freight backwards and forward between Pictou and Charlottetown. We intend to leave the Stanley and the car ferry to look after the Pictou-Charlottetown service.

Mr. HUGHES: Both steamers?

Mr. REID: Both. I do not know how they will run them, I have not the details, but they are both to be left on that route and the Northumberland will be put on the Point du Chene service.

Mr. HUGHES: And they will be operated out of the same vote?

Mr. REID: Operated exactly in the same way.

Mr. MARCIL: Are you going to carry the Intercolonial cars across to the Island?

Mr. REID: Not this summer.

Mr. MARCIL: But after you put the car ferry in operation?

Mr. REID: Yes, the intention is to carry the cars over to Prince Edward Island eventually and to widen the tracks there so that the cars can go right on.

Mr. MARCIL: No start has been made on the widening of the gauge?

Mr. REID: No, that will not be commenced until the car ferry is in operation.

Mr. COPP: I understand from the minister that he has a report in regard to the progress which is being made at the Cape Tormentine terminal.

Mr. REID: I have just read it.

Mr. COPP: When was that report made?

Mr. REID: It was made by the chief engineer for me to give to the House.

Mr. COPP: He did not say where he got the information?

Mr. REID: He has his officials there, they have wired him the information; and, in fact, information comes daily to him.

Mr. COPP: I am surprised to learn that the minister has that report from Cape Tormentine.

Mr. REID: He was there himself personally not very long ago.

Mr. COPP: I have been there very many times myself, and I have watched the progress of the work. I have been in consultation, both professionally and otherwise, with some of the contractors who are engaged in the work. I can assure the minister that he need not bother his head about making any preparations to operate the car-ferry service between Cape Tormentine and the Island this coming fall, irrespective of what he has reported. I want to ask the minister a question with regard to the item in relation to work that is proposed to be done on the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway. I was not present when the item passed a few days ago. I would like to ask what work he proposes to do on that railway for which a vote of $129,000 has been taken.

Mr. REID: This is to bring the line up to the Intercolonial railway branch line started.

Mr. COPP: I wanted to know if the minister had any statemnet as to what it is proposed to do.

Mr. REID: I have not the information here, but I will have it put on Hansard at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. LOGGIE: Unfortunately I was absent on Monday last when the Railway Estimates were up, but I understand that the minister allowed us the privilege of a general discussion on any one item. I wish to refer for a moment to the result of the present method of operating trains into Chatham, because of the taking up of the rails from Blackville to Chatham Junction. I should like first of all to read what the minister said in the House in May, 1913 (Hansard, Vol. VI, 1912-13, p. 10855):

Mr. Loggie: How much will it cost to make the improved facilities at Derby Junction? It would be necesasry, I fancy, to have a station on the south side of the river at the bridge.

Mr. Cochrane : That is all included in the $128,000.

Mr. Loggie: But you will still have to have two station agents.

Mr. Cochrane : No, we would move the junction down, and would not have the extra agent.

Mr. Loggie: You will have to have a station agent on the south side of the river.

Mr. Cochrane: I know, but we would move Chatham Junction down to it.

Mr. Loggie: You are going to move that to Derby Junction, are you not?

Mr. Cochrane: No, down to where the branch line would strike.

The matter was again brought to the minister's attention in the following year, when he is reported in Hansard (Vol. V, 1914, p. 4877), as follows:

Mr. Loggie: There is a rumour afloat that the work was let in two contracts and that one of them was cancelled. May I ask the minister if any changes are proposed other than those suggested by the minister last year, namely, that the freight from the main line for Chatham would be transferred at Derby Junction? The minister said last year that the station at Chatham Junction could be moved out to Derby Junction, and there the freight would be transferred for Chatham.

Mr. Reid : There has been no change, the policy as laid down by the minister will be adhered to.

That policy was that the train was to leave Fredericton and go into Chatham via Derby Junction, and that the freight was to be transferred from the main line trains at Derby Junction, and be carried by the branch trains into Chatham from Derby Junction, instead of from Chatham Junction as formerly. In 1914 I asked the Acting Minister of Railways whether it was proposed to make any change in the contract that had been given for the construction work at Derby Junction, and on the south side of the river, and the answer I got was:

There has been no change; the policy as laid down by the minister will be adhered to.

Now, at that time the plans were for improvements at Derby Junction, and the contract had been entered into; it provided for the construction of a "Y," and of a warehouse to be used in transferring the freight. Notwithstanding that the contract had been entered into, and notwithstanding the further fact that the minister on the floor of the House had said that there would be no change in the policy as laid down. that portion of the contract was cancelled and the "Y" was never constructed. The trains that had been operating between Fredericton at one end and Loggieville at the other had forsooth to have a different destination because this promise was—what shall I say?—broken. The contract was cancelled and it was no longer possible to run the trains into Chatham unless they were pulled in with the engine reversed, that is, with the tender ahead; so that it became practically impossible to get into Chatham via Derby Junction, as we had previously been able to do via Old Chatham Junction. The result is a most unsatisfactory service for about one-half of the people of Northumberland county. I have before me a letter from a very prominent merchant of the town of Chatham, protesting on behalf of the people of the town against the service that is being given that portion of the county at the present time. I have also before me a copy of an alleged petition, signed by twenty-seven passengers, who on the 3rd of March arrived at Newcastle at the regular hour of 11.30. As the minister knows, the distance between Chatham and Newcastle is only about 5 miles on a straight line, but the circuitous route that we have to take by rail brings it to about 13 miles. These twenty-seven passengers arrived at Newcastle at 11.30; the Maritime, from the south,, arrived at 12.35; and it was 2.25 in the morning before the 27 passengers reached Chatham. In other words, it took them almost three hours to get from Newcastle to Chatham. This is not an unusual thing. One paragraph of a letter I have here, referriing to this train service, says:

> The express agent there said that this was a most usual occurrence, and that the Chatham train was held up on any excuse possible.

I might as well give you another instance which is taken from the Tri-weekly Press, in the town of Chatham:

> The delegates returning from Fredericton Wednesday evening had a sample of train service that will do them for some time. They arrived in Newcastle at 11.30 and waited until the Maritime came in a little late, or at 12.30. Then they still waited hopefully for the branch to get under way, even after it had been in Newcastle over an hour, but for some reason or another it did not pull out of Newcastle until two o'clock and the tired delegates arrived here shortly before three. They certainly deserved the kindly reception that their efforts met with in Fredericton for their trip in the town's interests was made at considerable personal inconvenience.

I have deemed it my duty to draw the attention of the minister to this matter. The service into Chatham, Loggieville, and Nelson serves nearly half of the citizens of the county, some 15,000 persons. Up to the time that this diversion was made they had a service by which such passengers would have gone on directly into Chatham, instead of having to go to Newcastle, as they have now, and then be brought back some 3½ miles before they reach Derby Junction, so that without necessity they are traversing about seven miles. So far as I can see there is no good reason why those passengers can not be sent direct into Chatham. The passengers for Newcastle either could be transferred to the local between Chatham and Newcastle, or they could get off at Nelson, where there is now a new concrete and iron bridge, so that they would be within reach of home if the train continued down to Chatham, as it did in former years. I cannot see any good reason for this change, and it was a very unexpected one. When I had this matter up before the acting minister two years ago I took him at his word that there was no change in the policy to run the trains into Loggieville from Fredericton as usual; that the contract for the Y would be completed, and that the work was, as I supposed, going on, although there were rumours abroad that the plans were changed, and that the road was to end at Newcastle instead of at Chatham. The minister will see that the distance between Derby Junction and Newcastle is 3·7 miles. A passenger travelling south must traverse that 3·7 miles going north, and he must traverse it coming back, so that every passenger travels 7·4 miles more than he did formerly and more than I can see any occasion for. Further than that, every ton of freight that comes from the south into the lower portion of the county has to travel 3·7 miles into Newcastle and 3·7 miles back to Derby Junction.

Mr. BRODER: Why do they not leave the passengers at the Junction until they come back?

Mr. LOGGIE: That is exactly what we are asking them to do. We want them to leave the passengers at Derby Junction, but that is what they refuse to do. They take them past to Newcastle, 3·7 miles distant, and then bring them back.

Mr. REID: They give them that much of a free ride.

Mr. LOGGIE: I am afraid there is not much of a free ride, but if there is, that is a loss to the Government. That is one way of doing business. Just a short time ago the minister brought up the question of hauling a train eighty miles more to Churchill and eighty miles back and he said that the additional cost of operation would have to be added to the freight rate. How does he harmonize that statement with the one he has just made? The minister will see that, according to the timetable, there are five trains daily, but one of them has recently been changing its passengers at Derby Junction, so that four trains still keep on to Newcastle and change their passengers there. If we have four trains each way daily, that would represent eight trains a day. 3·7 miles travelled by eight trains would mean 29·6 miles daily by one train. Taking 313 days, that would give 9,265 miles; or in other words, you carry one train 9,265 miles—shall I say, without any revenue? The insinuation of the minister is that it is without any revenue. I do not believe that; I think some conciliatory offer was made that there would be no extra fare between Chatham and Newcastle for furtherance, as it were, on the main line, instead of between Chatham and Derby Junction, but how long that condition will exist I do not know. You have, however, this extra mileage, taking both passengers and freight 3·7 miles north and then bringing them back 3·7 miles. If you have on each train one express car, two passenger cars and, say, ten cars of freight, or in round numbers, say 150 tons of freight carried over 9,265 miles, at one-half cent per ton per train mile, the cost of operation would be $6,948.75. Somebody must pay that. Either the Government is paying it or the consumer or dealer who is bringing the goods in is paying it. It seems to me that that is unfair, and it surely can be remedied. Surely thoese people are not to lie under this burden forever; and if it has been promised that a Y shall be constructed, is there any good reason why it should not be done? If the minister can give me any good reason for it, I shall be glad to convey it to my constituents. The whole matter is very unsatisfactory. There is a grievance on the south side of the river because the rails have been taken up and there is a grievance that the service on the south side of the river into Nelson, Chatham and Loggieville does not compare favourably with the service that we had when the trains ran direct from Fredericton into Loggieville. There is no good reason why they cannot continue running from Fredericton into Loggieville, especially because the new bridge will allow passengers for Newcastle to get off and go to their destination. But passengers, as I have pointed out, remain three hours in order to cover a distance of thirteen miles by rail, but five miles in a straight line. The minister must expect that kind of service to breed discontent. The Department of Railways and Canals is, to all intents and purposes, a public carrier, a public servant. The Canadian Pacific Railway would not allow this sort of thing to exist but would endeavour to meet the views of their customers. These passengers are clients of the Crown, and the Crown should try to give them satisfactory service. I hold that there is no difficulty in the way of meeting their views except the construction of the Y at Derby Junction. That construction was actually contracted for, but for some unaccountable reason the contract was cancelled and we were left in the deplorable condition that the passengers must lose three hours to cover five miles. Besides, is there any reason why, if the trains are on time, the Crown, in this case a public carrier, should ask me to lose about an hour extra of time if I want to travel to Moncton or St. John? They haul me four miles north and then they haul me four miles south, instead of allowing me to avoid this loss of time by getting on a train at Derby Junction. There must be some way to overcome a difficulty like that. The public should not be put under such a handicap unless there is great necessity. And I say that the difficulty would be overcome by putting in the Y at Derby Junction and sending part of the train from Fredericton to Loggieville as they used to do, and as it was their policy to do, as I have shown by the references I have made.

Mr. REID: Let me first refer to the delay that occurred on a certain day in March. Of course, I have not the details before me to-night. But I know that in

the month of March last—and the hon. member can hardly have forgotten it—throughout the whole of that part of Canada trains were delayed on account of the snowstorms. Fort twenty-six years we have never had on the Intercolonial such difficult conditions to face on account of storms. In addition, there is the special work that the Intercolonial had to do last winter because of the war. In the case referred to, the delay was caused, as stated by the hon. member, by this train waiting for the Maritime through express.

Mr. LOGGIE: Only about forty minutes.

Mr. REID: There was a delay of the Maritime express on the line running from Fredericton to Loggieville.

Mr. LOGGIE: I desire to make that clar. If the line were running from Fredericton to Loggieville, the delay in the Maritime express would not have affected the situation.

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that in years gone by there was a train service between Fredericton and Loggieville direct, there was a service on each side of the river. The service from Fredericton to Loggieville never went to Newcastle. The rails were taken up between Nelson and Blackville, and therefore the service could only be carried on on one side of the river.

Mr. LOGGIE: The through train service was only carried on on one side of the river. If the Maritime train were late the passengers for the main line would be delayed at Old Chatham Junction. But now if trains from Fredericton would go on to Loggieville passengers for Newcastle could get off at Nelson and get home over the new bridge.

Mr. REID: If the train service is carried on between Fredericton and Chatham, or Loggieville direct, you avoid going to Newcastle.

Mr. LOGGIE: But the Newcastle passengers can get off at Nelson and go over the new Morrisey bridge to Newcastle.

Mr. REID: But they are three miles away.

Mr. LOGGIE: No.

Mr. REID: They have to change at Derby Junction.

Mr. LOGGIE: No. They get off at Nelson which is near the bridge, and they are at their homes.

Mr. REID: What I want to explain to the hon. member is, we have a train service between Fredericton and Loggieville or Chatham—via Newcastle—

Mr. LOGGIE: But it takes three hours to get from Newcastle to Chatham.

Mr. REID: Not if the connections are on time.

Mr. LOGGIE: If the train is on time it takes an hour and a half.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman said it took three hours.

Mr. LOGGIE: And so it did.

Mr. REID: Only in this one case. I remember a case that occurred in the month of March in this very city. A member of this House took his train at the station here at eleven o'clock at night, but woke at six o'clock to find that the train had started and had come back, and he did not reach Toronto until six o'clock the following night. The whole service must not be judged by a delay through a snow blockade. The hon. gentleman has sent me a time table which states that between Newcastle and Loggieville, a distance of eighteen miles, the train leaves Newcastle at 12.05 and arrives at 12.55—so that it takes fifty minutes. And we have four or five trains during the day. Yet the hon. member tries to make the Committee believe that it takes three hours for the train between Newcastle and Loggieville.

Mr. LOGGIE: I said it took three hours on this occasion, but in the regular way it takes an hour and a half. The train is due at Newcastle from Fredericton at 11.30, and according to the time table it is due at Chatham at 12.55. In other words, it takes an hour and twenty-five minutes to go a distance which is five miles in a straight line and 13 miles by the railway.

Mr. REID: With regard to the inquiry of the hon. member for Westmorland as to the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, the information that I have with reference to the expenditure of $129,600 is as follows:

Upon completion of the Prince Edward Island ferry terminals at Cape Tormentine, N.B., and Carleton Point, P.E.I., the bulk of the traffic between the Intercolonial railway and Prince Edward Island railway will be handled over the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway.

In order to handle this increased traffic and the larger locomotives which will be required for same it is necessary that the bridges be strengthened. It is, therefore, proposed to re-

place five of them with pile trestles and three with wooden stringers, and the bridge at Baie Verte with steel spans on concrete piers and abutments, which is estimated to cost $56,500.

It is also necessary to replace old 56 pound rail with 80 pound branch line rail at an estimated cost of $69,000. Ballast is also required at points which are not now ballasted, at a cost of $3,100.

In order properly to operate this additional traffic it is necessary to have a telegraph line, estimated to cost $1,000. The total amount required for 1916-17 is $129,600.

Mr. LOGGIE: I hope the minister will promise that some change will be made to remedy the serious state of affairs to which I have called his attention.

Mr. REID: I will take this matter up with the minister and with the management with a view to seeing if the grievance stated by the hon member is one that would justify a change in the present train service, whether anything can be done to remedy the conditions.

Mr. COPP: I want to say a word or two with reference to the unsatisfactory train arrangements to which the member for Northumberland has called attention, and to the carrying on of the Intercolonial business in the Maritime provinces at the present time. A few evenings ago the member for Northumberland drew attention to the way his county had been used in the matter of railway accommodation. At the mere whim or fancy of the general manager of the Intercolonial railway, the railway accommodation which these people had enjoyed for upwards of 30 years was taken from them; the railway was torn up and the people left without proper railway accommodation. The efforts of the acting minister to-night have been in the nature of his acting as apologist for the Minister of Railways and the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway, and in that respect I sympathize with him very much indeed. The acting minister told the hon. member for Northumberland that these 15 or 20 miles of railway had been torn up and taken away because upon examination and investigation it was found that that portion of the Intercolonial did not pay. That is a very poor excuse indeed. If that same argument were used in reference to other portions of the Intercolonial railway or in reference to other railways throughout Canada, many miles of railway would be dismantled and torn up, and the people would be deprived of proper railway accommodation. During the last fiscal year there was a deficit on the portion of the National Transcontinental Railway that the Government has been operating of $86,313.70, aside from the consideration that in the operation of the road by the Government certain equipment, cars, and engines of the Intercolonial railway were used. Although my hon. friend says that it is all right to subject the country to the loss of $86,000 in connection with the operation of that part of the Transcontinental Railway, it was entirely irregular and out of reason that the railway in the county of Northumberland, proving not to be profitable, should continue in operation. It must be torn up because, forsooth, it did not pay a proper dividend upon the investment made by the Government in that portion of the railway. If we take the St. John and Quebec railway, which the Government have been operating during the past year, we find that in the operation of that road also there was a deficit of $5,955. Yet my hon. friend to-day asked this House to pass a resolution in favour of giving more aid to that railway, although he has torn up the road in the county of Northumberland, which my hon. friend has the honour to represent. The same thing is true with regard to the International Railway, which has recently been purchased by the Government as a feeder of the Intercolonial. In connection with its operation last year there was a deficit of $1,237. According to the argument of my hon. friend the acting minister, instead of purchasing the International Railway they should have stopped operation, torn up the tracks and junked the whole road. The Government paid $270,000 for the road that I have just inquired about, the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway. They immediately expended upon it about $25,000, and in the estimates that were passed the oither day a further amount of $129,000 was provided for this same road. During 8 months of last year there was a deficit in the operation of this road of $18,522.72. Under these circumstances I do not think that the minister has made a satisfactory answer to the complaint of the member for Northumberland with regard to the dismantling of the road in his constituency. When that road was torn up the people of the locality were promised that bridges would be built across the river so that the farmers would be able to get some railway accommodation by getting access to the railway on the other side of said river.

Yet this Government, in spite of the fact that the manager of the Intercolonial went there and destroyed that railway, has never given the slightest evidence of trying to

carry out the promise made in regard to building bridges across the river to give those people who have suffered the loss of accommodation some compensation. I sincerely trust that the Acting Minister of Railways will try to impress upon the Minister of Railways, the desirability of trying to persuade the general manager to do something for the benefit of that locality.

I wish to refer for a few moments to the general operation of the Intercolonial railway. My hon. friend the acting minister said to-night that it was because of a heavy snowstorm in March that the trains were late and that our friends from the county of Northumberland had the experience which has been related. I regret very much that the acting minister has not had an opportunity of visiting the Maritime Provinces and of looking into the railway situation there, for, let me tell him, and I am sure that every hon. member from the Maritime Provinces, whether he supports this Government or sits on this side of the House, will agree with me, that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in regard to the operation of the Intercolonial railway in the Maritime Provinces. There are several reasons for that dissatisfaction. During the past few years, and I am bound to say that the complaints have not been confined to the period during which the present Government has held office, the head of the Department of Railways has endeavoured to unload a certain amount of responsibility for the operation of the Intercolonial railway on the general manager or on the board of management. I do not propose to-night to go into any lengthy argument as to what claims the Maritime Provinces can well make in regard to the operation of that railway. That has been threshed out in this House many times, and on every public platform in the Maritime Provinces, but I do say that the Minister of Railways, I care not to what Government he belongs, cannot rid himself of the responsibility for the operation of the Intercolonial railway. You may import general managers from where you like, or you may have boards of management, or what you will, but the responsibility for the operation of that road still rests upon the Government represented by the Minister of Railways. The present management of the Intercolonial is most unsatisfactory in many respects. I would suggest to the Acting Minister of Railways, if he intends to remain in charge of that department for some time, to go down to the Maritime Provinces, not on a flying trip and not with the view of letting the papers say how quickly the trains can rush along, but on a visit that will enable him to personally look into the railway situation and realize, as I believe he would realize, the most unsatisfactory condition which prevails in regard to the operation of that railway. I do not believe that it was ever the intention or the expectation of any Government that the Intercolonial railway should yield a surplus to be paid into the consolidated revenues of this country. It is all very well for the minister to tell us that last year it produced a surplus of $2,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. REID: I said that there was a surplus, but I want to add this: The hon. member understands that if at any time the Intercolonial railway had a surplus, not only during the regime of the present Government, but throughout the 16 years when the Liberal party were in power, it went back to the Intercolonial railway; it never went into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. There was never a dollar of profit from the Intercolonial railway that went into Consolidated revenue. If there was a surplus, the Intercolonial got the benefit of it.

Mr. COPP: I quite understand that. I was going to say that it is very easy to show a surplus or a deficit in connection with the Intercolonial railway or any other public institution; it is merely a matter of bookkeeping. But if there was a surplus, no credit is due to the Government, or to the general manager, or to the officials of that road, because the surplus comes from the pockets of the people who pay the freight charges. The freight rates on the Intercolonial railway have increased very materially during the past few years. I cannot say exactly what the percentage of increase has been, but the rates have been increased from time to time, and that increase is the result of the expensive management of that railway. We all know in the Maritime Provinces, as every member of this House knows, the late manager of the Intercolonial railway, Mr. Pottinger. He was general manager for many years, and, if my memory serves me rightly, he never received more than $7,000 a year. I grant that for a time the railway did not go so far as Montreal, but, for some years after the railway was extended to Montreal, that gentleman managed the Intercolonial railway at a salary of $7,000 a year, and every-

body seemed perfectly satisfied. Eventually a change was made, and the railway was placed under the control of a Board of Management, Mr. Pottinger being one of the members of that board; and after the change of Government the board was dissolved, and Mr. Gutelius was appointed manager at a salary of $20,000 a year. I do not know whether the report is true that his salary has been increased to $25,000, but I do know that he was paid $20,000 a year after his appointment. I know also that he has brought to the Intercolonial railway a very large number of high-salaried officials from other railways. Under those conditions, it seems to me that the people of the Maritime Provinces have some reason to find fault, or, at least, to bring to the attention of the Minister of Railways the condition of affairs in regard to the operation of the Intercolonial railway. I do not propose to take up the time of the committee in discussing the question of whether the appointment of Mr. Gutelius was made in consideration of the services which he rendered to this Government in connection with the investigation of the Transcotinental railway, but I desire to draw the attention of the minister, and particularly the attention of the members from the Maritime Provinces to the fact, which is without question, that the present manager of the Intercolonial railways has adopted a policy of bringing from other railways men with whom, I suppose, he had been associated for some years in the operation of other railways, and placing them in responsible positions on the Intercolonial railway.

I maintain—and I want to put it in the strongest manner possible—that these positions should go to those who are trained on the Intercolonial railway and who are just as capable, just as willing and would make just as good a record for the Intercolonial as importations brought from the outside by the present manager. I do not propose to take up the time of the committee in discussing the Transcontinental railway as that matter will come up upon another vote. My hon. friend claims that the traffic on the Intercolonial last winter was very heavy and that is put forward as an excuse for the failure of the Intercolonial to carry the freight which was offered to it at Montreal and other points. The principal reason for this failure to handle the traffic, it seems to me, was due to the fact that upon undertaking the operation of the Transcontinental railway from Moncton west, the minister took the rolling stock and equipment from the Intercolonial and placed it upon the Transcontinental railway thus sacrificing the interests of the people of the Maritime Provinces. The freight that should have gone over the Intercolonial day after day and week after week was held up for weeks and months—I know that it was held up for over a month at least—and business men, manufacturers and people generally in the Maritime Provinces were unable to get their shipments of merchandise and other articles through to the great detriment of the business interests of the Maritime Provinces. While the department were serving the people in the western section of the country, the people of the Maritime Provinces were suffering because this rolling stock was being used for the purposes of the Transcontinental railway. I desire to show the conditions that existed in the Maritime Provinces as a result of freight being held up at different points. I have in my hand a letter written by a very prominent manufacturer in Amherst. He is not a political friend of mine, but I know him very well and I know my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) would realize that a letter from him would mean a great deal and should have consideration. I do not propose to read the whole or it, but the writer says:

> The following letter by Mr. William Knight in regard to the continual bungling and inefficiency which is characterizing the management of the Canadian Government railways appeared in a recent issue of the Moncton Transcript. It will be of special interest in Amherst not only because Mr. Knight is a prominent citizen of the town but also because he points out some of the harm which is being done Amherst industries and people by the bungling. The letter is as follows:
>
> We hear a great deal these days about loyalty to the Empire as well as to Canadian institutions. This condition is very laudable. In fact, any other stand by the individual is quite inexcusable. But I have been wondering why this spirit of loyalty does not equally apply as well to Canadian Government railways and their management.
>
> It is understood that munitions and allied freight have the right of way, which, of course, is quite correct. But is no attention to be paid to commercial freight at all? Is no effort to be made to relieve the apparent congestion? Or are Canadian industries to be allowed to go to the dogs?
>
> The Amherst Foundry Company is now closed down for lack of coke supply. A car of coke for this industry crossed the line into Canada on February 16th. Since that date nothing has been heard from it. I have tried every conceivable means to get information as to where this car has been side-tracked and why, and when we may expect to receive it in Amherst, but no information is forthcoming. Evidently

the railway management does not consider Canadian industries worth its notice, let alone the ordinary courteous treatment due to a business inquiry. Other industries are in somewhat the same condition, I understand, through similar causes.

That is a portion of a letter written by a gentleman in Amherst, and making complaint as to the condition of affairs on the Intercolonial railway because freight was being held up. The acting minister may make the same answer that he gave to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie), and say that it was a hard winter. But this appeared on February 16, and at that time the weather conditions were not unfavourable to getting freight through. But when you come to realize that seventy-five engines were taken off the Intercolonial railway and placed upon the Transcontinental you will readily understand why freight became congested and was held up at junction points along the line of the Intercolonial. What was true in Amherst was true in Moncton. I was in Moncton during the Easter holidays, and I was talking to a very prominent business man there, a builder and contractor, who told me that his business was entirely held up because some lumber that he was bringing from British Columbia was delayed at Montreal. He had to discharge his hands, and the work was shut down waiting for this freight to be brought forward. These are matters that should occupy the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways and the Government in the interest of that portion of the country which is served by the Intercolonial. I do not know whether the same complaints have come to other hon. members of this House; I have not only had personal complaints, but I have had numbers of letters, and I have seen complaints in the newspapers published in that portion of the country in regard to this matter. I contend, as a representative from the Maritime Provinces, that the Intercolonial to-day, as it has been ever since the present general manager has had charge of it, is run more in the interest of the Canadian Pacific than in the interest of the Government or people of Canada, or the patrons of the road. They have changed the methods and management of the road to conform to the system of operation of the Canadian Pacific. They have adopted the standard rules, as the Canadian Pacific have, and they have changed the system in dining car service, as was sworn to before a committee of this House of which I have the honour to be a member. The superintendent of the dining car service, when put on the stand recently, stated that they had changed the system of the dining car service so that it would be conducted in the same way that other railways conducted their dining car service. What is true of that is true of nearly everything in connection with the road. They have increased the freight rates to compare with those of the Canadian Pacific. The Intercolonial railway was built particularly in the interests of the people of the Maritime Provinces at the time of Confederation. When I say that I do not mean to argue that freight should be carried free. The Intercolonial should be operated so as to maintain, as nearly as possible, an equilibrium between expenditure and revenue. I believe, and so do a great majority of the people in the Maritime Provinces, that at the present time the Intercolonial is being operated just to suit the convenience of the Canadian Pacific railway, and practically at their dictation.

Another matter to which I wish to refer is the wages paid to the ordinary labourer on the Government railway system. Speaking on this point in the House the other day, the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne said:

> Mr. F. B. McCurdy (Shelburne and Queens): Drew attention of the Minister of Railways to a matter affecting a large number of employees on the Intercolonial railway. I understand that the scale of pay allowed to trackmen, ash-pit men, and that class of labour, has been $1.60 per day. In these days of much travel, when the railway is busy, and also in view of the conditions which prevail in the outside labour market, I would ask the Acting Minister of Railways if he cannot see his way clear to make a revision upward of that scale of pay?
>
> Hon. J. D. Reid (Acting Minister of Railways): With reference to the question of labour on the Intercolonial and rates of pay, I may say that this matter was taken up by the Minister of Railways and Canals with the general manager as far back as February last, and my information is that last month the wages of trackmen were increased to $1.75 a day, on country sections, and to $1.85 a day in cities. It has also been decided, commencing on the 1st of April last, to pay the coal shovellers, ash-pit men, etc., referred to by my hon. friend, at the rate of $1.70 per day. These advances have been made voluntarily by the minister and the general manager.

I suppose the minister thought that he was acting very magnanimously when he increased the wages of the ashpit men and common labourers from $1.60 to $1.70 a day, and the men on the country sections from $1.60 to $1.75 and the men in the city sections from $1.60 to $1.85 a day! Let us see whether this is a

fair rate of wages to be paid to the ordinary labourer in this country.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member quoted the minister as saying that a voluntary increase had been made in the men's wages. Have any requests come from the men themselves for an increase of pay?

Mr. COPP: I could not say whether there has been any special request, but we all know there have been any number of requests through their unions.

Mr. MORPHY: I understood this increase was a voluntary one on the part of the minister.

Mr. COPP: I was reading from the minister's speech. I am not one to find fault with the salaries that are paid Government officials, unless they are very very extravagant, such as the salary paid to the General Manager of the Intercolonial and some of his officers—$12,000 for instance, to one man, and $10,000 to another. I am not going to find fault with the salaries that are paid the men in the offices at Moncton. But I do wish to draw the attention of the Government to the wage the ordinary labourer on the Intercolonial railway is being paid. I maintain that he is not being paid a wage sufficient to enable him and his family to live decently and honestly in the city of Moncton or any other city in the Maritime Provinces. It is all very well to say that the man on the farm gets only $1.50 or $1.75 a day, but it must be remembered that the great majority of that class of labour own a small house, and have a few acres of land, a cow, and a few hens. They raise some of their own meat, and with all these advantages can live decently on that wage. But a man with a family, living in the city of Moncton, or any other city, who has to pay rent and taxes, educate his family, and meet the hundred and one demands that are made upon him, will any hon. gentleman say that a man can do this on $1.75 a day? I have read some parts of the report made by the Cost of Living Commission, laid upon the table of the House early in the session. Among other interesting things in that report, which was made by a commission appointed by this Government, I find a table compiled, no doubt, from evidence adduced before the commission, which gives the average cost of living for a period of five years. The commission estimated that in the year 1913 it would cost a man $9.63 a week to keep himself and a family of five; that is, I suppose, living like an ordinary, decent man should live.

Mr. MORPHY: What is the heading of that table?

Mr. COPP: I just copied out the details, but I can let my hon. friend know to-morrow. According to this table it will cost a man with a family of five a little over $500 a year to live. Now, if the $1.70 per day man, whose wages the minister has so magnanimously raised from $1.60 to $1.70, works 300 days a year—if he works every working day in the year, he can only earn $530. The $500 that the commission estimates it would cost him to keep himself and his family does not allow one cent for rent, for clothing, for education, for church and charitable purposes, or for medical attendance and things of that kind. He earns, then, $530 at the outside, and his bare living expenses, according to this table, amount to a little over $500. I have no doubt there may be some errors here and there; I do not know the gentleman who made up the statement, but if it is worth anything, it must mean that this man is going to be some two or three or four hundred dollars behind at the end of the year if he lives as an ordinary, decent, intelligent man should live. Under those conditions, if the minister is not in a position to do so himself, he should have someone work out a reasonable table and evolve a minimum wage for the ordinary labourer which will enable him to make a decent living. In the city of Moncton the working man who goes down into the ashpit in the early morning and works there for ten hours gets $1.70 a day, whereas the general manager of the Intercolonial gets his $20,000 a year with free house rent and everything else in connection with it absolutely free. Compare the condition of that labourer's child with the condition of Mr. Gutelius' child. I am not so unreasonable as to say that the general manager of the Intercolonial should not receive a larger salary than the ordinary labourer who does the inferior work on that railway, but the latter should be placed in such a position that his child can go to school decently clad and mingle with the children of the other officials of the Intercolonial or other citizens. I make that claim, whether it be right or wrong, on behalf of the labouring men on the Intercolonial. As long as I have an opportunity to raise my voice in defence of the ordinary people of this country, I will say that this matter should be taken up by this Govern-

ment in order to see that a reasonably fair deal is meted out to them. I do not propose to labour that question further; I simply want to bring it to the attention of the acting Minister of Railways. If the Government cannot see their way clear to increase the wage of the common labourer, then they should cut off something from the salary of the high officials and add it to the wages of those who are receiving a mere pittance and doing the hard part of the work.

I also want to call attention to a matter which is working havoc and causing loss to the Intercolonial, that is, the policy that has been followed by the Intercolonial of withdrawing the Ocean Limited train during the winter months. My hon. friend may say that it does not pay to run the Ocean Limited from Halifax to Montreal during the winter months. I do not see how you can figure out whether the running of a certain train pays or does not pay. An engineer who understands the working of a railway and the running of trains may be able to say what it costs per mile to operate a certain train from Halifax to Montreal. Many business men, however, might make up their accounts at the end of a week or at the end of a month and find that they had not made any money, but is that any reason why they should go out of business? They should rather put more energy into their business and make the next week or month make up for what they have lost, and pay a good dividend. The Ocean Limited has been running for the past few years and is looked upon practically as a tourist train and as a great advertisement for the Maritime Provinces. The Matapedia Valley is considered to be one of the most beautiful spots in the whole Dominion, and coming through there on the train at daylight the passengers have an opportunity of seeing that section of country that we all admire, and we feel that the operating of that train has been of great service. The Canadian Pacific and the Ocean Limited come from Halifax to Moncton as one train; at Moncton one section known as the Ocean Limited goes on over the Intercolonial to Montreal; the other section known as the Canadian Pacific goes on down to St. John and then through the state of Maine and on to Montreal. Just as soon as passenger traffic commences to drop off in the winter, the Ocean Limited is taken off and the whole traffic handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway. What is the result? We are all creatures of habit. It is as natural for us to travel always over a certain road as it is for us to eat. If one acquires the habit of going to a certain hotel, it is the most natural thing in the world to continue going to that hotel. How then can the manager of the Intercolonial railway or the Minister of Railways, who is head of the department and who has charge of the operation of that road, expect to build up a traffic for the Ocean Limited over the Intercolonial railway, when every few months of the year that train is taken off and that traffic is handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway? The people living along the Intercolonial are absolutely dependent upon the Maritime Express and those of us who go down to the Maritime Provinces know that it is a miracle if she is not from two to five hours late in the winter season. I think I am voicing the sentiments of every member in the Maritime Provinces when I say that when we go down there in the winter season we travel by the Canadian Pacific and pay the fare of $6 through the state of Maine rather than go by the Maritime Express, and what is true of ourselves is true of the travelling public; they will not travel by the Maritime Express unless they are compelled to and want to get up into the northern part of New Brunswick. We are advertising extensively and endeavouring to make the Intercolonial part of a great system, and when we realise that the Government have of their own volition taken over the Transcotinental railway and are going to make that a part of the Government system, it is a sin and a shame—I was going to say it was a disgrace—that they are operating the Intercolonial railway as a branch line, as an adjunct of the Canadian Pacific railway. I ask the minister to consider whether or not in future that cannot be changed and a better system evolved by which the people of the Maritime Provinces will receive better treatment and will have the Ocean Limited running throughout the whole year. If they lost a little money this year, that is no reason why the train should be withdrawn and, on the plea that there is only room for one, hand over the whole traffic to one, that one being the Canadian Pacific.

I have spoken in no fault-finding spirit. From the newspaper reports, not only in Liberal but in Conservative journals, the hon. gentleman will find that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction. I trust that if the acting minister continues at the head of the department, I, as one member from the Maritime Provinces, extend to him the strongest invitation to come down to the Maritime Provinces and see for himself the operation of the Intercolonial. Let him

come and stay a few weeks. One cannot get a grasp of the management of the Intercolonial by rushing over as ministers of railways usually do. If we are to have an Ontario man for all time as Minister of Railways, he should come to the Maritime Provinces and get some insight into affairs, some knowledge of that portion of the country. Then the people who are served by the Intercolonial may hope to have a fairer deal than they have been given under the present general manager, who has been brought from another competitive railway and put at the head of the Intercolonial, and who is operating the system to the great dissatisfaction of the people of the Maritime Provinces and in a way that I believe must redound to the discredit of the present Administration and to the minister in charge of the department.

Mr. MORPHY: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp). I regret that there are only four of his colleagues on that side of the House who have thought it worth while to be present to listen to his statements. For he has made a very strong impression upon my mind. We at the other end of the country have been taught that the Government, in the Intercolonial, was a spendthrift, throwing away the people's money in useless and extravagant works—branch lines and others. The hon. gentleman has paid to the Government, not designedly, I think, a compliment in accusing them of stinginess in dealing with this road. It is pleasant to me to be disillusioned. I myself had begun to think, from the charges which had been made, that the Government were frittering away the public money on this road. But the hon. gentleman has absolutely convinced me that such a suggestion has no foundation and that, if anything, the Government have been too stingy in running the road and in affording the accommodation which the hon. gentleman thinks the people should have. It settles my doubts on the question when I was inclined to think the other way.

Mr. GRAHAM: But I do not recall that the hon. member for North Perth (Mr Morphy) made any such charge against the Government.

Mr. MORPHY: I say I was in doubt, in fearful doubt. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Copp) has dispelled my doubts. I congratulate the Government on their careful, prudent, economical administration of the road.

Mr. COPP: Does that refer to the wages?

Mr. MORPHY: I am coming to that. I was with the hon. gentleman; I thought he made a very good point there. I understand that under the wise administration of this Government a surplus is at last in sight on this great railroad instead of the usual deficit. I do not think it is altogether fair for the Government to claim that surplus if it was gained at the expense of the working-man. I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman. In these times when everything a man has to use in daily life is higher in price, and especially now that the road is on a better basis through the unfortunate circumstance of the war, resulting in increased traffic, it might be a time for the Government to repeat its generosity to the men. I am not saying that they have been too generous. I think the Government are to be commended inasmuch as they made that advance to the men, apparently, without any request being made for it. That, it seems to me, shows an advance in sentiment on this subject for which the Government is to be commended instead of condemned. If the road through the connections made, and also through the fact of these seventy-five engines having been taken to swell the traffic of the road which otherwise would not have been received, these matters should be considered. I do not think the hon. gentleman made a strong point when he instanced the case of one car of lumber—a purely isolated case. Perhaps the man did not give the right address and the car is now lying in Toronto.

Mr. COPP: It may be collared. They will be lucky if they get it out of Ontario.

Mr. MORPHY: I have heard it said that when a man goes around declaring that he is extremely honest, it is better to watch him. I do not think the reflection comes with good grace from my hon. friend when he assumes that a car going into Ontario will be "collared." I believe that the people of Ontario are as honest, or nearly so, as those of other parts of the country. As to this question of running the train, I am not in a position to discuss it, but I thought the hon. gentleman's argument weak. The Government cut the train off because past experience showed that it did not pay, and to cut off the train meant to save money for the people. And the hon.

gentleman had the Canadian Pacific railway to fall back upon, so he did not suffer anything.

Mr. REID: He had to pay $6 extra.

Mr. MORPHY: Members of Parliament, so far as that is concerned, may well be asked to make a little sacrifice for the country. The Government might consider the personal loss to the hon. gentleman, but that question and the question of the labouring men are the only points on which I could agree with him.

Mr. COPP: It is hardly fair for the hon. gentleman to say that I referred to the case for any personal reason. I used it only for an illustration.

Mr. MORPHY: I had no intention of using that argument.

Mr. COPP: I did not think any hon. member would take that view of it.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.39 p.m.

Thursday, May 4, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

VACANCIES.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received communications notifying me that the following vacancies have occurred in the representations, viz.:

Of Edward Arthur Lancaster, Esq., member for the Electoral District of Lincoln, by decease; and

Of James Reid, Esq., member for Electoral District of Restigouche, by decease.

I have accordingly issued my Warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new Writs of Election for the said Electoral Districts respectively.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 99, to amend the Exchequer Court Act. He said: The purpose of the Bill is simply to extend the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court so as to enable it to determine questions purely and simply of value. In the past there have been instances where the situation that arose was either that some party or parties put before the Government or some department of the Government a claim with regard to which there could be no room for debate or discussion as to the existence of the claim, but which was of such a nature that the quantum to be paid could not be agreed upon and was not easy of determination, or that it having been deemed proper that certain property or properties belonging to the Crown should be disposed of by sale or lease or otherwise, the parties concerned and the department concerned were not able to determine what would be the precise value. The purpose of the Bill is to add a clause to the Exchequer Court Act enumerating the matters with regard to which that Court shall have jurisdiction and to add a clause giving it jurisdiction for the purpose of determining the value in cases such as I have referred to. The present difficulty is that in such cases there is no case proper that comes under any of the cases enumerated in the existing section.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SHELL CONTRACTS.

ROYAL COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, I desire to move the adjournment of the House, and before doing so, I want to state that I have given you very short notice. I have given the leader of the Government no notice at all, and I realize that I am perhaps trespassing upon the good nature of the House in taking this course, but my reasons are as follows: A matter occurred this afternoon at the sitting of the Royal Commission when Mr. Johnston was prohibited from cross-examining witnesses on the ground that the scope of the commission was not broad enough to permit of his doing so. I wish here in the most emphatic manner to state that I do not wish to be considered as casting any reflections whatever upon the decision of the commissioners. I simply want to state the facts as accurately as I can. Mr. Johnston rather persisted in the matter, and finally the commission made the statement that it might be advisable to apply to Parliament in order that further powers might be given to them. The only way that I could do so would be to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss the matter, and the discussion on that motion, as my hon. friends know, would

be a discussion only of the matter itself and, of course, would not decide what might take place in the future. I did not leave the rooms of the commission until ten minutes past one o'clock and I had no time whatever to see anybody. As the House met at two o'clock, I simply handed to Your Honour a very rough draft of my proposal and I had no opportunity of communicating the matter to my right hon. leader or to the Government side of the House.

Mr. ROGERS: I may say in general terms, that, of course, there would be no objection to the adjournment of the House being moved for the discussion of any question of public importance. My hon. friend presents a statement of what he claims to be the facts as presented at the commission about one o'clock——

Mr. CARVELL: Before noon.

Mr. ROGERS: —when Mr. Johnston was refused the right to cross-examine certain witnesses in connection with the investigation, but my hon. friend can quite understand that we have not all the facts before us. We have not the exact statement as made by the commissioners and the reasons given for their refusal, and I think my hon. friend should at least be satisfied to allow the matter to stand until to-morrow when we shall be pleased to facilitate any proposal he wishes to make with respect to the adjournment of the House for the discussion of the matter, as we shall then have a report before us.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I find on referring to the rules of the House that section 39, subsection 2, says:

Leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the House (when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance) must be asked after the ordinary daily routine of business (rule 25) has been concluded, and before notices of Motions or Orders of the Day are entered upon.

Therefore it will be a little later on in the proceedings of the House before the hon. member can ask for leave to move the adjournment.

Mr. CARVELL: The routine proceedings have been completed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have not yet come to the Orders of the Day. Subsections 3 and 4 of the rule are as follows:

(3) The member desiring to make such a motion rises in his place, asks leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and states the matter.

(4) He then hands a written statement of the matter proposed to be discussed to the Speaker, who, if he thinks it in order, reads it out and asks whether the member has the leave of the House. If objection is taken the Speaker requests those members who support the motion to rise in their places, and, if more than twenty members rise accordingly, the Speaker calls upon the member who has asked for leave.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not wish to ask you to make a ruling at all—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. (Reading): "The hon. member for Carleton desires the leave of the House to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the enlargement of the scope of the Meredith-Duff inquiry." I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the Royal Commission.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. That was written in a great hurry.

Mr. ROGERS: I can only repeat what I said a moment ago, that, in view of the fact that the House would not be in possession of the facts of the case and the actual statements made by the commission giving their reasons for the refusal, whatever they may have been, I think my hon. friend from Carleton will appreciate that he should not press the motion until to-morrow, when, I assure him, everything will be done to facilitate the bringing of it before the House with a view to having the discussion he desires.

Mr. CARVELL: Of course I could not refuse the request of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, put in such a pleasant tone as he has put it to me; but I would like to impress upon the House the importance of having this matter decided very early. We can quite see that the whole investigation, or at least a very large part of the conduct of the investigation is held up, pending the decision of that question. For instance, the witness under cross-examination was Sir Alexander Bertram, whose examination was delayed or postponed until this matter should be decided. The same question will arise, I think I am safe in saying, in the case of two-thirds or three-quarters of the witnesses that may be called. Therefore, if it is to be decided at all, it must be decided quickly. However, if the minister thinks it cannot be discussed to-day, I want to be reasonable, and I comply with his request. I would make this suggestion, however, that possibly an arrangement might be made by which it could be discussed after eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the hon. member a question? Does he intimate to the House that the commission themselves expressed the desire that their powers should be enlarged?

Mr. CARVELL: I would not go that far. The commission made the suggestion that the application be made to Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of their own motion they counselled that application be made to Parliament?

Mr. CARVELL: The commission themselves made the suggestion of their own motion that if—I want to use the words as nearly as I can,—if Mr. Johnston desired to go into these matters it would be proper to apply to Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is very different.

Mr. CARVELL: I want to tell the hon. gentleman that I am not trying to deceive the House, and I do not think it necessary to have any nasty insinuations thrown across the floor. We may as well understand that from the beginning.

Mr. ROGERS: In view of the fact that provision has been made for the printing of the evidence taken by the commission day by day, I think we should not go on with this matter until to-morrow. We shall then have the printed evidence and hon. members will then have before them the exact statement of the commission, and there will be no question between this side of the House and hon. gentlemen opposite as to the facts. I do not think it would be in the interests of the recommendation made by my hon. friend to undertake the discussion to-day.

Mr. CARVELL: Do I understand from the minister that to-morrow the matter can be discussed?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. CARVELL: That is quite satisfactory.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

WAR SUPPLIES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES:

1. From whom is the Government purchasing supplies for the troops located at Charlottetown, Summerside and Souris, P.E.I.?

2. From how many persons or firms did the Government receive offers for these supplies?

3. What prices is the Government paying for the supplies they are purchasing at each of the above mentioned places?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. From the following firms: DeBlois Bros., Dominion Canners Ltd., Estate C. D. Rankin, Grady, John, Great London and China Tea Co., Holman Ltd., R. T., Holman Ltd., F. J. Hughes & Co., Ltd., J. J., Kelly, Wilfrid, Kinkletter, F. M. Matthew & McLean, McDonald, Augustus, Pickard & Co., A., Prince Edward Island Hay & Produce Co., Saunders, Newsome & Co., Smith & Co., E. D., Sterns Bros., Stewart, D., Strong & Co., F. W., Wetzells Ltd., Wood Harry J., and Lidstone, W. J.

2. Twenty-eight tenders received; 61 firms were invited to tender.

3.

	Charlottetown.	Summerside.	Souris.
	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.
Jam	8½ lb.	9½ lb.	75 pail, compound 1 10 pail, pure
Marmalade	7½ lb.		
Meat	15 lb.	14½ lb.	14 lb.
Hay	17 00 ton		
Straw	9 00 ton		
Oats	70 bush.		
Bacon, breakfast	23 lb.	25½ lb.	26 lb.
Bacon, green		24 lb.	20 lb.
Potatoes	70 bush.	75 bush.	75 bush.
Beans	7½ lb.	7½ lb.	8 lb.
Dried prunes	17 lb.	12 lb.	
Milk		8 qt.	
Milk powder			16 lb.
Creamery butter	32 lb.	35 lb.	32 lb.
Dairy butter		30c. & 32 lb.	
Cheese	18 lb.	19 lb.	20 lb.
Split pease	7 lb.	8 lb.	8 lb.
Sugar	7½ lb.	7½ lb.	7½ lb.
Salt	2 lb.	1¼ lb.	1½ lb.
Rice	6½ lb.	5 lb.	
Rolled oats	4½ lb.	4 lb.	
Pepper	30 lb.	32 lb.	28 lb.
Fresh vegetables	½ lb.	1¾ lb.	1 lb.
Lard		17 lb.	
Yeast		5 box	
Flour	3 75 bag	6 50 bbl.	
Bread	4½ lb.	4½ lb.	5 lb.
Fuel wood, hard	3 00 cord	4 25 & 5 00 cord	
Fuel wood, soft	2 75 cord		
Coal, anthracite	8 00 ton		
Coal, steam	5 75 ton		
Coal, run of mine	5 25 ton		
Tea	27 lb.	27 lb.	27 lb.
Coffee	23⅜ lb.	23⅜ lb.	23⅜ lb.
Izal	65 gal.		
Chloride of lime	5 lb.		
Coal oil	21 gal		
Straw for men's bedding		9 00 ton	6 00 ton

As regards prices for groceries, the contractors have lately refused to carry on contracts except at advanced prices. New prices were asked with the result that the lowest prices are now as follows:

	Charlottetown.	Summerside.	Souris.
	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.
Bacon, breakfast	25 lb.	26 lb.	26 lb.
Bacon, green.		24 lb.	
Bacon, rolled		20 lb.	
Lard		17 lb.	
Butter, creamery	36 lb.	35 lb.	35 lb.
dairy	33 lb.		
Fresh vegetables	1½ lb.	1½ lb.	
Beans	8 lb.	8 lb.	8 lb.
Potatoes	2 lb.	15/12 lb.	1⅛ lb.
Currants		12½ lb.	
Flour			
Pepper	32 lb.	28 lb.	30 lb.
Prunes		11 lb.	
Rice		5½ lb.	
Cheese	21 lb.	19 lb.	19½ lb.
Rolled oats		3½ lb.	
Sago		8 lb.	
Salt	2 lb.	1 lb.	1½ lb.
Sugar	7¾ lb.	8 lb.	9 lb.
Tapioca		8 lb.	
Split peas	8 lb.	7 lb.	7½ lb.
Baking powder		25 lb.	
Macaroni		12½ lb.	
Raisins		12 lb.	
Yeast		5 lb.	
Canned tomatoes		2 40 case	
Canned corn		2 20 case	
Canned peas		2 20 case	

STATUS OF ENLISTED INDIANS.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM:

Have Indians, 21 years of age and British British subjects, who enlist as soldiers in the present war, the right to vote at a Dominion election held during the war?

Mr. DOHERTY: It has not been the practice to answer questions of law. Section 1, however of An Act to enable Canadian Soldiers on Active Military Service during the present war to exercise their electoral franchise, provides:

1. Every male British subject of twenty-one years of age or upwards serving in the military forces of Canada in the present war (hereinafter called volunteer), who, within six months immediately preceding the date when he was appointed to or enlisted in such forces, had been resident in any electoral district in Canada for a period of not less than thirty days, shall be entitled to vote in the electoral district in which he was last so resident in the manner hereinafter set out, notwithstanding his absence from such electoral district or from Canada: Provided that if any person was, at the time he was so appointed or enlisted, qualified to vote in any other electoral district in Canada he shall vote in such other district only.

—and makes no exception of Indians.

WAR SUPPLIES AT WINDSOR, N.S.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. From whom is the department purchasing supplies for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces located at Windsor, Nova Scotia?

2. Were tenders asked for the same? If so, in what manner were they published or made public, and on or about what date?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. From the following: Dominion Canners, Ltd., T. Upton Co., Ltd., Walter F. Card, Geo. W. DeWolf, Wentworth Stores, Wentzells, Ltd., Great London & China Tea Co., Wm. Neilson, Ltd., and Canadian Milk Products Co.

2. Yes; tenders for meat were invited by circular letter, dated December 15, 1915, from 6 firms; 2 tenders were received. Also for jam from 15 firms; 6 tenders received. On December 30, the G.O.C., M.D. No. 6, was directed to obtain tenders for bread and groceries. On January 6 he forwarded 7 tenders for bread, groceries and straw. On March 2, 1916, tenders for tea and coffee were invited by circular letter from 18 firms; 8 tenders received. On March 22, 1916, tenders for bacon, lard, butter and groceries were invited from 17 firms; 1 tender received.

FARNHAM EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Who has charge of the Government Experimental Farm at Farnham, Quebec?

2. What are the names of the persons employed by him upon the said farm since the first of January, 1914?

3. What salary has each of the said employees received?

4. What balance, if any, is due to the said employees for work and labour performed prior to January 1, 1916?

5. Why has said balance not yet been paid?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Mr. Omer Victor Chevalier.

2 and 3. Amounts paid from January 1, 1914, to March 31, 1916: H. Gariepy, $17.25; D. Marchesseault, $19.50; G. Archambault, $19.50; W. Gariepy, $36; G. Tetreault, $935.90; I. Clouatre, $863.90; L. Georges, $19.50; A. Savarais, $24; L. E. Lorquet, $1,662.50; Y. Lorquet, $17.50; L. Tetreault, $78.40; A. Fournier, $21.30; J. Morris, $1.50; Alphonse Benoit, $15.80; H. Messier, $45.60; V. Tetreault, $182.40; J. Forgues, $6.40; J. Thurston, $9.60; E. Perreault, $14.80; E. Brouillette, $150; J. Lamarche, $59.75; E. Blaine, $14.40; P. Lapierre, $70.35; A. Champagne, $42.60; C. Thurston, $107.44; A. Tetreault, $203.20; A. Dandelin, $30.40; B. Lamarche, $38.40; C. A. Rainville, $3; R. Portelance, $231.30; H. Ruelle, $15.19;

A. Messier, $8; D. Gariepy, $107.20; J. Fontaine, $14.40; N. Paquette, $26.50; M. Menard, $17.50; A. Maille, $9.60; J. Adam, $70; J. Messier, $1.89; A. Millette, $41.60; E. Milette, $27.20; O. Bessette, $39.55; G. Gladu, $43.20; A. Lapierre, $20.80; E. Cardinal, $19.20; E. Pepin, $21.40; A. Loiselle, $106.69; J. Copal, $37.50; A. Thibault, $37.50; W. Deslorier, $6; N. Lussier, $12; P. Butler, $9; H. Menard, $2; E. Fournier, $28; E. Martel, $21; P. Fontaine, $16.36; L. Menard, $40; E. Lepeltier, $185.10; C. Benoit, $81.28; J. Desroches, $25.60; J. Courtemarche, $30.40; H. Thurston, $58.88; H. Lamoureux, $27.20; P. Lemoire, $271.10; E. Aldridge, $28.80; E. Tetreault, $16.00; H. Clouatre, $38.08; L. Lorquet, $34.08; N. Nolin, $9.60; A. Bertrand, $11.68; D. Benjamin, $9.28; E. Gaboriault, $3.80; S. Ouellette, $1.70; H. Zaize, $3.33; H. Marchessoult, $2.05; G. Dubois, $3.53; O. Deveau, $3.95; J. Gendron, $1.27; O. Horbec, $1.29; L. Lacaille, 76 cents; A. Lapatrie, $2.20; A. Domay, 85 cents; W. Racicot, $1.39; W. Leduc, $1.19; O. Renaud, 9 cents; L. P. Comeau, $125.94; N. Lasnier, $2.81; E. Couillard, $1.62; J. Buttler, $1.70; C. Drouin, $3.12; E. Boulais, $1.72; O. Clouatre, $3.49; A. Seguin, $4.05; J. Marcier, $3.04; O. Lamoureux, $2.85; A. Benoit, $4.98; A. Jarly, $4.04; E. Bessette, $1.85; E. Desloriers, 85 cents; E. Ouellette, $2.09; J. Sirmond, 81 cents; R. Landry, $1.57; L. Lequin, 89 cents; H. Fontaine, $3.01; E. Arbec, $3.74; R. Gariepy, 42 cents; O. Leduc, $8.52; D. Gaudreau, $2.20; J. Simard, $1.13; C. Loisel, $2.87; V. Charron, $2.26; N. Leduc, $3.93; J. Murphy, $3.58; H. Forguet, $28.07; A. Archambault, $1.66; L. Cardinal, $3.81; W. Lapatrie, $4.13; E. Miller, $2.18; A. Blain, $1.77; O. Lepeltier, $12.38; H. Granger, $10.00; L. Drouin, $9.50; R. Monty, $10.00; H. Decelle, $10.00; W. Gendron, $2.50; L. Arpin, $20.00; L. Carr, $6.00; W. Benoit, $11.76; Chas. Russell, $26.25; H. Pelletier, $22.50; O. Dupont, $6.75; C. Wilby, $6.75; H. Leroux, $12.75; H. Vadon, $13.50; J. Chouinnard, $7.50; H. Robert, $20.00; J. Galipeau, $20.00; L. Demers, $7.00; L. Donseareau, $6.50; T. Quintin, $66.00; E. pere Wilby, $27.00; T. Wilby, $3.00; H. Dandurand, $89.00; E. Morasse, $53.68; P. Dupont, $3.00; O. Duquette, $22.50; W. Dome, $19.50; A. Cardinal, $37.00; A. Lapointe, $48.50; A. Roy, $20.25; J. N. Bessette, $55.42; L. Bessette, $5.65; T. Dubuc, $44.00; W. Dubuc, $35.10; H. Dupont, $8.25; P. Morasse, $15.00; P. Laflamme, $1.26; H. Brodeur, $8.34; L. Pelletier, $19.41; P. Fournier, $8.80; J. Fournier, $31.49; E. Michaud, $18.16; J. Lafrance, $12.75; A. Laflamme, $6.22; S. Dachaud, $5.32.

4. None.

5. Answered by No. 4.

MOSES MITCHELL.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Was Moses Mitchell appointed a valuator in reference to land expropriated by the Dominion Government for the Valley Railway at Fredericton, N.B.?

2. If so, what amount was paid by the Government to Mr. Mitchell for his services in this connection as a valuator or otherwise?

Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

J. J. BEHAN.

Mr. ROSS:

1. Is J. J. Behan, of Kingston, Ont., employed in any department of the Government? If so, in what capacity, and what is his salary?

2. How long has he been so employed?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

PAYMENTS TO A. C. ST. AMOUR.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. What is the salary paid to Mr. St. Amour, Superintendent of the Soulanges canal?

2. What additional sums, month by month, have been paid to him by the Government since his appointment?

Mr. REID:

1. $1,700 per annum.

2. Statement showing amounts paid monthly to A. C. St. Amour in addition to his salary from date of his appointment, 25th November, 1911, to 1st April, 1916:

Travelling expenses:

	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.	1916.
	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.
Jan...	.....	39.65	34.40	42.40	42.90	41.40
Feb...	.....	53.20	16.40	39.25	51.95	49.85
March	.....	53.20	41.80	43.30	60.80	59.25
April.	.....	68.45	40.15	50.75	49.25	.....
				22.76		
May..	.....	66.05	52.45	53.45	55.00	.....
June..	.....	93.20	49.05	60.05	65.25	.....
July..	.....	17.10	50.15	55.80	87.30	.....
					10.50	.....
Aug..	.....	86.00	50.80	93.50	62.70	.....
		4.50		6.00	26.50	
Sept..	.....	68.80	61.30	68.40	66.30	.....
					22.50	.....
Oct...	.....	61.30	51.60	75.10	46.30	.....
				12.03	41.00	
Nov..	.....	46.45	50.30	66.50	54.00	.....
					15.00	
Dec...	27.75	49.90	57.05	58.90	51.90	.....
					9.50	

Disbursements:

	1911.	1912.	1913.	1914.	1915.	1916.
	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.	$ c.
Jan...	.....	22.45	6.70	5.00	21.70	11.19
				2.00		
Feb...	.....	42.49	17.66	13.67	16.39	21.16
March	.....	51.24	9.50	18.18	57.20	46.06
April.	.....	21.43	26.57	8.97	37.41	.....
					33.41	
May..	.....	17.25	9.25	9.70	10.20	.....
June..	.....	14.40	10.99	12.55	7.80	.....
July..	.....	15.13	7.30	10.48	7.60	.....
Aug..	.....	29.20	5.00	10.55	5.25	.....
		13.00				
Sept..	.....	14.06	6.85	9.47	7.25	.....
					2.35	
Oct...	.....	17.45	8.75	6.00	6.25	.....
Nov..	.....	8.30	8.70	7.35	11.10	.....
					12.80	
Dec...	3.50	24.00	8.15	13.79	14.00	.....

Disbursements cover moneys advanced by the superintendent to meet express charges, cleaning of office, etc., for which he was reimbursed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY SITTINGS.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS: I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doherty, the motion standing in the name of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), as follows:

That on and after Saturday next, the sixth instant, and on Saturdays until the end of the present Session, the House shall meet at two o'clock in the afternoon; and the order of precedence on Saturdays shall be the same as on Thursdays.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would suggest to the hon. gentleman leading the Government, that he do not propose this motion to cover next Saturday. The reason is that a great many members, believing that this would be the last free Saturday they would have, have made arrangements to go home and fix up business to stay here through next week, at least until the session is concluded. In addition to that, there is a good deal of correspondence in connection with the two railway propositions which hon. members wish to digest, and for this they have no time but Saturday. I would suggest that the motion be changed to refer to a week from Saturday.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to ask the Government and the leader of the Opposition as well to give a little consideration to some of us who have been in the House continuously since the 12th of January. We never get an opportunity to go home, and I think it is rather unfair that the session should be prolonged and that continued absence from our business and our families should be forced upon us. I think there is a little consideration due to those members who are here all the time, and who do not go home for two or three days every week.

Mr. KYTE: I desire to register a very mild protest against the unnecessary prolonging of the session. We have been sitting here now for a good many months. I think it has been in the minds of many hon. members on both sides of the House that this motion would be moved to-day, or that it ought to be moved. I cannot conceive of any good excuse or reason which can be urged to prevent the House from expediting the business of the session so that we may arrive at the earliest prorogation possible.

Mr. ROGERS: In answer to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), I may say that this motion was proposed by reason of the fact that, as he can see, there is evidence on both sides of the House of a strong desire that the session should come to an end. The Government are doing everything possible to facilitate the work and to meet the wishes of the members on both sides of the House with the view of bringing the session to an end. I hope my hon. friend will see that the desire of hon. members on both sides of the House is respected to this extent and that we shall endeavour to get on with business on Saturday. If my hon. friend wishes the railway proposals to stand, we can take up other matters in connection with the Estimates, and clean up the work which is still left. By that means we should be able to close the session next week. If hon. gentlemen are well disposed to the carrying out of the business of the House, there is no reason at all, that I can see, why it should not be possible to prorogue in a week or ten days.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was not speaking for myself at all, but for several members who have spoken to me in regard to this very motion. While hon. members opposite are not saying anything, those who are opposed to it are saying something. With reference to the expedition of business, I say that there has never been a session during which I have been in this House in which the Estimates have gone through with so much expedition as they have this session. There can be no doubt about that. The minister will remember that there is one very important item of legislation which is constantly before the public and the press,

and which has not yet been brought down. We have begun to sit at two o'clock on week days, and now it is proposed to sit on Saturdays, and that piece of legislation is not yet before the House. I submit that even before we decided to meet at two o'clock the programme of the Government, as is customary, should have been laid before the House. Then we would have known what business was to be transacted. As it is, we do not know. A new Bill was brought down to-day by the Government, an amendment to the Exchequer Court Act. I do not think it is very serious, but to-morrow there may be half a dozen new Bills brought down.

Mr. STEVENS: The Prime Minister gave notice of that Bill three or four days ago.

Mr. GRAHAM: He mentioned in a discussion that there would be an Exchequer Court Bill, but that does not alter the effect of my statement. The Prime Minister may say to-morrow that a Bill will be brought down the next day. The Government ought to tell us what its programme is, and then we can sit mornings, nights, and Sundays, if necessary, if the Government want to get through. If it be true that the Government is keeping back an important piece of legislation till the last moment, I do not think it is fair to the House to rush the business through on Saturdays until they tell us their programme. It has always been done heretofore.

Mr. ROGERS: There may be some ground for my hon. friend's statement in respect to further legislation, and while I am anxious that this motion should be agreed to, as I trust it will be, my hon. friend can depend upon it that the Prime Minister will make a statement to-morrow of all the legislation that is to be brought before the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope we can depend on everybody being here on Saturday.

Mr. ROGERS: I hope so.

Mr. HUGHES: The members from the East and West have to be here.

Motion agreed to.

VACANT SEATS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHAS. MARCIL: May I ask the Minister of Public Works whether it is the intention of the Speaker to issue his writs for elections in the counties of Lincoln and Restigouche? Restigouche adjoins my constituency, and, as the people there have been disfranchised for several months, they are interested in knowing whether it is the intention of the Government to bring on an election.

Mr. ROGERS: The matter has not been considered at all, and therefore it is impossible to give my hon. friend a definite answer.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Mr. SINCLAIR: While we are waiting, I would ask the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals to read the report of the Marine and Fisheries Committee, which refers to improved facilities on the Intercolonial, and so be in a position to inform us, when we come to discuss that report, whether or not he will accede to the proposals of the committee.

Mr. REID: I will read the report, and shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman the information desired.

Trent canal improvements, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I asked the Minister of Public Works from whom the Seymour Power Company rented certain powers on the French river.

Mr. ROGERS: I think those powers were leased from the local Government.

Mr. REID: I discussed that with the chief engineer, and he told me it was from the local Government and not from our department.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would be interesting, in view of what has taken place lately, to know whether it was the Federal or Provincial Government that leased those powers. I am inclined to think it was the Provincial Government, and that they are simply getting back the powers which they themselves leased.

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada —to pay expenses in connection with cases before them, $25,000.

Mr. REID: That is the usual annual vote for that purpose.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I noticed in the press some time ago that an application had been made by the Canadian Northern Railway for permission to reduce the rate on, I think, oil in some parts of the West; that complaint was made by the other rail-

ways against the reduction, and that the Board of Railway Commissioners refused to allow the Canadian Northern Railway to make the reduction. It was an unusual position for the board to take. I have always supposed that if a railway was ready to carry goods at a reduced rate, the Board of Railway Commissioners would allow it to do so. I was a little surprised to see that statement in the press. Could the minister tell me anything about it?

Mr. REID: I saw that statement in the press. As the hon. member knows, the Board of Railway Commissioners have a power to fix rates on the several railways. When the Board fix them the railways must put them in force to the public. They have the right, as I understand the law, to prevent the railways from making rates lower than the figures at which they fix them. I suppose this was done in order that no injustice might be done to some other railway. A large corporation, like the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern, might fix lower rates to injure some smaller railway, and for that reason the Board of Railway Commissioners have power to see that no injustice is done to any railway operating in or near the territory through which another railway passes. That is the law, as I understand it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know something about that case. It was not a rate on oil; it was a rate given to the Standard Oil Company, or the Canadian branch of the Standard Oil Company, to carry to the West an amount of manufactured steel for the purpose of the construction of buildings to provide a distribution plant in the Prairie Provinces. This steel came in from across the line and the company made application for a rate which would approximate the manufacture in transit rate, just as wheat is given a rate, allowed to be unloaded, made into flour, and then taken in. Application was made to the Board of Railway Commissioners for the disallowance of the rate given. If it had been a universal rate which applied to any appreciable amount of business, the Board of Railway Commissioners might not have given the same decision, but it was evidently in the nature of a rebate to a particular company for a particular amount of business and so against the intendment of our Railway Act and absolutely against the principle of the Inter-State Commerce Act by which rebating is made a crime. I think the Board of Railway Commissioners took the ground that practically, if not technically, it was a violation of the spirit of the Act in that it gave special privileges to one company which practically could not be taken advantage of by any other company.

Mr. SINCLAIR: When I drew the attention of the minister to the matter I did not have the reference, but I have it now and perhaps it will do no harm for me to read it to him:

In a decision given out Saturday, the Railway Commission refused to allow the Canadian Northern railway freight rate cut on steel from Toronto to Regina.

I was mistaken when I said it was oil.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was an oil company.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It had something to do with oil then.

The rate was a special one given the Imperial Oil Company, which is building a big refinery at Regina. The crude steel is being obtained in Pittsburg. American railways offer a rate of 75 cents from Smoky City to Regina. The company is having the steel fabricated at Sarnia and is shipping it to that point and from there to Regina. The G.T.R. and C.P.R. held out for a rate of $1.04. The oil company was looking for a 75 cent rate and the C.N.R. accommodated them with a rate of 58½ cents per hundred pounds from Toronto to Regina. With the local rate from Sarnia to Toronto, this made a through rate of 75 cents from Sarnia to Regina.

There was a united kick from the older railways, backed up by Winnipeg manufacturers. For the first time, perhaps, the Railway Commission refused to allow a railway to reduce its rate.

You will see that the American railways were willing, provided the material was fabricated in the United States, to ship it to Regina for 75 cents a hundred, but the Canadian railways held out for $1.04. The Canadian Northern, for some reason, were not willing to do it for less than 75 cents. I see no reason why they should not have been asked to carry the goods at the rate the American railways were ready to give them. However, that is the case.

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada —maintenance and operation of, including $800 for Clyde Leavitt, as chief fire inspector, $178,350.

Mr. GRAHAM: What are Mr. Leavitt's duties in connection with the commission?

Mr. REID: Mr. Leavitt is the chief fire inspector for the commission. His duties are in connection with fires along the railways which the commissioners are obliged to investigate.

Mr. GRAHAM: They do not give him any money for doing that kind of work.

Mr. REID: $800 is what the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners recommends.

Mr. GRAHAM: He possibly has some other position and this is to be paid him by the commissioners?

Mr. REID: He is employed in the Interior Department and this is in addition to his salary in that department.

Mr. GRAHAM: Both departments pay him.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I remember that certain powers were given the Board of Railway Commissioners with reference to the prevention of fires. The Board, if I remember correctly, in connection with an agreement with the railway companies and the Chairman of the Conservation Commission, issued some orders in reference to fire protection along different lines. The Canadian Pacific burn oil going through the mountains.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: That was suggested by the Board of Railway Commissioners and the British Columbia Government, and I understand that really an order was not issued. In connection with the construction of the Transcontinental through New Brunswick, I think Mr. Flemming came to Ottawa, there was a consultation and we arrived at a decision by which the Transcontinental and the New Brunswick Government acted in unison for the protection of forests during the construction of the railway. That railway was taken over by the Government and it passes through some very valuable property in New Brunswick and in other provinces as well. What steps are the Government taking in reference to the protection of forests in the country through which the Transcontinental is operating?

Mr. REID: The several provinces have their own fire protection service. The hon. gentleman knows the system which is in force on the Intercolonial railway. I think they have tank cars located at different points that they can run along the line and then sectionmen are supposed to watch for fires. In a part of New Brunswick, and in Quebec, there was a private company which owned a large forest and they were paid a certain amount by the Transcontinental Railway Commission and, I think, by the New Brunswick Government, the company paying a certain portion of the cost. This matter came before me some time ago, and a return was brought down the other day on the subject. We are following the same policy on the Transcontinental since we took it over, as on the Intercolonial; the one policy applies to the whole system. We have tank cars located at different points, and we are not paying anything for outside protection against forest fires occurring along the line.

Mr. GRAHAM: There has been enough timber lost in Canada through forest fires to keep us running for a good many years, and we are only now beginning to wake up to the necessity of being more careful. The Government, which has now a pretty big mileage under operation, ought to be a model in its precaution against fires occurring along the line of railway. The Interior Department with their fire rangers assist the Government in this respect. If I remember correctly, legislation was passed some years ago, at the instance of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and with the consent of all the railways, after consultation requiring the leading railways to station men at certain intervals along their road solely for the purpose of protection against fires. By a little expenditure in this direction a great amount of money may be saved. In British Columbia alone there has been destruction of timber to an extent that, at present prices, would startle the world. I think that what gave rise to the legislation was the number of complaints that had been made against the various railway companies, including the Intercolonial, for having started so many fires. I admit at once that I think the Intercolonial is blamed for a good many fires for which it is not responsible.

Mr. REID: That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM: I should not like to admit that the Intercolonial has caused all the fires of which it has been accused. A good deal can be done, and I imagine is being done to prevent forest fires, by using improved smoke-stacks, careful firing, and all that kind of thing. A few years ago the private companies, and possibly the Intercolonial, endeavoured to run their trains with engines of too small a capacity, with the result that at the least bit of an incline open went the door, the coal was shovelled in, and a streak of sparks, and fire almost, shot out of the smoke-stack. I suppose that to-day the

Board of Railway Commissioners insists upon the latest improvements being used by the companies, particularly in districts where there is valuable timber, and I think that that is one of the most important duties the Board of Railway Commissioners could have at the present time.

Mr. REID: There is some legislation empowering the Board of Railway Commissioners to give special attention to protection against forest fires throughout Canada, and I agree with the hon. member that it is a matter of great importance. The forests of Canada are a great asset, and everything should be done to protect them. I believe that the present regulations are good, and are being acted upon. I remember discussing this matter of fire protection with the Hon. Mr. Cochrane and Mr. Gutelius, and Mr. Cochrane gave instructions that the same precautionary measures were to be taken on the Transcontinental as on the Intercolonial. There should be only one system of fire protection for the whole Government railways. Some one suggested to me that the question of fire protection on the Government railway system should be under the Board of Railway Commissioners. I did not care to take that matter up until the minister was here. My own view is that if you are putting the question of fire protection under the Board of Railway Commissioners you may as well put the whole thing under them.

3 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do you mean the Intercolonial?

Mr. REID: The whole Government system.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not suggest that.

Mr. REID: No, but that is how it strikes me. The minister and I think that if the present law in regard to fire protection is good for the private railway companies it is good for the Government railway system, and if it is carried out on the Government railway system I think that should meet the wishes of all concerned. That, I understand, is the system that is being carried out on the Government railways. Our own employees are doing the work, but in addition to them we have protection from the Interior Department, which, to a certain extent, looks after forest fires throughout the Dominion.

Mr. GRAHAM: Their work is mostly in the West.

Mr. REID: Probably it is. Then each local Government has its fire rangers and fire protection service, so that not only the Dominion Government, but the local Governments and all the railways realize the great importance of protection against forest fires, and are doing what is necessary in that respect.

Mr. MARCIL: What system is employed for protecting the railway property itself, in case a fire breaks out at the station?

Mr. REID: There is no fire insurance.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there any protection against fire?

Mr. REID: It must depend, of course, upon the local service in any municipality. If fire should break out, say, in any of the small stations along the line, we have no special fire protection.

Mr. MARCIL: The matter would be all right in a town where there is a fire engine, but there are numerous places along the line where there is no municipal fire protection whatever.

Mr. REID: At large places we have our tank service and hose from our tanks along the line, but in small places where there is no special fire protection service, we could not do anything other than have, say, a chemical extinguisher.

Mr. MARCIL: A couple of years ago an arrangement was made with the people at Matapedia and the railway by which they could use the water of an old reservoir, and at the time I asked that more hose be put into the station in case fire should break out on the Intercolonial or in the village. The place is huddled up close to the Intercolonial property and there have been a couple of fires there in the past. The last complaint made last year was that the hose in the station was not long enough to reach the houses in the village. The Minister of Railways promised at that time that he would look into the matter. I also asked him if arrangement would be made with the residents of the localities by which they could use the water for domestic purposes.

Mr. REID: I was present when the matter came up. I gave instructions to the general manager to see that the hose was supplied and that the wishes of the hon. member should be carried out. I have since heard no complaints. The fact that the hon. member has brought the matter to my attention will also bring it to the

attention of the people, and if there is any difficulty, I shall be glad to see that the hon. member's wishes are carried out.

Mr. NESBITT: I notice an item of $800 for a fire-inspector. What does this inspector do?

Mr. REID: This fire inspector receives only $800 from the department, but he is also an employee of the Interior Department. Parliament passed an Act giving the Railway Commission powers in regard to fire protection along the lines of railway so that the commission has power to issue an order as to what a railway must do in that regard. This man has been appointed chief fire inspector.

Mr. NESBITT: While the commission does not control the railway companies it has power to order certain things to be done by the management of those railways.

Mr. REID: By the railway companies themselves. The commission may order the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern or any other railway that comes under its jurisdiction to do certain things towards fire protection along their line of railway.

Mr. NESBITT: But the commission cannot give such orders to the Government railways?

Mr. REID: No, because the Government railway system is not under the Railway Commission in any way and never has been.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some months ago the Board of Railway Commissioners made an order for a union station at Toronto. Can the minister tell us what progress is being made with that station? I admit that it is a little difficult at the present time to get money for the purpose, but this is a joint station in which more than one railway is interested. If ever there was a place where strangers risk their lives in getting on or off trains, it is in Toronto. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Armstrong) knows his way about the Toronto station and he does not get lost; but if I were to hand in my bill to the railway companies for taking strangers in and out of that building, I would have a comfortable living for the rest of my life. You may be standing right beside a train wondering how you are going to get through it to your train and suddenly it will move away. Perhaps the next time a trainman will break a train up in two sections four or five cars down At other times you will have to climb in between cars in order to get to your own train. I can readily understand the difficulty at the present time of hurrying on the matter, but it has been announced during the past few months that work has been proceeding on this new station. Can the minister tell us what the companies are doing or how far they have advanced towards carrying out the order of the Board of Railway Commissioners?

Mr. REID: There has been a delay for a long time in regard to the Toronto railway terminal question. There is no place in Canada where a proper station and adequate terminal facilities are required so much as right in Toronto. Trouble arose over the plans, the cost, and so on, and after a great deal of delay, the matter was finally agreed on by all concerned. I have been urging for a long time that the railway companies should come to some arrangement because we wanted to build an examining warehouse and customs office adjoining that property and we could not start with it because the railways could not get their plans right. However, their plans were approved last fall, and perhaps the hon. member will remember—it was announced in the press—that Mr. Leonard was appointed manager of the terminal company formed to construct that station. I know that the contract has been awarded to Peter Lyall and Sons, Limited, and they have instructions, as I am informed, to proceed with the work and to carry it through to completion as quickly as possible. As the plans have been definitely settled, we can now go on with our work. Probably there will be no difficulty in the future about the station at Toronto. The investigation that we are likely to have into the railway systems of Canada will give good results in regard to stations of that kind. In our large cities there are terminals which not only are an inconvenience to the public but mean an unnecessary expenditure of money, and it seems to me that the terminals in such centres should be all in one place. In Montreal, the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, and the Canadian Northern have their own terminals and they are all spending a great deal of money on terminal facilities. At another session, we shall have a report in regard to such matters and it will be of great advantage to the public in the future.

I can assure the hon. member that the contract has been let for the Toronto station and the railway companies have in-

formed me that they will push forward the work as fast as possible.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the Grand Trunk Railway Company made any claim on the Government to assist them in defraying the expense of such reconstruction as they have undertaken of their station in Montreal?

Mr. REID: No application has been received, so far as I know.

Mr. GRAHAM: For a good many years there was an arbitration board to settle certain difficulties between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial. It seemed to be almost a perpetual board. I think that it lasted so long that one or two of its members died before a report was made. Is that board doing anything now? Are these vacancies filled?

Mr. REID: No, it died a natural death.

Mr. GRAHAM: The difficulties were straightened out?

Mr. REID: All straightened out; no difficulties at all remain.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid there are still difficulties. Reverting to the station at Montreal: the situation there is something like that at Toronto and it has not been modified by the recent fire. I think the Board of Railway Commissioners had the matter of elevating the tracks in Montreal under consideration. Did they give an order about the Montreal station at one time?

Mr. REID: They have investigated, but nothing has been settled.

Mr. GRAHAM: The entrance of the Grand Trunk to Montreal is on the level while the Canadian Pacific railway is on the hill and the Canadian Northern under the hill—constituting three distinct kinds of entrance. It may be difficult at this stage to overcome all the difficulties that arise in the way of making ideal accommodation in Montreal for passenger traffic, but, for the convenience of the public it would be much better if, in this, as well as in other large centres, the railway passenger terminals could be concentrated. People getting off the steamer at Montreal go to the Canadian Pacific railway expecting to go right through to their destination. I have seen them, when they showed their tickets, told that they were in the wrong station and that they must go to the Grand Trunk. Of course it is only two blocks away, but when those people got to the Grand Trunk probably they found that the train had gone and they would have to wait over until the next day. Of course, it will be difficult and expensive to concentrate the passenger business in such a great centre as Montreal, but it will be a great advantage to the travelling public. I will go further and say, it would be a great convenience to the travelling public if some arrangement could be made by which tickets would be made interchangeable over the different roads.

Mr. REID: That is what I advocated.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it could be brought about. Of course, when you approach the companies about these things you are told that there are insurmountable difficulties. But tickets are issued on the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific railway that are honoured when you get to some other line. To make tickets interchangeable might cause some inconvenience, but I do not see why it should be impossible to so arrange that a man who has paid his money to the Canadian Pacific for a ticket should be able to present that ticket on a Grand Trunk train and the Grand Trunk get their pay from the Canadian Pacific. Can the minister tell me if the Railway Commission was asked to approve of the rebuilding of the Grand Trunk station at Montreal?

Mr. REID: I have made no inquiries and there is no information in the department on the subject. I see by the newspapers that the Grand Trunk are building a temporary station. I will inquire as to the point the hon. gentleman raises.

Mr. MARCIL: As I recollect it, within the last three or four months, the city of Montreal and the Grand Trunk got together and went before the Railway Board with a view to having the work gone on with. The Railway Board, while admitting the need for the work, thought it inopportune to issue an order on the subject on account of the difficulty of raising money at this time to carry on works of this kind. This subject of passenger stations is an old-standing grievance in Montreal. I recollect reporting the proceedings in the city hall of Montreal 25 years ago or more when this very subject was under discussion. The late Sir Joseph Hickson, general manager of the Grand Trunk, had a plan for raising the tracks of the Grand Trunk and building a new station. This question really takes us back thirty years or more, and things are in the same position as they

were then, except that lately the Bonaventure station was burned down—through no fault of the Grand Trunk Company—and we now have a very primitive station indeed. I suppose it cannot be otherwise under the circumstances. But I hope that something will be done before the new station is built. As the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has said, there is great inconvenience in Montreal by reason of the many railway passenger stations in the city. We have the Grand Trunk station, the Windsor station of the Canadian Pacific, and now we are to have the Canadian Northern tunnel station at Dorchester street. The traveller at Montreal is bewildered by the number of railway stations. I have heard the suggestion made that an arrangement should be come to by which the Grand Trunk passenger trains might run on the upper level and the passenger business be concentrated at the Windsor station, the tracks on the lower level to be used for freight business. I do not know whether there is anything in that or not. But if the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk could be brought together in the Windsor station, then, with the Canadian Northern on the other side of the square opposite St. James' cathedral, there would be fairly close concentration, and the whole would be a great improvement. There is another station, the Viger Square station, which is mainly used for traffic going to Quebec, while the western traffic generally leaves by the Windsor station. But the old idea in Montreal was to have one central station. When the Canadian Pacific railway was first started, the city of Montreal voted $1,000,000 for a station at Viger square, then considered to be in the eastern part of the city, but, some time after that a company was formed under which the railway obtained permission to build the Windsor station, and there the western traffic has been concentrated. The minister will be entitled to the gratitude of the city of Montreal if he can bring this condition of affairs to an end. If the Grand Trunk is allowed to put up a very expensive station and to raise their tracks, then the idea of having a union station in Montreal will have to be abandoned for two or three generations at least. Whatever is decided should be gone on with. Montreal has already a large population—over six hundred thousand—and when the war is over and matters fairly settled, within a few years thereafter we count on a million people in Montreal. This railway business is very urgent, and if anything can be done to improve matters it should be done soon.

Mr. REID: I quite agree with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and have stated similar views. In arranging for terminals at Montreal there are not only three but four railways to be considered, the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific, and the Canadian Northern. If it is possible to bring them together in one station, that should be done. The Grand Trunk now have only a temporary station, their station having been burned down.

I understand that the reason they have gone on with this work is that it will take at least $15,000,000 to make the terminals at Montreal and to elevate the tracks. That has not been done. It should be done if there is any possibility of the railways being brought together as suggested by the hon. member. Under present conditions there is, I believe, no possible chance that the Grand Trunk will proceed with any work of that kind during the coming summer. It is the intention to have an investigation made as to the railway situation, and I am strongly of the opinion that there should be some way of compelling the railways to join their passenger terminals together at these large centres of population, on the lines suggested by the hon. member. I do not think there is any possibility of much being done during the next few months in any of the large centres, and I am in hopes that when the next session opens we shall have a report that will place every hon. member of the House in a position to judge as to the proper method of dealing with the railway systems in Canada; and the question of terminals is of course, one of the most important features of the whole railway situation. I therefore think we can safely allow the matter to rest until the opening of the next session, and I hope that an arrangement, or perhaps some legislation, may be procured which will put the Board of Railway Commissioners in a position to deal with the question in a place, like Montreal, where the providing of proper terminals facilities would be in the public interest as well as in the interest of the different railways. The saving would, of course, be very great.

Mr. NESBITT: I suggest to the minister that he should impress on the railways the

necessity of providing in the present union station at Toronto an information bureau in a conspicuous place, or at least constables with distinctive caps, so that passengers coming off one train and desiring to take another train, may obtain information. It is almost impossible for a person to get information at the union station in Toronto and, as has been said, there is probably no place on earth where people are more likely to become bewildered. I have seen people hunting all over the place for some man from whom they could get information. I have asked about trains and have received very curt answers, so much so that I have felt almost like taking the fellow by the coat collar and shaking his head a bit.

Mr. MORPHY: What size is he?

Mr. NESBITT: It does not matter to me about the size, they all look alike to me. I want them to be civil. They are not very civil, and do not put themselves out of the way, especially for women and children. If the minister has any control over matters of that kind, I wish he would see that the three railways make some such provision as I have suggested.

Mr. REID: I agree that it is necessary in a station to have a good information bureau. There is one upstairs at Toronto now, but of course there should be one downstairs as well. I will take the matter up with the railway companies and endeavour to have them provide a place of that kind. There is a room in the Union station which, I think, would make a splendid information bureau, and we may be able to get it as we shall probably have prohibition in force by September. I will ask the railway company if they cannot make—

Mr. NESBITT: That booze joint.

Mr. REID: —into an information bureau.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the members have a grievance against the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway for not running the Grand Trunk sleeping car between Ottawa and Brockville during this session.

Mr. REID: Has that car not been on? I wish it had been brought to our attention before.

Mr. GRAHAM: It has not been on this session. The Canadian Pacific Railway have also neglected to put on the sleeper that, during other sessions, lay at Broad street station at night, so that members might board the car after the House rose and awake in Montreal. That was a very great convenience.

Mr. REID: I do not think there should be any difficulty about the car from Ottawa to Brockville, as in discussing with the Grand Trunk officials the question of Pullman traffic in Canada, not long before Parliament met, the question of this car was taken up, and it is certainly a great surprise to me to learn that it has not been operated.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then in other years we had a chair car from Brockville to Ottawa over the Canadian Pacific railway. That car has been taken off on week days; it runs now only on Sundays. That causes great inconvenience to travellers. A man has to be at the station before train time if he desires to get a seat.

If he has his wife or children with him he has to go down to the station at least half an hour before the train is due to leave to get a seat, because the only first class coach is usually filled. It does inconvenience the travelling public a good deal. When a chair car is on the intending passengers go down on time and get their seats. I wish to bring another mattter to the attention of my hon. friend. At Iroquois one of the soldiers doing duty on the canal there was killed in November last.

Mr. REID: He was drowned, was he not?

Mr. GRAHAM: No. This soldier's name was Barbour, and he went to assist the lockmaster, and the crank flew around and struck him and killed him. He leaves a widow—I do not know if there are any children—who is not in very good circumstances. Application was made, I believe, to the Railway Department, or to the Militia Department, and they declined to do anything on the ground that, legally speaking, they were not liable, which was undoubtedly correct. I suppose that as a matter of law the soldier had no business to turn that crank, and he was negligent in interfering with the work of the lock-master. But he was there for the time being, assisting in putting some boats through, being glad, I suppose, to have something to do to keep him busy, and this well intended effort resulted in his death. I am not appealing to the minister on the ground of any legal right that the widow has, but I do appeal to his sympathy, and suggest

that he look into this matter and see whether or not a compassionate allowance cannot be given to this widow, who requires assistance very much at the present time. I do not claim that the widow has any legal right, but the circumstances are such that I think the Government might well consider the case.

Mr. REID: This is the first I have heard of the case, and I will be very glad to look into it. I do not think it would be possible, even if we so decided, to make a compassionate allowance during the present session. The man may be said to have been on active service, and I wondered whether an application had been made to the Militia Department for a pension. That is a matter which might be considered in a case of this kind, and I believe the Militia Department have been very liberal in such cases when men were on active service. I will take the matter up with the Militia Department. If the widow is entitled to a pension under the Militia Act, it would be much better for her than a compassionate allowance.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would be more permanent.

Mr. REID: Yes. I do not think that the payment of a certain amount would be of the same benefit; even the interest probably would not amount to so much as the pension. I will look into the case, but I would suggest in the meantime that if the family have taken no action with the Militia Department they should make an application so that it may go before the Pension Board.

Mr. GRAHAM: I doubt whether the widow would have any claim to a pension; her husband was not killed in the performance of his duty.

Mr. REID: He was killed at the locks while assisting the lock-master, and that circumstance might be considered. At any-rate I think it would be well to have the case considered first by the Militia Department. If that has already been done, I will get the report, and if they cannot do anything, I will see that the matter is taken up by the Railway Department with the view of considering whether something should be done to assist the family.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not wish to take up the time of the committee in going into details, or in discussing the abstract principles on which our railway systems are conducted; but throughout the different time tables one can find many instances showing that it is the desire of each railway company to run its own business without regard to the passengers who are carried on other railways. They do not care about the connections made from other roads than their own. There are cases in the time-tables where, say, a train leaves a junction point at 10 o'clock, and another train crosses that point say at two minutes after 10 o'clock. There is no chance of the train at the junction point waiting the two minutes to allow a connection to be made by the other train. The time tables are filled with cases of that kind, and disappointments are numerous because of the lack of some consideration being shown to the travelling public.

Mr. MARCIL: They do not co-operate in the interests of the public.

Mr. MORPHY: Not at all. The railways are run for the railway companies and not for the public convenience. To illustrate, I went to Toronto on one occasion last winter, having made an appointment at Woodstock, in the constituency of my hon. friend from Oxford. I travelled on a Canadian Northern train from Ottawa and it reached Toronto five minutes behind time, and I missed the Canadian Pacific railway train for Woodstock. I made inquiries as to when I could go on to Woodstock and was told that I could not go until night unless I went by Stratford. I commented on the situation to a gold-topped man, such as the hon. gentleman spoke of, and he was very discourteous about it. I told him that he was not there for the purpose of being discourteous, and he said that the Canadian Northern railway did not count. There were several members of Parliament there, of whom the Chairman of the Railway Committee was one, and the hon. member from North Grey another. The official told the latter that he would have to wait until night before he could leave Toronto, although he desired to get home on the Saturday to attend to his business. I took exception to the statement of the official that the Canadian Northern railway did not count, but he was so big that he scared me off, and I let it go at that. Later on he sent through another member of Parliament an expression of regret for the language he had used. I was forced with another member to go to Shakespeare on the Grand Trunk and to engage a motor car to come from Woodstock, 20 miles distant, to take us there to fulfil an appointment at one o'clock in the afternoon. I

would like to impress upon the committee the fact that experiences of that kind are more general than may be supposed. A communication should be sent from this Parliament to the Board of Railway Commissioners, whose duty, I apprehend it is, to take hold of these questions, to study the time-tables and correct such abuses so that the public may have the benefits, for the securing of which, public money has gone to these big corporations.

Mr. TURGEON: While we are ventilating grievances, may I take the acting minister down East with me for a moment? I would like to call his attention to the advantage of the through passenger services given on the Intercolonial railway between Montreal and Halifax by means of the Ocean Limited and the Maritime Express. I do not wish to criticise the action of the minister, or of the department, in taking away the service of the Ocean Limited when the traffic does not permit the running of more than one of these trains. But I do want to call his attention to the fact that if we cannot have both of these services, and if one of them must be taken away, in the public interest, in the interest especially of through passenger traffic, and in the interest of the railway itself, the Ocean Limited should be kept on and the Maritime Express taken off. All along the railway we have local express services which are sufficient, generally speaking, for the local traffic. I will explain the difference between the through service of the Ocean Limited and of the Maritime Express. If you leave the Maritime Provinces, or northern New Brunswick, by the Maritime Express, in the middle of the night, getting into Moncton at nine or ten o'clock, and Newcastle and Bathurst about twelve or one o'clock, you are on the train all day again and only reach Montreal at six or seven o'clock in the evening if you are on time. Then, it is too late for any person to attend to any business in Montreal. He has to spend all next day and wait until the morning after before he can return East. If a man leaves Moncton, or the north shore of New Brunswick, by the Ocean Limited early in the evening he reaches Montreal at eight o'clock next morning; if he is a business man he has the whole day in Montreal to attend to his business and he can take the train again at 7.30 in the evening and reach home next morning or early in the day, whereas, by the other train, he has to wait until next morning and only reaches northern New Brunswick next day, and St. John late in the afternoon. The minister will understand the great difference it makes to the travelling public. Then take the southern portion of New Brunswick, St. John and the neighbourhood; by taking away the Ocean Limited you ignore totally the traffic between Montreal and St. John. The Ocean Limited, when it is running, leaves Montreal in the evening about the same time that the Canadian Pacific leaves Montreal for St. John and the man who travels on the Ocean Limited reaches St. John next day about the same time as the man who travels on the Canadian Pacific. Therefore, there is an inducement for people to take advantage of the Government railway instead of the Canadian Pacific. If you take off the Ocean Limited for a considerable, or even for a short time, the travelling public from the southern part of New Brunswick have to take the Canadian Pacific and once they become used to that road they continue to patronize it even after the Ocean Limited is put on again. The Ocean Limited therefore loses the traffic for the whole year round. If the local services on the Intercolonial railway are not sufficient to meet the demands, it might be to the advantage of the Government railway to augment that service in one section or another, and then if only one of these through trains can be retained, I maintain that in the interest of the road and of the travelling public, it should be the Ocean Limited and not the Maritime Express. I hope my suggestion will commend itself to the favourable consideration of the minister. I know that I voice the general feeling of the public in the Maritime Provinces

Mr. REID: The Ocean Limited is taken off for a few months during the winter for the same reason as that which applies to trains taken off during winter by other railway companies.

Mr. TURGEON: I am only speaking of taking off one train.

Mr. REID: I understand that. The reason that the Maritime Express is left on is that you may have a train leaving Montreal in the morning if you are going through to Halifax. The Canadian Pacific has a night train leaving Montreal. If we were to leave on the Ocean Limited you would have two trains leaving Montreal at night and going through to the Maritime Provinces and you would have

none in the morning. Passengers from the West arriving in Montreal at 9 or 10 in the evening, or at 7 in the morning on the Grand Trunk, Canadian Northern, or Canadian Pacific, would have to wait until 7 or 7.30 o'clock at night before they could proceed on their journey through to St. John or Halifax. The object of having two trains, one in the morning, the Maritime Express, owned by the Government Railway system, and one in the evening, owned by the Canadian Pacific system, is that the travelling public may have an opportunity of leaving Montreal for the lower provinces twice a day instead of once as would be the result if you had a train running on the Ocean Limited time. The only way to satisfy the hon. member would be to keep the Ocean Limited on.

Mr. TURGEON: If the department could by any possibility keep on the double service the year round that is what we would like. Taking everything into consideration, I believe it would be more to the general advantage to keep the Ocean Limited on, if only one train is kept on. I perceive the advantage of being able to make connections with trains from the West, but on several occasions when I have come from the West it has been my luck to reach Montreal just in time to miss the Maritime Express, so that even if that train had not been on I would have been just as well off. On the other hand, other trains are supposed to arrive in Montreal in the evening, and these people have the advantage of making a connection with the Ocean Limited; so that, taking everything into consideration, as far as connection from the West is concerned, I do not think it makes much difference. It does make a great difference to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and more particularly to the people travelling between Montreal and St. John. If the people are without the through service on the Government railway for three or four months in the year they will do without it for the other seven or eight months, and thus a great deal of traffic is diverted from the Intercolonial to the Canadian Pacific that would not be diverted if the Ocean Limited were kept on.

Mr. REID: I cannot agree with the hon. member that the connection at Montreal with the Maritime Express from the West, New York, and other places is not a very important one. I have arrived at Montreal on the Grand Trunk many times, and I think that on the whole the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific trains arrive at Montreal pretty nearly always on time. There is some little difference between the arrival of the trains from the West, New York, and other places and the departure of the trains for the East, and as a rule, connections are pretty well made. I do not think the public would stand for the two trains leaving Montreal at practically the same hour at night, and having no train in the morning. We think that we should always have a morning train from Montreal for the lower provinces. With regard to keeping the Ocean Limited on throughout the year, it has always been the policy to run it for a certain number of months only, and take it off in the winter. As an experiment the present Minister of Railways allowed the Ocean Limited to run for the whole twelve months two or three years ago, but the traffic was so small that there was a very, very heavy loss. The hon. member knows that it costs $800 to run the train from Montreal right through, and $800 coming back again, or $1,600 a day. The loss was so great that the minister had to go back to the system that prevailed before he took office. I could not say whether the traffic now would justify the Ocean Limited being kept on for the whole twelve months. However, it will be on again in the next few days, and will of course continue, even under the old arrangement, until next fall. On the minister's return I shall draw his attention to my hon. friend's suggestion, and also take it up with the general manager with a view to seeing whether it would be advisable to give the experiment another trial. I agree that the more trains you have the more convenient it is for the public. But, of course, regard must be had to the public interests, when a train is being run at a heavy loss. I am very glad the hon. member has brought the matter up.

Mr. TURGEON: I was not criticising the taking off of the Ocean Limited during a certain period of the year. I admit that it might not be in the interest of the department to have the two trains running in the winter months, and of the two I would prefer to have the Ocean Limited kept on. Another suggestion I would make is that it might be better to have a local train from Montreal to points east in Quebec rather than run the entire train through from Montreal to Halifax or St. John.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: I endorse what the hon. gentleman has said. The Ocean Limited would give very much better accommodation to the people in Nova Scotia than the Maritime Express. A man going by the Maritime Express to Sydney—and the bulk of the traffic is east of Truro—has to wait seven or eight hours at Truro before he can get a train to take him to his destination; whereas if he went by the Ocean Limited, he would have to wait only two or three hours, as he would be able to make connection with the train from Halifax. If, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Gloucester, the Ocean Limited were continued instead of the Maritime Express and a local train were put on between Montreal and points east in Quebec, the whole country would be very much better served, because much better time would be made. Is the minister in a position to give me the information I wrote him about a couple of days ago, with respect to the Antigonish flower garden.

Mr. REID: I wired for that, but I am sorry it has not yet come to hand. I will wire again to-day, saying I must have the information by to-morrow.

Mr. BOULAY: As the minister has explained it does not pay at a certain time of the year to run both the Maritime Express and the Ocean Limited. If from a business point of view only one train can be kept on, I would prefer to have the Ocean Limited. However, the explanation given by the minister seems reasonable, and it might be more in the interests of the railway and of the people in a certain section of the country to have the express kept on. Another thing I should like to point out to the minister, and about which I have spoken to the general manager several times, is that the Maritime Express leaves Montreal too early in the morning for people coming from the West, except those from Toronto. People travelling on the Canadian Pacific Railway train from Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury or Winnipeg, arriving in Montreal about nine o'clock in the morning, miss the Maritime Express, which leaves at 8.15 and have then to spend a whole day in Montreal. I would suggest that when the Ocean Limited is taken off, the Maritime Express should leave Montreal about twelve o'clock, as it did some years ago. This would give passengers from the West a chance to get home to points between Lévis and Moncton without having to wait twenty-four hours in Montreal. Under the present schedule they have to stay in Montreal from 9 or 9.30 in the morning until 8.15 the next morning, which is very inconvenient. I would suggest that the express start about eleven or twelve o'clock, but twelve would be better, as it would give business men in Ottawa a chance to catch the train. I think this change would be to the advantage, not only of the Intercolonial, but of the whole travelling public between Lévis and Moncton. When the Ocean Limited is taken off I think a good many passengers will take the Canadian Pacific railway for points East unless the time of the departure of the Maritime Express is changed, as they would not want to stay in Montreal a whole day. This causes the Intercolonial to lose a great many passengers going to the Maritime Provinces. The making of the change in the way I propose would keep our passengers and would be to the interest of the Intercolonial.

4 p.m.

I would like to make another suggestion in regard to a change in the administration. I have already complained several times that the division between Montmagny and Campbellton is under the control of New Brunswick officials. I would suggest that instead of that, the whole line in Quebec, from Montreal to Campbellton, should be put under the direction of the Superintendent of Railways. That would divide more equally the work of the two inspectors, as the one who has charge from Montmagny to Campbellton has under his direction several small branches, such as the Fredericton branch, so that he has a good deal more mileage to administer than the Superintendent of Railways. My suggestion, if carried out, would be satisfactory to the people of the province of Quebec; it would settle all the difficulties that we have had for years with the officials at Campbellton and it would also be of great advantage to the administration of the road. The officials at Campbellton who administer the Montmagny-Campbellton division do not know anything about that road; they are all strangers to us; they do not know the grades except from what they see on the plans; and they are liable to make many mistakes. It often happens that trains are delayed on sidings just on that account. If the people appointed to look after that division were men from the province of Quebec who knew the ground, they could do their work more efficiently. I make this suggestion in the interest of the road and also of the people of the province of Quebec, and it would at once remove all the friction

arising between the employees on the two divisions. All the employees in the Campbellton office who run the trains on our division speak nothing but English and belong to New Brunswick, and our people in the province of Quebec do not like to be run by those strangers. We prefer to be under the control of our own men whom we know, and it would make conditions a great deal better than they are now.

Mr. REID: The hon. member mentioned this matter to me a few days ago, and I think the suggestion is worthy of consideration. I am taking it up with the management now, and I shall be glad to see that every consideration is given to his suggestion.

Mr. BEST: I would just like to add one word about what the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) says about trains not waiting for passengers from other trains. I believe that no people are so badly used in that regard as are the people of Dufferin and North Grey. There is a daily train from Toronto to Owen Sound, a distance of about 120 miles, and from Owen Sound to Meaford on the east is 20 miles. To get across that 20 miles you have to go about 240 miles from Owen Sound to Toronto and back to Meaford. If the trains would wait at Inglewood, about 60 miles would be cut off, and you could reach your destination in about five hours, whereas if you leave Shelburne or Owen Sound in the morning, you arrive at Inglewood about eight in the morning and have to wait until six at night. One train is the Grand Trunk and the other is the Canadian Pacific, and there is only about four minutes difference in the time. Many people have been trying to get the matter arranged with the Board of Railway Commissioners, so that the trains might be compelled to wait for each other. I think it is up to the Government to see that something is done in a case like that. No matter whether you go from north to south, or from south to north, you have a ten hours' wait.

I would like to make a suggestion to the Government in regard to the taking away of agents at night on the line between Owen Sound and Toronto. Up to a few months ago the agents used to wait at their offices until the last train, which arrives at Owen Sound between ten and eleven, was in. For the last few months at many of the stations the agents have been taken away at night, and baggage for one of these stations is thrown off on the platform without any one to look after it, or it goes on to Owen Sound and it is sent back the next day. That is very unfair, because the line is a paying one; in fact, I have heard it said that there is no better paying line in Canada than the one between Owen Sound and Toronto.

Mr. REID: Such matters should be and can be settled by the Board of Railway Commissioners. There was a similar case at the town of Brockville, where one train left a minute or two before another one arrived. We had the matter arranged by applying to the Board of Railway Commissioners. Their officials look into the matter, and if they find any injustice, they issue an order which the railway company must carry out. If the hon. member will give me a written statement of any complaints he has to make, I shall be very glad to bring them before the Board of Railway Commissioners, or the parties interested can do so themselves. All they have to do is to lay their complaint before the Board and ask for a hearing, which the Board are compelled to give, and, as a rule, the decisions of the Board have been satisfactory. The hon. member can either adopt that method of procedure or, if he wishes me to deal with the matter, I shall be glad to take it up with the Board.

Mr. MORPHY: I spoke of this matter a few minutes ago, and I rise for the purpose of putting another point of view before the Acting Minister of Railways. People do not like to complain; they do not organize to go to the Board of Railway Commissioners, because a solicitor has frequently to be employed, and that costs money; and, while no doubt they get every consideration when they do go before the Board, I think this is a case where the Government should take action by communicating to the Railway Commission the fact, that this abuse exists throughout the whole railway system. The trouble is caused by each railway acting on the principle of carrying on its work without any consideration to any other railway, to the absolute disadvantage of the public. It is a shame that such should be the case, and the abuse should be corrected. If the hon. minister would state, so that his statement will appear on Hansard, that it is the desire of the Government that the Board of Railway Commissioners should take up this question and see what is the true state of affairs, with a view to correcting the abuse themselves, without the people making com-

plaint, a great benefit would accrue to the people of this country.

Mr. REID: I will bring this matter to the attention of the Railway Commission as suggested by the hon. member. Complaints are sometimes made against the railways for which little grounds are found to exist when they are looked into; but there are undoubtedly grievances. In a specific case such as that mentioned by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) there is no reason why the matter should not be investigated at once. We had a great deal of trouble with the connection at Brockville, but we got that straightened out.

Mr. BEST: I would not have spoken on the subject at the present time but that the judges took it up, and the very time-table itself showed that there was only three or four minutes' difference in the time of the arrival of the trains at the crossing, and the losing of the train at that point might mean a hundred miles of travel for a passenger, or the loss of a day. Not only did the time-table show that one train would have only a few minutes to wait for the other, but it was also shown that at the other end of the line the Grand Trunk train had ample time to wait. We could get no redress.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Act provides that complaints of grievance can be made to the board not only by interested parties but by the Minister of Railways, or the board of its own volition can issue an order on a matter in which no complaint has been made. There is plenty of room to have the board act in this matter.

Mr. MORPHY: I desire the minister to get my point of view, especially in view of one part of his remarks. He said that if any member wishes to make a complaint to the Railway Commission the matter will be dealt with. I think members of Parliament have their time pretty well taken up with the miscellaneous duties they have to perform, and I am under the impression that the Railway Commission is there for the public benefit and to correct these difficulties the moment they hear of them. The reason I spoke was—and I have no doubt the same is true of other hon. members—that I assume the commissioners will read this in Hansard and learn that there is a great public complaint which has not reached them. Having sovereign powers, as you might say, and an equally sovereign duty to the people of this country, if they feel there is an abuse they should correct it without waiting for a member of Parliament to call it to their attention.

Mr. MARCIL: I desire to add a word with regard to the situation in Montreal, in the hope that it will reach the Railway Commission or this new commission, to which reference has been made. I said a few words about the desirability of concentrating the passenger terminals at Dominion square, by inducing the Grand Trunk to link up with the Canadian Pacific and use the Windsor station. With the Canadian Northern on the other side of the square we would have the three railways close together. Another great grievance in Montreal is that of street crossings. On one line they have adopted one system and on another a different system. The Grand Trunk uses the old gate system, and one may approach the railway track when he is in a hurry only to find that the gate is shut and there is no means of knowing whether he is to be kept for a minute or for half an hour before he is allowed to cross. He can take the risk of trying to cross, and he may be crushed, as a great many people have been crushed, under the train. The Canadian Pacific Railway system has been to close up the streets entirely. Under the Canadian Pacific track running from Windsor station, Decarie avenue is the only crossing that is open for many blocks. This is in Notre Dame de Grace, an extension of Montreal, which has progressed more rapidly than any other part of the city and is now quite densely populated. It is crossed by the line of the Canadian Pacific, and one finds that between Decarie avenue and Montreal West for a distance of fifteen or twenty blocks, every street is closed. The children going to school, the people going to church, the people on their way between Sherbrooke street and the Lower Lachine road may have to walk a mile or a mile and a half out of their way to find a subway which allows them to pass under the Canadian Pacific track. I suppose the company have the power to do this, because the road was built before this part of the city was developed and the crossings that were closed were only farm crossings. But the fact that the company had the right, does not make the situation any less a burden on the people, and I think that means of relief should be found. I hardly know which is worse, the level crossing system of the Grand Trunk with its gates which

you can get through at some time in the day, or the system of the Canadian Pacific railway which prevents you from getting through at all except by going a roundabout way. The railway companies protect themselves; and of course nobody would wish to see the railways of Canada go behind in any way, but it seems to me there should be some supervising authority to look after the interests of the people. Some years ago I had the advantage of travelling in France, and there I found such a thing as a level crossing to be very rare; the same is true of England. The railways run either over or under the roads. But the rights of the public seem to have been protected; there is something left for the common citizen; he can cross the street without danger of being run over and without being compelled to go half a dozen blocks out of his way. To solve the very complicated problem in Montreal, these several matters should be called to the attention of the Railway Board or of the new commission.

Mr. REID: I shall be glad to act on the suggestion of the hon. member and call attention of the Railway Commission to the matter. It is a big question and one that will bear examination by the new commission, and I hope that great results will follow that examination.

Mr. McKENZIE: I had not the opportunity of saying anything with respect to Intercolonial affairs when the Estimates were going through, but I understand that the privilege is still open for members to call attention to matters which they deem of importance with regard to that system. I wish to refer to what has been stated by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best). I did not hear the whole of his remarks, but I understand the gist of them to be that there is no proper connection made between the different systems of railways, no regulation or understanding by which one train waits for another. He spoke especially of one case in Ontario, but so far as we are concerned in Eastern Canada that is not the case. The feelings of two sets of passengers in trains of this kind are very different. The train load that is held up is swearing at the delay, while the passenger who wishes to take that train is hoping that the train will wait. There is a very strong conflict of opinion about a situation of that kind, and differences are not always easily reconcilable. I have frequently had to wait at Truro from 8 o'clock in the evening until 11.30 o'clock for the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway train. I would have arrived at Truro about the middle of the day and would have waited there until the Halifax train came in at 8 o'clock, when, in the ordinary course of events, I could have proceeded towards my home in Cape Breton; but we have been frequently held up until nearly midnight waiting for the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway train. If courtesy as between railways is scarce in Ontario, it is carried to the extreme at our end of the Dominion, and we should like to have matters adjusted so that the long stoppages at our end would be curtailed and part of them applied to Ontario. That would be an evening up that would be satisfactory all round. Only two or three days ago I waited for an hour and a half at Truro for a train. Coming from Cape Breton we were delayed for four hours by a little obstacle, a little worse than a cow crossing the track, at Tracadie. We lost our connection at Truro and had to wait for a whole day. This may be nobody's fault and accidents of that kind will happen; but it is very annoying. For the last six weeks or two months the arrival of trains at Sydney and adjacent points has been far from satisfactory. Sometimes the train from Halifax, only two or three hundred miles away, is 10 hours late. That is most extraordinary, and we cannot find out exactly what causes the trouble. I used to say, speaking facetiously, that when we had a manager with a salary of $5,000 or $6,000 a year, we had regular trains; but as the salary increased the time became worse, and if this manager received $30,000 we would have no trains at all. I would bring the size of the salary and the lateness of the trains to the serious consideration of the minister.

I wish to bring seriously to the attention of the minister the lack of proper facilities for the handling of traffic at North Sydney, which is really the eastern Atlantic terminus of the Intercolonial. Of course there is a terminus at Sydney, but there is very little business done there. The main business is done at the terminus at North Sydney, where connection is made for the island of Newfoundland. It may interest the minister to know that until 19 years ago we had not water terminus at North Sydney, and no business was done at that point in connection with the Intercolonial. But in 1897 a wharf was built and the road was run down to the water. At that time there was practically no business between

the island of Newfoundland and the Intercolonial railway, but that business has since grown by leaps and bounds so that now, during open navigation, which is about 10 months of the year, we ship outwards on the Intercolonial about 10 cars a day, sometimes 15 cars a day of freight going over the Intercolonial and on the boats to Newfoundland. When I was in North Sydney the other day, there were about 100 cars standing on the sidings, both down at the wharf and up at the station, waiting for boats to carry the freight to Newfoundland. With the in-coming business I am not so familiar. I am sure that the passenger business from Newfoundland must be a very material source of income for the Intercolonial, while the handling of freight, such as fish from Newfoundland, must be profitable. The business handled at this point is enormous, but the facilities are absolutely inadequate. The wharf is too small. It is not long enough and is not wide enough, and is in no sense commensurate with the business to be handled there. I would ask the acting minister to bring this to the notice of the real Minister of Railways—although if reports be true I am talking to the right man now. There are two, and sometimes three, boats on the Newfoundland route. There is only proper room for one boat at the wharf. The boats trading along the coast that want to land fish and other freight at North Sydney are compelled to tie up at some other wharf and cart their freight back to the railway. This is far from being just to our people, because they ought to have room to bring their vessels alongside the railway and be enabled to put their freight aboard the cars with the least possible expense and trouble. But there is always a Newfoundland boat there, as the service is a daily one. There is land near the wharf that the minister could buy at a reasonable price for the purpose of extending the wharf.

Then, the station at North Sydney is far from being sufficient. About half a mile from the station there is a little Indian village. I am far from casting any slurs upon Indians or upon poor Indian women, but it is a fact that white people do not care to be obliged to congregate with them at railway stations and in small railway rooms. We have only the one room there, a small room for a large passenger traffic. Passengers are compelled to wait in that room all huddled together, all kinds of people. It is quite proper that the Indian women and the Indians should have some shelter, but I think it would be well that the accommodation for passengers should be large enough to obviate the crowding of other people in with them as is the case with the present small station at North Sydney. Even apart from any objection of that kind, the station is far from what it should be. It was built 25 years ago when traffic was small and the town of North Sydney and surrounding places were not as large as they are now. There was no provision for Newfoundland traffic at that time, and so the station to-day is far from what it ought to be. I submit to the minister that when he undertakes to enlarge the wharf, which must be done in order to handle the business, he should also give some attention to the enlargement of the railway station.

I wish to bring up also another matter in connection with the handling of trains in that vicinity. The minister may tell me that I should go to the general manager with the case, but the manager is not available to us; we cannot see him, and, as was well said by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Copp), while this road remains a Government road, this Parliament, and this Government, and the Minister of Railways cannot divest themselves of responsibility. Members of Parliament will properly go to the minister with their complaints and requests and will expect them to be transmitted to the manager and his staff to have them attended to. The minister is aware that the town, from which I come, and the immediate vicinity are pretty well populated. We have a series of villages or towns along the first ten miles of the road from North Sydney. There is in the vicinity a large quarry operated by the Dominion Steel Company, and next to that are the Colonial Coal Company's works, the town of Florence, and the town of Sydney; so that for the first ten miles, there is practically a continuous community. The people there take advantage in the evenings to travel into North Sydney by the train from Halifax, which passes about 7 o'clock, returning by a train which goes out at 9 o'clock. Thus the people can go into Sydney and get back to their homes that night. That is all right, but on Saturday night, which is the night of all nights that the people want to go to town, there is no outgoing train; that is, no train leaves Sydney on Saturday night. If the people in the district go into town by the 7 o'clock train, they cannot get home

unless they drive, which means that they are really prohibited from getting into town.

Mr. REID: Is the train which leaves Sydney at 9 o'clock the through train going west?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, that is the night train going west to Halifax. The people come into town on the through train from Halifax, and it is very convenient for them to get home on this through train that goes out at 9 o'clock. There is usually standing at the town of North Sydney, an engine, and I think, a few cars, and it would not be very much trouble to make up a small train every Saturday night to run from North Sydney, about five or six miles, passing through these towns, so as to enable the people who go into North Sydney by the 7 o'clock train to return home. I think such a train would be a paying proposition; it would certainly be a great convenience to the people. Saturday night is pay night, the night on which people want to do their shopping, and it would be regarded as a fine stroke of business if the minister put on that local train. I trust he will give these suggestions his best attention.

Mr. KYTE: I desire to add a word or two to the criticisms made by the hon. member for North Cape Breton regarding the imperfect railway connections in the province of Nova Scotia. For instance, the Maritime Express leaves Montreal at 8.15 o'clock and arrives at Truro about noon the next day, just two and a half hours after the express train from Halifax has gone on its way to Sydney. The consequence is that persons living in certain sections of the province of Nova Scotia, off the main line of the Intercolonial, are obliged to remain in Truro for 24 hours before they are able to get a connection for their destination. It seems to me that some better arrangement and some better connection than that might be devised. As I have said, the Maritime Express leaving Montreal at 8.15 reaches Truro at noon the next day. It seems to me that some arrangement could be made by which that train could leave Montreal earlier, or by which it could make better time to reach Truro at 9.15 or 10 o'clock on the following day, and thus enable passengers from Montreal to connect with the day train for points to the eastern terminus of the Intercolonial railway. When the Ocean Limited is not running between Montreal and Halifax, it takes passengers who live in certain portions of eastern Nova Scotia four days to travel from points between Ottawa and Montreal to their destination. It takes me four days to travel from Ottawa to the constituency in which I live, and that is true of other hon. gentlemen occupying seats in this House, as well as of a large proportion of the travelling public who belong to eastern Nova Scotia. That seems to me to be a rather intolerable condition of affairs in this day and generation. I fancy there is no portion of settled Canada where the people have a worse railway connection than in the province of Nova Scotia. Taking into account the fact that that province, and particularly the island of Cape Breton, has contributed so heavily towards the revenues of the Intercolonial road, it seems to me that the Department of Railways should give to that section of the Maritime Provinces the best possible railway accommodation.

I desire to say a word or two with regard to the accommodation that is given to the public on the trains. At the present time, a passenger taking the train at Sydney at twenty minutes to seven o'clock in the morning is unable to get anything to eat until that train reaches Truro at five o'clock in the evening. As often happens, if that train is late, as was the case when I was down in Nova Scotia a few days ago, passengers who have had their breakfast at 6 o'clock in the morning are unable to get a bite to eat until 7 o'clock in the evening. Up till a year ago or so, a dining car was attached to the express from Sydney going West at Port Mulgrave, and it afforded accommodation to the passengers who desired a midday meal. When that dining car was taken off, one was attached to the day express at Antigonish, which gave passengers an opportunity of getting their meal at a reasonable time. But the dining car has been taken off altogether. I think it must be eight or nine months since there was a dining car on the day express from Sydney going to Truro. That is a great inconvenience to the travelling public. A buffet service existed on the chair and parlour cars, but I understand that even that has been cut out. It certainly was cut out on the two occasions that I travelled on the Intercolonial during the last couple of months. This is a complaint which is very general among the passengers on the Intercolonial railway. I am not making the complaint personally. In recent

months, I have not travelled very often on the Intercolonial, and I was not particularly inconvenienced by reason of there not being a dining car attached to the train; but it is a complaint which has come to me from commercial travellers and others who frequently patronize the Intercolonial railway.

There is one other matter of criticism, and that is with regard to the manner in which parlour cars on the Intercolonial railway are kept. It is a matter of very common complaint that the parlour cars and the Pullman cars on the Nova Scotia end of the Intercolonial railway are not kept as clean as they used to be. I am not directing this criticism towards any particular official of the Intercolonial railway; I am merely stating it as a fact. I have heard ladies make very loud complaints within the last couple of months that the parlour and chair car service of the Intercolonial railway between Sydney and Halifax is not looked after as it was in the past. The complaints appear to me to have considerable foundation. As I have said, I do not pretend to make any charges against any person in particular, but it seems to me that a little better supervision ought to be exercised by the official who is in charge of that particular department and thus remove what I regard as a very considerable ground of complaint.

Mr. REID: Answering the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) first in reference to the port of North Sydney, I realise that it is a very important point on the Intercolonial railway. The matter was brought to my attention during the last two or three months on account of the congestion of the trade with Newfoundland. There was a very large number of cars that could not be unloaded. Cars were detained because the boats plying between North Sydney and Newfoundland could not carry the freight on account of the large quantity to be moved. We put on one or two Government steamers in order to relieve the congestion at that point. I was also informed that this trade has grown very rapidly within the last few years. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has been looking up the question of trade between Newfoundland and Canada, and I suppose the Reid Company, who own the Newfoundland railway, have been trying to increase the trade between the two countries. That port has grown to be a very important one. Of course, they must have facilities necessary to perform the work that may be required of the railway. I have not had it drawn to my attention before that the facilities were so inadequate as the hon. member has stated. The Estimates that were made out for the Intercolonial Railway system and this, of course, is part of it, were taken up by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) at the beginning of the session. I had nothing to do with them, and I know that he cut out many important items that he would like to have had in the Estimates for the Intercolonial railway on account of war conditions and the desire to keep the vote down as low as possible, and this may have been one of them. Unless there is an item in the Estimates, the hon. gentleman knows it will be impossible for us to go ahead with the work that may be necessary during the coming season. However, I will be very glad to look into it and see if anything can be done during the coming year to improve the facilities there. With reference to the station at North Sydney, the same thing applies. It should not be much trouble to provide a little more accommodation, such as is suggested by my hon. friend, if that is all that is required, so long as it does not involve the building of a new station.

Mr. McKENZIE : It might be enlarged.

Mr. REID: I will also take that matter up. With reference to the train service between Sydney and North Sydney, as I understand from the hon. gentleman, the train for Montreal leaves every night except Saturday night. As I have understood the situation in Nova Scotia, the train does not leave on Saturday night because it does not run through on Sunday.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a train on Sunday night, but not on Saturday.

Mr. REID: I know. There was a time when they did not run right through on Sunday. I do not know whether that system prevails now, although I am aware that it has been changed in part. But, I will look into that complaint and see if it cannot be remedied. I realise that in all these large centres such, for instance, as Sydney, people like to get in from the country and near-by places on Saturday night. It is a very important night for people who desire to come in and do their trading, and I can see that it is quite an inconvenience if there is no train out on Saturday night. There are, of course, difficulties in operating a suburban service such as that which

has been mentioned for one night only. There is a rule among railway employees, in fact, it is an agreement, an understanding with the railway unions, that if you start a crew out, even for a ten mile run, they receive a day's pay. It may be an expense that the traffic would hardly justify. But, it is well worth looking into and if I can overcome the difficulty I shall be very glad to do it. I stated a moment ago that I would like to see the people in the neighbourhood of a large centre have the advantage of coming into town on Saturday night. The large railways try to arrange a Saturday night service to enable people to get into the cities.

With reference to what the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) stated about the train leaving Montreal for the East, the connection at Truro, and missing the connection by an hour and a half or two hours, if you start the train an hour and a half earlier you miss the connections from the west. There is one hour between the arrival of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk trains and the departure of the Maritime Express. There is an hour allowed the people from the west to get the Maritime Express, and there is a great deal of difficulty in making change because if you start the train earlier you miss the connection from the west. The hon. gentleman made another complaint which I cannot understand, but I will get the information at once. He has stated that in going west there is no service by which a passenger getting on the train about seven in the morning can get anything to eat until five in the afternoon. There was a time, as he states, when a dining car was on, but that has been taken off, and I conclude from the remarks he has made that there is not even a restaurant provided along the road at which passengers may get something to eat from the time of starting at seven o'clock in the morning until arriving at five in the afternoon.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: There is no restaurant east of Truro.

Mr. REID: That is what I understand, and therefore a passenger starting at seven in the morning and arriving at Truro at five in the afternoon can get nothing to eat, because there is no restaurant and there is no dining car service. I think that is what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. McKENZIE: Quite so.

Mr. REID: That being the case, I will take the matter up and see if we cannot remedy this condition at once. The hon. gentleman also said that the Pullmans and the chair cars were not kept clean. Of course, any complaints of that kind, whether in this House or out of it, should be brought to the attention of the manager or of the minister, and should be remedied at once. That is one thing that must be looked after properly. It may be that those in charge of the work are not giving it the care they should.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Would it not be possible to have the train from Halifax to Sydney delayed about an hour and a half so that connection might be made at Truro? I realize that it would delay the arrival of the train at Sydney an hour and a half, and that might not be so convenient for my hon. friends who are on the main line, but those who, like myself, go over the Inverness road, have to remain over at Truro until the next day. It occurred to me that it might be possible to arrange some method by which the train from Halifax might be delayed an hour and a half, and some other changes might be made with respect to the train from Montreal. I quite realize that the traffic from the West is important, and that there is only an hour between the arrival of the Western train at Montreal and the departure of the train for the Maritime Provinces. If that time were shortened a little, and the train starting from Halifax were delayed an hour or an hour and a half, the connection might be made. This is very important to the constituency I represent, because the Inverness road is a branch of the Intercolonial. As it is at present all passengers on the Inverness road have to remain over at Truro for the night.

Mr. REID: It is well to have all these complaints on record. I will take this matter up and see if any better facilities can be given. It might however necessitate the changing of the whole time-table. It is the wish of the Minister of Railways and myself to give the best possible service, but it is difficult to get a time-table that will suit everybody. I have known us to change the time-table an hour only, and that would upset the connections with the branch line trains. We wish to have as few complaints as possible. When the manager is drawing up a new time-table I will have him look into all these com-

plaints thoroughly, to see whether any better service can be given.

Mr. McKENZIE: If it would be of any assistance to the minister I might say something further with regard to the dining car service. It is very inconvenient as it is now. For some years the diner used to be attached to the train leaving Halifax in the morning and going east to Sydney and passengers could get their mid-day meal in the diner before the train got to the town of Antigonish. There the Sydney train going west was met, and the diner was transferred to it, about two o'clock. That was rather late, but the passengers had ample time to get their meal between there and Truro. If that arrangement was restored I think it would satisfy the public. I also think this way of running the diner would be cheaper than having it go through all the way to Sydney.

Railways and Canals—Grand Trunk Pacific railway—Remuneration to Government Director of $2,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the minister read the director's report?

Mr. REID: I haven't it here.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is the director anyway?

Mr. REID: Jules Hone.

Mr. GRAHAM: He ought to be sharp. It seems to me that if he had been a real good director he would have sent in a report to the Government covering some of the points raised in the correspondence with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. REID: We have a certificate from the secretary of the board that the director attends all the meetings.

Mr. GRAHAM: All those he is notified of, but I suppose the really important meetings, at which dangerous matters are discussed, he gets no notice of, I suppose he makes an annual report?

Mr. REID: I do not think he does.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the minister in his waking or other hours ever read or seen a report from the director?

Mr. REID: I have never met the man, I do not know him, nor have I ever seen a report from him.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the Minister received any report on the advisability of taking over the Quebec and Saguenay railway?

Mr. REID: Perhaps the hon. member could give me some information about that.

Mr. MARCIL: I see that L'Evenement, the Government organ in Quebec, reproduces a despatch published the night before last by La Patrie of Montreal. The proprietor of La Patrie is one of the directors of the Quebec and Saguenay railway. He announces that the arrangement is completed for taking over this road and making it part of the Transcontinental, and that the resolution will be introduced in the House in a day or two. I thought the minister might be able to give me some information about that.

5 p.m.

Mr. REID: I cannot, for the reason that I have none. I did not even know until the hon. member mentioned it that the proprietor of La Patrie was a director of that railway.

Mr. MARCIL: He was appointed within the last three or four months.

Mr. REID: I have no information on that. The hon. member knows the condition of the Quebec and Saguenay railway. It was started, I understand, for the purpose of serving the people living along the north shore of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Murray bay, and is very nearly completed.

Mr. MARCIL: Does the minister know how many miles have been completed?

Mr. REID: I understand that it will not take very long to complete the road and put it into proper shape.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister must have been getting a lot of information about the road.

Mr. REID: Every one knows about it. If the hon. member does not want to hear any more about it, I certainly am not anxious to continue.

Mr. MARCIL: I am anxious to know something about it. I will read this despatch which may clear the way for further information. It is dated Ottawa, May 2:

The fate of the Quebec-Saguenay is practically settled. The Government will present, this afternoon or to-morrow, the first resolutions to the effect of taking over the road to complete it and put it into operation as soon as possible. We do not know yet the details of the intentions of the minister beyond the fact that the Quebec-Saguenay will be added to the Transcontinental railway. This project is not included in the Bill relating to the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific.

It is a separate affair, but it is understood that it will pass. It is not expected that there will be any strong opposition.

The people of the district are naturally interested in knowing what kind of a railway it is, how many miles have been built, where it leads to, and what remains to be done. If it is to be a Government railway, I would like to know something about it.

Mr. REID: I do not know and I do not say that it is going to become part of the Government railway system. I have no information that that has been decided upon. The hon. member has asked what condition the road is in. Our railway officials know what condition it is in.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister went over it.

Mr. REID: Yes, he went over it and he knows its condition. In addition to that, Parliament has subsidized the road and has paid a large amount of money in subsidies and of course, before doing so, the Department of Railways and Canals must have had a report of the condition of the road. So far as I understand, it was the intention of the promoters of that road to run a railway between Quebec and Murray Bay and eventually it was intended to extend the road to St. Catherines bay, as a winter harbour, opposite Tadoussac. The train service between Quebec and Ste. Anne de Beaupré, a distance of about thirty miles, is owned by the Quebec Light, Heat, and Power Company, and I understand is a good paying railway.

Mr. MARCIL: That is an electric service.

Mr. REID: Yes. From Ste. Anne de Beaupré to Murray Bay is a distance of sixty miles. In that locality there are many people who have been settled there for years and who have no railway service, and this railroad was intended to serve those people. Those who were building the road spent a very large sum of money on it and they got the road almost completed when financial difficulties arose and the road was not finished, although it would have taken very little money at that time to complete it. After the Minister of Railways returned from his trip over that road, I heard his statement in regard to it and I was greatly surprised as to its condition and as to the service it would give to the people on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. The road is so nearly completed that it is a pity to leave it in its present condition. For the benefit of the people between Murray Bay and Quebec, the road should be completed; and for our traffic between Quebec and the lower St. Lawrence during the season a road on that side of the river is just as justifiable as one on the south side. That is only my private opinion. There are, I suppose, members on both sides of the House who know the condition of that road much better than I do. I would like to know from my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) now that he has heard what I have stated, if he, knowing that locality, thinks a railroad is justified on that side of the river where there are so many people, or if he thinks the service they have had for so many years, with steamers crossing to the other side, is all that is necessary for that part of the country.

Mr. MARCIL: I have never been over the road, but I understod that a railway, like any other facility, would be a good thing for that locality. It all depends upon the conditions under which the road is built. I understand that the only part of the road now being operated is in the neighbourhood of Murray bay; that from Ste. Anne de Beaupré to Quebec there is an electric service, and that a great deal of work remains to be done on the steam road. I do not know whether the Government is seriously considering the extension of the road from Murray bay to St. Catherines bay and establishing a winter port there. Winter navigation has been declared possible in the St. Lawrence by special boats, but it remains to be seen whether the Government will undertake the work or whether any company will be found willing to do it. We have heard of this railway being more or less of a stock-jobbing enterprise; it has been on the Montreal Exchange for a long time, the stock jumping up and down, so that the people have become more familiar with it in that way than with its real work as a railway. I do not know what amount of money has been invested in the road or whether it has been invested by Canadians or not, but I believe a large number of Parisians were glad to get their money out of it. What I wanted to know was, as the Government papers have been announcing that the road was to be taken over, what position the road was in, so that we would be in a position to criticise or to approve.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps this discussion in regard to the Quebec-Saguenay is a little premature. The minister has given us his argument why the Government should aid that road. Perhaps that is also premature—I do not know—but for a man who did not know anything about the road, the minister told us quite a few things, which would indicate, of course, that the Government had been studying the situation.

Mr. REID: I said that those were the facts in the department.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have been in the department and I know how much study a minister would make of a special line unless something came up specially in regard to it.

Mr. REID: When I was acting for the Minister of Railways, not now, but some time ago, the subsidies came due as the road was being built, and, of course, when they came up before me, I would not consent to those subsidies being paid without having a report from the chief engineer or inspector as to the condition of the road. Therefore the whole matter came before me in that way months and months ago, and I knew the condition of the road from those reports. Besides, the money spent on the road must be proved to the satisfaction of the chief engineer before amounts are paid.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is information about the road, but it is not a reason for the minister arguing strongly for the Government acquiring the road. It has been suggested that this road can be purchased under the Branch Lines Act without the matter being brought to the attention of the House until after the purchase is made. But I would call the attention of the minister and of the Government to the fact that that could not be done without treating this House unfairly, and—I say it courteously—without proper respect.

Mr. ROGERS: Without proper respect?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, it cannot be bought under the Branch Lines Act without treating this House without proper respect. When the Branch Lines Act was before the House the question of the railways to which it could be applied was discussed at some length. I will not read the whole discussion, but I would refer the hon. minister to page 1544 of Hansard of 1915, where he will find a few words in relation to the matter which I shall quote. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had been discussing at some length this question of purchase—

Mr. REID: Of this road?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, but the purchase of railways under the Act. And he asked this question:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier: We understand, then, that this legislation applies to the Intercolonial only?
>
> Sir Robert Borden: And to the Prince Edward Island railway. That is thoroughly understood.

So, that neither this railway nor any other that is not a branch line of the Intercolonial or the Prince Edward Island railway could be brought under this legislation, and the Prime Minister gave us assurance that it would not be done. I just bring this to the attention of the minister on account of the rumours in the corridors that this transaction has been completed under the Branch Lines Act, and that the particulars need not be brought before the House until next session if the arrangements are not completed until after the close of this session. So, it cannot be done in this way without treating the House unfairly and in violation of the assurance given by the Prime Minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When this question was transferred from this House to the Senate the same question was put to the leader of the Senate, and he declared in the most emphatic terms that the Branch Lines Bill did not contemplate adding to the system of the Transcontinental, the Quebec and Saguenay, mentioning that road by name. Also, he stated most positively that the Branch Lines Bill applied only to the Intercolonial. Now, we are to sit on Saturday at two o'clock. We are all anxious to prorogue and go home. I would advise the Government not to introduce any more contentious legislation; we already have our hands full. Not that I am against the completion of that road, but there are so many things in, and around, and behind that road that really the Government would have to extend the sittings of this House to have considered properly.

Mr. ROGERS: Replying to the remarks of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), and also those of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), I am afraid these hon. gentlemen are giving themselves unnecessary worry about this Government undertaking to do anything behind the back of Parliament, or in con-

travention of any statute in existence. We, as my hon. friend has stated, are a Government of study. We have studied the conditions of the Quebec and Saguenay, and the situation in the West, and in other parts of Canada as well, in connection with proposed railway legislation, and when the proper time comes to make known our conclusions from that study my hon. friend need not be alarmed but that those conclusions will be made known to the House and to the country in a very open manner. I have promised the House already to-day that any further legislation, or any further matters to be presented to this House, will be announced to-morrow.

Mr. GRAHAM: That does not touch the point I raised.

Mr. ROGERS: What is that?

Mr. GRAHAM: That if it were brought under the Branch Lines Act it would not have to be announced to-morrow.

Mr. ROGERS: If the hon. gentleman had paid attention to what I said, he would have known that I said he was giving himself unnecessary worry about that.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister's speech does not lessen it any.

Mr. McKENZIE: The presence of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) as leader of the House reminds me of something that happened two or three years ago. On an occasion when he was leading the House, I moved a resolution which was to the effect that in the opinion of the House the time had arrived when the Intercolonial railway with its branches should be extended into the non-railway sections of eastern Canada. The question was very fully discussed and a number of members, particularly those from eastern Canada, spoke in the debate. When we were all through, the minister, who had already spoken on the subject, accepted the resolution. The non-railway sections of eastern Canada referred to in the resolution included certain sections of Quebec, of New Brunswick, and of Nova Scotia. Since then, of course, war conditions have arisen and that is an excuse, and a good excuse I suppose, for the cutting down of large public expenditures. But when we are discussing railway matters, as mover of that resolution, and always bearing in mind that the resolution was accepted by the Government, I think it my duty to remind the hon. ministers that that acceptance on their part stands on record and that it has prevented me from introducing again a resolution of that kind. When a government solemnly accepts a resolution it assents to the acts set forth in the resolution and should at the earliest moment carry out the scheme for which the resolution was declared. I am pleased to learn from the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) that he realizes the very great necessity of giving railway accommodation to the remote sections of this country. I hope that the day is not far distant when every part of this country will have the full benefit of railway connection. I have been a member of this House for a great many years, representing the county of Victoria and the northern part of Cape Breton. In North Cape Breton we are not complaining about railway facilities; we have a railway. But in the good old county of Victoria we have no railway at all. The county of Victoria extends along the shores of the Atlantic, with its splendid fisheries, for a distance of 110 or 120 miles, but in that whole distance we have not one foot of railway. The Government of the day, in 1911, shortly before the general election, had undertaken, by legislation and by vote, to build a railway into the county of Victoria, and a resolution which I brought forward some two or three years was accepted by the present Government. That resolution involved the extension of the railroad into the county of Victoria, and I now impress upon the Minister of Railways that whenever any move is made in the direction of further railway development in eastern Canada, he will not forget that that resolution has been accepted by this House, and that the carrying out of the terms of that resolution will involve the building of a road into the old county of Victoria.

Mr. REID: I shall be very glad, when the matter of further extension is considered, to take up that matter.

Mr. NESBITT: I should like to add my voice to that of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). If the Government intends to bring in any fresh legislation we may as well make up our minds to stay here all summer, and I am anxious to get home.

Mr. REID: I do not think there is anything more than has been indicated by the Minister of Public Works. If there is any further legislation to be introduced it will be announced to-morrow.

Consolidation of Railway Act, $2,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How is that work progressing?

Mr. REID: It is completed, I think, and ready for presentation to the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much has that cost?

Mr. REID: About $7,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY: With a Department of Justice, with a Minister of Justice, with a Solicitor General, with a Deputy Minister of Justice, and quite a large number of highly paid officials on the part of that department, with a solicitor to the Railway Department, with a general counsel to the Intercolonial, why should it be necessary to go outside for the drafting of a Bill to consolidate the Railway Act? Why employ outside counsel to the extend of over $7,000, the salary of a judge of the Superior Court for a whole year, and the salary of a Cabinet Minister?

Mr. REID: The solicitor who did this work was a long time at it.

Mr. GRAHAM: They usually are.

Mr. REID: As to going outside of the department, no man in the House knows better than the hon. member for St. John the work of the officials in the Department of Justice. They have a staff barely large enough to do the work in connection with the several departments of Government. They are all very busy, and it has always been the rule, in many important cases, to employ some outside counsel. In this case I suppose the Department of Justice had no official whom they could ask to devote his whole time to the consolidating of this Act. No Act is more important or requires more careful study than the Railway Act, and it was necessary to employ an experienced solicitor to deal with it. I think the work has been well done, and the consolidation is now ready for the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am told it will be necessary for the members to watch that consolidation very closely, as in many important points a sufficient number of words have been changed to alter the meaning of the Act. Not being a lawyer I should not know the significance of the changes, but I take this opportunity of telling legal members of the House that when the Bill comes up for consideration it will be necessary to investigate the changes very closely.

Mr. REID: There is no doubt that there have been a great many changes, but I understand that the solicitor who has this work in hand consulted with the Chairman of the Railway Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is his name?

Mr. REID: Mr. Samuel Price.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where does he live?

Mr. REID: He is now the Chairman of the Ontario Railway Commission. He originally came from St. Thomas. He is, from what I have learned, a very able man. At all events the work was carried on in consultation with the Chairman of the Railway Commission. When the Bill comes before the House it may be materially improved by the many able legal gentlemen who are members of this House. The consolidation as prepared will be at least a working basis, and I think it is one that will not require many changes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this simply embodying into the new Act the amendments which have been adopted since 1903?

Mr. REID: And any changes that may be deemed necessary in the old Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: Reverting to the St. Peter's canal, what progress is being made with the work and when is there a chance of the canal being opened? Who is really the contractor? Is it a corporation or an individual?

Mr. REID: The contractor is a person named W. H. Weller. He took the contract when it was tendered for, and has been working on it ever since and will complete it. I have this memorandum on the work:

> The main portion of the excavation has been completed. The concrete work in the lock walls is nearly completed. Work is proceeding on the remodelling of the old lock gates which will be hung as soon as ready. By this time it is expected that the lock concrete will be fully completed and a small barrier of rock at the canal end of the lock will have been removed.
>
> A few weeks' work in dredging out the west wall of the old lock, after the lock gates are hung will enable us to open the canal for traffic. Some minor works in the Atlantic entrance and in the prism of the existing canal will be carried out while the canal is in service.

I understand that it is expected the canal will be open for service in the month of July.

Mr. McKENZIE: What will be the depth of water on the mitre sill of the canal after the new works are completed?

Mr. REID: We are not increasing the depth materially; it will be about 19 feet on the mitre sill at low water.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to say a word with reference to the acquisition of branch lines. The minister will remember that in 1915 authority was given to the Government to acquire branch lines of the Intercolonial. I feel particularly charged with this duty owing to the absence of the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), because I remember that he took a great interest in this question, which, as the minister knows, was first urgently advocated by the late Mr. Emmerson. In the elections of 1911, the hon. member for Kings and Albert, which two counties are equally interested in the acquisition of a certain branch line, deemed the matter of such great importance that he wired the Prime Minister, who was then in Charlottetown, P.E.I., asking as to the policy of the Government in regard to the acquisition of branch lines of the Intercolonial. The Prime Minister wired back to the hon. member for Kings and Albert that it was the policy of the Conservative party to acquire branch lines of the Intercolonial, and that telegram was used with great effect by the hon. member for Kings and Albert in his candidature. I do not find any fault with that hon. gentleman for asking the question, or with the Prime Minister for replying in the way he did. But I have had a good many communications sent to me in reference to the taking over of these branch lines. The people feel that the delay has been very great. I think that only two branches have been taken over by this Government. For the information of the people of the Maritime Provinces, who are more especially interested in the carrying out of this policy which was unanimously approved by both parties in the House some years ago, I would ask the acting minister whether any steps have been taken towards the acquisition of other branch lines. I would think that before considering the acquisition of branch lines of the Transcontinental Railway, such as the Quebec and Saguenay railway, the Government ought to carry out the policy which it announced would be carried out in reference to branch lines of the Intercolonial.

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that we passed a Branch Lines Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, in 1915.

Mr. REID: Exactly; we made that step forward in order to be able to take over any branch lines which we desired. We have taken over two branch lines, but the hon. member knows that under the present war conditions we could hardly go ahead and take over more branch lines. The fact that we have taken over two shows that we are carrying out the policy which was announced by the Prime Minister, and we will continue to carry out that policy as soon as conditions permit.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I quite agree with the acting minister that this is not a good time to take on new obligations, but those who have communicated with me have heard rumours in regard to the taking over of a line which is not connected with the Intercolonial, and which was not included in the Branch Lines Act. As the minister can realize, they would naturally feel very much aggrieved if, before carrying out the policy which was approved by the House unanimously, the Government should make a new departure and take over a road which was not contemplated at the time, and which the Prime Minister, in 1915, expressly excluded from the contemplation of the Act then passed. I do not think that the people of the Maritime Provinces are anxious to have new obligations entered upon at present, but they feel that, before the Government take on heavy obligations in other directions, their claim ought to be considered. For instance, I had a letter the other day from a gentleman who takes a very great interest in the acquisition of branch lines in New Brunswick, which is included in the Act which was passed in 1915. He had heard rumours about large advances to the Canadian Northern Railway Company and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, more especially to the Canadian Northern, and he thought it would be a very great hardship upon the people of the Maritime Provinces if the Government should commit the country to further obligations with the Canadian Northern and be forgetful of the claims of the districts which are served by these branch lines in the Maritime Provinces. They feel that all parts of the country should be treated with equal consideration, and that the different railway companies should have equal justice.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital —Quebec bridge—construction, $3,450,000

Mr. REID: I was to give a statement as to the Quebec bridge. With reference to that I may read a memorandum from Mr. Monsarrat, the chief engineer, dated Mont-

real, December 2, 1915. The memorandum is as follows:

I beg to report progress in connection with the construction of the Quebec bridge for period ending November 30, 1915, as follows:

Superstructure. Since my last report the work on the north shore has progressed rapidly, and at the present time the entire cantilever arm has been completed, thus completing practically all the steelwork for the north shore, which is in accordance with the programme mapped out by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company. There still remains a certain amount of riveting and erection of sidewalk, which will be done next year.

Work has already been started on the dismantling of the erection traveller, which will be taken down and re-erected at Sillery cove, to be used in connection with the erection of the suspended span at that point.

On the south side the programme of the contractor was also carried out, and practically all steelwork completed up to and including the main post over the main pier. There still remains a certain amount of riveting to be done on this work, but this will not be done until next season. Portions of the steel falsework supporting this anchor arm are now being removed and will be used in connection with the erection of the suspended span.

Next year the south cantilever arm will be erected, after which the suspended span will be floated into place and suspended from the two ends of the cantilever arms. The work of the erection of the suspended span will be commenced early in the spring and will be completed by the time the cantilever arm is ready to receive it.

The status of the work in the shop and field is as follows:

	Tons.
Raw material ordered from the mills	69,038
Raw material received at the shop...	66,908
Fabricated at the shop..	56,145
Members delivered at the site.. ..	55,434
Steel erected and partially riveted.	36,087
Net weight of erected bridge, estimated at..	65,000

Removal of unused steel. The contractor for this work entirely completed his contract to our satisfaction.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) C. N. Monsarrat,
Chairman and Chief Engineer.

I want it to be noted that this report is dated December 2, 1915, so that when the chief engineer says that the south arm will be erected next year, it means during the present year, 1916. Mr. Monsarratt told me that they are now well on with the work. The statement of expenditure is:

Total expenditure to March 31, 1914, including cost of collapsed bridge	$12,732,062 71
Expenditure to March 31, 1915	2,816,305 10
Expenditure to Oct. 31, 1915 ..	2,709,253 24
	$18,257,621 05

Of the above amount $10,473,346.38 has been expended on the new bridge.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not quite see why the minister puts into the cost of this bridge the cost of the bridge that collapsed. We made a certain contract for this bridge, the contract was on estimated quantities and it will cost not a great deal more than the estimate, but it will cost some more. The real cost under this contract has no connection with the collapsed bridge so far as the value we are getting under this contract is concerned. When does my hon. friend expect the bridge will be completed and this span floated into position?

Mr. REID: Mr. Monsarratt told me that he expects to have the last span in this fall, but of course, it will not be ready for operation by that time. It is going to take some time to do the riveting and finally to complete the structure. Speaking roughly, the bridge will be completed so that you can go across it this fall if there are no mishaps. With reference to the statement of my hon. friend as to why I included the expenditure on the collapsed bridge, I merely read what is in the memorandum before me, as supplied by the officials. However, $10,473,346.38 is all that has been expended on the new bridge, and, of course, the collapsed bridge has nothing to do with it. I suppose that has been carried on in the books and they have just copied it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I understand from the minister that they continued the construction of the bridge along the lines laid down originally by the commission. Mr. Monsarratt is the engineer, and with Mr. Monsarratt there is Mr. Snider—

Mr. REID: A commission was appointed; I think by my hon. friend (Mr. Graham). That commission remains exactly the same except that Mr. Snider died.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who took Mr. Snider's place?

Mr. REID: Mr. Monsarrat said the work was so nearly completed that they did not require another commissioner, but in order to carry out the commission as slated it was necessary to appoint some one else, and, speaking from memory an Order in Council was passed appointing Mr. H. P. Borden one of his assistant engineers.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is the secretary of the commission.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is Mr. Modjeska still on?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no fault to find with that. The difficulty in the first place

was to get a board of engineers that would agree on a plan. After the plan was agreed upon and the method of operation arranged for, I imagine they got over that part of the work for which they wanted Mr. Snider's advice particularly. Mr. Snider was one of the oldest bridge engineers on the continent, older, I think, than even Charlie Macdonald. I am glad to know that the work is going along successfully. There was a change made by the new commission in the style of the piers. Has the chief engineer reported if that has been found satisfactory?

Mr. REID: He told me that it was found perfectly satisfactory. They were enlarged, I think.

Mr. GRAHAM: I took perhaps a greater interest in that particular work than in anything that came before the department when I was there, because it was so difficult to get it started. I think the minister might intimate to the company that they might let members of Parliament know the day they intend to float this span into position. It is a matter of great interest. The House ought to know that this is the largest bridge of its kind ever constructed in the world. Its completion is of great interest to the people who have paid any attention to it, and more particularly is it of interest to the engineering world. Each end of this bridge is being constructed separately, one on the north side, and one on the south side, and the floating span will be floated into position. It means that this span will be floated into position at a point 160 feet above high water and the work of placing it in position must not occupy much more than a few seconds, or at all events a very small fraction of a minute because the tide must be taken advantage of to bring down this floating span and when it is put into position it must be put in there properly and fastened almost immediately or the current will take it beyond its position unless that is done. If other people are as interested in it as I am it would be a kindness to a great many if the minister would let the members know the particular day when the company intends to float that span into position, because it is something they may never have a chance to see again. That is the only point at which I tremble about the Quebec bridge, and I will sleep more peacefully at night when this span is successfully floated into position. It will require the greatest delicacy and skill. If there was still water at that point there would be lots of time to float the span in place; but as it is tidal water the work will have to be done very rapidly. Some people who have criticised this great undertaking have said that it will be impossible to accomplish it in tidal water. I want the minister to promise that he will let me know the day the span will be floated in.

Mr. REID: I quite agree that the putting in of the last span will be a great feat, and I for one should like to see that great event.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You might take us all.

Mr. REID: I shall be very glad indeed to see that every member of the House gets notice of the day so that if possible we may all be there to see the last span put in. It will be very difficult to do, but Mr. Monsarrat and those who have been constructing the bridge have been so successful with the work so far, that I am confident that if anybody can do it they can.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Ocean and river service—P.E.I. winter mail service, $11,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This is for the winter mail service to Prince Edward Island. It connects with the ice-boat service between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. The vote is the same amount as was voted last year. The expenditure for 1914-15 was $10,996 and about the same amount was expended up to the 31st of December, 1916.

Lighthouse and coast service—construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals, and providing suitable boats for carrying on construction work, $750,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Is any of that expenditure to be made in relation to Hudson bay navigation?

Mr. HAZEN: No. The expenditure for 1914-15 was $996,638.16. We are reducing the expenditure this year to $750,000. Up to the 31st of December, 1916, we expended $506,681.70. Out of this vote we provide all the new aids to navigation such as lighthouses, buoys, beacons, fog alarms and submarine signals, including apparatus and machinery, as well as all large repairs to existing aids and the replacing of obsolete buildings and apparatus by equipment suitable for the protection of modern heavy

draught vessels. It also includes the purchase of the plant necessary for the carrying on of the works, as well as the purchase of lands, wharves, etc., the erection of such supplementary works as may be required, the chartering of any boats that may be found temporarily necessary to properly carry out these works; the regulation of traffic in the Detroit river and such other places as may be found necessary, and the administration and operation of the lighthouse department at Prescott.

Mr. GRAHAM: That last item looks bad.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, anything at Prescott is naturally bad. That includes also all the minor works which have been decided on and which will be found necessary and urgent, between the present date and the end of March, 1917. There will also be the usual work to be done in connection with the various depots, workshops, etc., together with provision for extending the accommodation at such places as will be found absolutely necessary. The expenditures for last year will be found in detail in the marine report at pages 3, and 33 to 58.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who supplies the submarine signals?

Mr. HAZEN: A company that has been doing it for years, the International Submarine Signal Company.

Public works chargeable to capital—Marine Department—ship channel, river St. Lawrence —amount required for the completion of specially designed steamer to be used exclusively for testing and sweeping the river St. Lawrence channel.

Mr. HAZEN: There was less expended during the past year than we expected and so we have to revote a portion of the amount.

Ocean and river service—to provide for the construction of two steamers to replace the C.G.S. Quadra, $150,000.

Mr. HAZEN: A few months ago the steamer Quadra came into collision with a steamer of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company off the harbour of Nanaimo and was sunk. After getting the best opinion we could, we had the vessel sold as it lay. The estimated value of the vessel as reported by the officials of the department was $10,000. Tenders were asked for and four or five tenders were received, the highest being $9,500, or $500 less than the amount estimated by the officials of the department. We accordingly sold the vessel as it lay for $9,500. Our officials were of the opinion that it would not pay to raise the boat and repair it as it was a very old boat and the cost of repairing it would be great. Such a boat would cost usually about $150,000. We propose to replace it with two boats, the total cost of which will be about $150,000. We find that we can discharge the service better with two smaller boats costing in the gross the same amount as the larger vessel.

Mr. MACDONALD: Where are they to be built?

Mr. HAZEN: In British Columbia.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will each of those boats be a little swifter than the Quadra was?

Mr. HAZEN: They will be swifter and better adapted for the purpose for which they are intended, that is, the lighthouse service. They are not meant for the fishery service. Speed is not an essential, but they must be properly equipped with cranes, lifebuoys, etc.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are they to be wooden or steel vessels?

Mr. HAZEN: We have not definitely decided. The plans have not been prepared.

Lighthouse and coast service—amount required to pay a pension at the rate of $300 per annum from the date of retirement to the following pilots: Elzéar Godbout, Théophile Corriveau, Alphonse Pouliot, Emile Couillard, Treffié Délisle, Pierre Pepin Dumas, and Alfred Gaudreau, $2,400.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are pensions granted under any regulation?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, a regulation under Order in Council passed in the year 1906 or 1907 which has been acted upon ever since.

Marine hospitals—Seamen's Hospital Fund, $5,000.

Mr. HAZEN: This vote of $5,000 is being given in compliance with a request made by a large delegation including some members of Parliament on both sides of the House. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and some hon. members on that side, and my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) and some gentlemen on this side, some prominent citizens of Ottawa, and some Toronto gentlemen interested in this hospital, called upon us and asked us to give a subscription of a small amount. This hospital is situated on the Thames and is available to sailors from all parts of the world, including Canadian sailors. After these gentlemen had called upon me they furnished me with further data showing

that this hospital was rendering valuable services to our sailors who from time to time need hospital attention in that part of the world. It is a voluntary institution and among the subscribers is His Majesty the King. Over $30,000 had been raised by private subscription in Canada including a grant of $2,500 made by the Legislature of Ontario. At first, I was somewhat averse to this, but in view of the circumstances and the desire expressed I decided to ask for this vote. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the hon. member for Guysborough brought this matter up in the House and spoke of the admirable character of the hospital and the splendid service it rendered. His views as a shipping man of experience would naturally have weight with me. After considering the matter, I thought it fair to give the hospital a grant of $5,000 to supplement the subscriptions from private sources.

Mr. NESBITT: Is the hospital free to all sailors?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes; it is not for sailors of the navy, but for sailors of the merchant service.

Mr. MACDONALD: The claims of the hospital were not put forward as being in any way the result of the war?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MACDONALD: Nor is it intended that this should form the basis for a yearly grant?

Mr. HAZEN: Not at all. I understand that in consequence of the very generous subscriptions that people have been giving for purposes connected with the war they have had to curtail their subscriptions to this hospital. It is not intended that this should be an annual grant, and as I understand it there will be no occasion to ask Parliament for it again.

Fisheries—to provide for the inspection of pickled fish and the fish canneries, $25,000.

Mr. HAZEN: The Fish Inspection Act came into operation on the 1st of May, 1915. Before that time copies of the Act, with the full code of regulations attached, were distributed amongst those interested on the various parts of the coast, and the general inspector of pickled fish has visited the different sections of the coast and at meetings of the fishermen and packers fully explained the requirements for putting up fish. Over one hundred of these meetings were held. A staff of local inspectors was appointed. As the Act is not compulsory, no definite idea could be formed as to the extent to which it would be availed of at the start, and consequently as few inspectors as it was considered possible to get along with were appointed. The Atlantic coast was divided into six districts, as follows:

1. Cape Breton Island: inspector, H. H. Mann, North Sydney,
2. The south side of Nova Scotia from Antigonish to Yarmouth county inclusive, inspector, A. H. Hiltz, Mahone Bay.
3. The Bay of Fundy counties of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, including Westmorland county, N.B., inspector, A. O. H. Wilson, St. John.
4. The Magdalen Islands, Prince Edward Island, and Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou counties, Nova Scotia, inspector, Thomas Doyle, Rustico, P.E.I.
5. East coast of New Brunswick, inspector, Colson Hubbard, Carafuet.
6. Gaspé Peninsula and north shore of the gulf. No inspector has yet been appointed.

As the packing of barrels for the brand increases it will be imperative to appoint additional inspectors. As the past season was the initial one under the Act, it was not anticipated that many barrels would be put up for the brand. Few of the packers had provided themselves with barrels made in accordance with the regulations. There were, however, some put up on different parts of the coast, as follows:

1,160 barrels of alewives were put up for inspection and of these, 1,158 were found to be in accordance with requirements and were branded, namely, 899 in St. John county, all of which were branded, and 261 in North Sydney, 259 of which were branded.

58 barrels of herring were submitted for inspection in Gloucester county, New Brunswick, of which 43 were branded.

110 barrels of mackerel were submitted for inspection, of which 10 barrels were branded, namely, 100 barrels in Kings county, P.E.I., none of which were branded, and 10 barrels in Halifax, all of which were branded.

During the last fall the educational work among the packers and fishermen was again taken up in a personal way by the general inspector. Several of the larger packers in the United States have become interested in the brand and some of them have intimated their intention of requiring all the fish they buy next season to be put up for inspection. Owing to the war the herring fishery on the European side has been reduced to a minimum, leaving the markets on this continent practically bare. The Canadian dealers are realizing this and several of them are arranging to go into the putting up of herring according to regulation next season. One or two fish merchants went into the business last year and re-

ceived from 100 to 150 per cent more per barrel for their fish than they ever did previously. The Inspection Act, it would seem, has come into operation at a most opportune time; but the greatest care must be taken to have its provisions fully carried out, in order that the brand may become recognized on the markets as standing for the excellence of quality it indicates. If this is not done, any trade that may be built up will be lost again when normal conditions return.

Mr. MACDONALD: I desire to call attention again to matters of which I spoke on a previous occasion—the extension of the lobster fishing season in Northumberland straits. I was in Nova Scotia last week and saw the conditions at that time; the ice lay along the coast and fishing was not going on. The same conditions that arose last year obtain this year, and no doubt the need for an extension of the season will be urged upon the minister. I am satisfied that that extension should not be given except under special circumstances; but the conditions of this year ought to justify its favourable consideration.

Mr. HAZEN: The season does not close until the 25th of June, and it is too early to say yet what can be done; but we will watch conditions closely, and if they prove such that the fishermen have not had a fair opportunity to make what would be the catch of a normal year we will certainly consider the question of an extension.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have merely taken this opportunity to accentuate what I had already said. Along the Northumberland straits for the last two or three weeks the packers have had men under pay and have had their supplies ready, but they have not been able to fish. It is now the 4th of May. There is still ice all along that coast. If they do not begin fishing until next week, the minister will see that the season will be much shorter than it was agreed it should under the recommendations of the commission. Under these circumstances, where people will not have an opportunity of fishing for the period the commission recommended, it does seem to me that a case is made for an extension. I mention the matter now because I understand the minister is going away.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: What steps did the minister take last year to inform himself of the conditions when representations were made to him along the lines of those just made by the hon. member for Pictou; and what steps does he propose to take this year to acquaint himself with the conditions with a view to meeting the wishes of fishermen?

Mr. HAZEN: When representations are made we ask the inspector to investigate and make a special report for the information of the department, and we will take the same course this year.

Fisheries Marine Biological Board of Canada, $26,000.

Mr. HAZEN: A new boat is required for the oyster culture business to replace the Ostrea which was built in 1902 and is absolutely worn out and unfit for service. The new boat is now being built at the Government shipyard at Sorel. She will be equipped with oyster dredging apparatus and will be able to do more work, and more effective work, than the Ostrea.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: Some experiments were carried on in connection with the herring business last year, with headquarters at Souris. Will similar work be carried on this year?

Mr. HAZEN: The Marine Biological Board of Canada is composed of a number of gentlemen, one of them an official of the department, Professor Prince, who is a specialist and a biologist, and the other gentlemen from different Canadian universities, who serve practically without remuneration, simply for their expenses. Professor MacCallum, of Toronto University, takes a great interest in this work. There are also gentlemen from the university of Acadia, and from one or two others thoughout Canada. There is a biological station at St. Andrews and another at Prince Rupert. During this year the board has been doing very good work on the Atlantic in the continuation of experiments in the hatching and rearing of lobsters, and a continuation of the study of the natural history of the herring. On the Pacific, it has been investigating the question of kelp groves. Kelp is quite abundant along the shores of British Columbia, and it is claimed that it has very economic value and can be used for many different purposes. The board has also been making, on the Pacific, a study of the natural history of the halibut.

In connection with the study of the natural history of the herring, the services of Dr. Hjort were secured. Doctor Hjort is the director of the Nor-

wegian Fisheries, and is one of the most eminent experts on the herring. Keeping in view the vast possibilities of the herring fishery on this side of the Atlantic, it was considered well to arrange for Doctor Hjort's services when it was found out that such could be had last year. In order that he might be able to cover as much of the field as possible, packages of herring caught at different times of the year were procured on different parts of the coast for his examination on his arrival. After close consultation, it was considered that the end in view could best be achieved by placing at his disposal the department's steam drifter "33" for experimental fishing, dredging and tow-netting operations, and to arrange for two of the department's steamers to take him over desirable portions of the Gulf and Atlantic, so as to make hydrographic and other investigations. The final arrangement for these trips of investigation was as follows: Three trips were to be made in the cruiser Princess, over the Gulf, to start from Prince Edward Island and go northward to the Natashquan bank on the north shore, thence eastward to the Bay of Islands, Newfoundland, thence to St. George's bay, Newfoundland, and back to the place of starting. Three trips in the steamer Acadia on the Atlantic coast, going over Sable Island, thence to Banquero, to Miquelon Island, thence over the Green Bank to the Grand Bank of Newfoundland, thence up to Cape Race, thence back to the point of starting. The first trips were to be made in the early part of May, when the herring and other fish were spawning and when winter conditions would obtain in the sea; the second in June when the larvae of these fish would be in the water, and the third, at the end of July or in August, when the distribution of young fish, herring, cod, etc., could be studied, and when the summer conditions of the sea are fully advanced in the different water layers (currents). Owing to the unusually late spring, it was not found possible to start as early as expected, so that only two trips of investigation could be made, but these were carried out to the eminent satisfaction of Doctor Hjort, and in his opinion, much valuable and interesting information was obtained. The aims of the investigations were:

1. To obtain an understanding of the hydrographic conditions,—temperatures, salinities and currents.

2. To obtain material for a general description of the floating animal and plant life in the different layers of water on which the important food fish feed.

3. To ascertain where the eggs and larvae of the different food fish are found, so as to know where they may be caught during the spawning season.

This information should throw light upon the general distribution of fishes in Canadian waters, and especially on the races and growth of the fishes. Also, important information for the same purpose was to be collected by the 33. Owing to the late date that the ice remained in the Gulf, the first trip was made in the Atlantic on the Acadia, which started on the 29th May. The cruise was a highly successful one, the weather being favourable, enabling continuous work to be done day and night. Temperatures at different depths, and samples of water to enable the salinities thereof to be ascertained, were taken at stations twenty miles apart. The first cruise in the Gulf was taken in the Princess, starting on the 9th June. A second cruise was made in the Acadia, over the same area as the first one, in July, and in the Princess in August. The 33 was engaged throughout the summer in carrying on fishing and other operations in the Gulf, around Cape Breton, and as far out as Newfoundland.

Associated with Doctor Hjort in these investigations were Professor Willey, of McGill University, Doctor Huntsman, of Toronto University, Doctor J. A. Mavor, of Toronto University, and Doctor Bjerkan, a Norwegian. All the material collected could not be immediately worked up, and it was not expected that it could be completed before the end of last year or the first part of this one, so that Doctor Hjort's final report will not likely be available for a few weeks yet, but as soon as it is available copies will be printed for distribution.

I understand that the fishing people of Nova Scotia, the Halifax Board of Trade and others who had the pleasure of hearing Dr. Hjort's addresses, were very much pleased with the information he was able to give them, and are hopeful of very good results from the investigation which he is carrying on. He believes that the herring which visit our shores, and which are now caught near the shore, are not by any means the best herring, and that to get the best it is necessary to go farther out into the sea. It is to ascertain, among other things, where the schools will be found farther out in the sea that this investigation is being carried on.

Mr. HUGHES: Will any work of this kind be carried on during the coming year or will this work be completed when Dr. Hjort's report is completed?

Mr. HAZEN: I think that the work will be completed when we get his report, in a few weeks. It may be that the report will be such that it may be considered desirable to carry on further experiments, but I do not think so, and that is the opinion of the technical officers of the department.

Mr. HUGHES: If the work is finished and the services of Dr. Hjort and his assistants will not be needed this year, I shall refrain from making a few remarks I intended to make. Otherwise I should feel it my duty to make them. Perhaps there is nothing in them, but I know that as a matter of fact Dr. Hjort, when discussing the war, was, to say the least, not anti-German. I think it would be well, if the matter is not pressing, to suspend the work for a year.

Mr. HAZEN: I do not think there will be any further need for going on with it another year.

Mr. LOGGIE: I would like to take this opportunity of drawing the minister's attention once again to the necessity for protecting the lobster fishing industry and preventing, if possible, illegal fall fishing. When this matter was before the House on a previous occasion, the minister remarked that practically no illegal fall fishing went on during last year. I know of one case where 150 cases of lobsters without labels were offered to a buyer. The buyer did not purchase the goods, but I have no doubt that they found a market somewhere. While the labels afford a certain protection, they are not a protection against illegal fishing. What the minister requires to do is to stop the work while it is being done; that is to say, to stop the men who go from the shores, bring their lobsters in at night, and can them in the woods or in their houses. These lobsters will find a market. If they cannot sell them in the fall, they will sell them in the following season. The minister can never hope to stop illegal fishing by simply employing cutters along the coast, distributing traps, and insisting upon labels on the boxes. He requires to have men who will be fearless in the discharge of their duties, and who, when they find men guilty of illegal fishing, will punish them severely. If this were followed up, the practice might be stopped, but I do not think you can stop it with the procedure which has been followed for a number of years past. I know of this one case; I do not know if the parties were illegally fishing, but I know that the lobsters were offered for sale without labels. I do not know whether they found a purchaser or not.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend has a thorough understanding of the lobster business, and his views are entitled to every respect, and will have every consideration. It is not an easy matter to prevent illegal fishing. My hon. friend knows that, during the past few years, the officers of the department have been more successful in dealing with illegal fishing than in previous years. The statement made by my hon. friend that 150 cases had been offered for sale without labels, is a serious one, and I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me, not in the House, but in confidence, who were the parties, as that might help us to guard against similar violations in future. The hon. gentleman's suggestion is, I understand, that illegal fall fishing cannot be successfully prevented by the system of patrolling the coasts, but that it is necessary to have officers, at higher salaries than are paid now, who would live outside the district altogether perhaps, appear on the scene at unforeseen times, and perhaps catch the guilty parties red-handed. I understand that that is what he suggests.

Mr. LOGGIE: They would have to be there all the time.

Mr. HAZEN: If they were there all the time, the fishermen would naturally guard against them. If, as in the case of bank inspectors, they did not know when the officers might appear there would be a better chance of catching them. We will give consideration to my hon. friend's views.

Mr. HUGHES: The minister states that his officers have been more successful than in previous years. The reverse is the case in the province of Prince Edward Island. Some officers, I think they are called overseers, are certainly not as active there as their predecessors were. These overseers are remiss in the discharge of their duties in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has the minister been in receipt of any protests from persons engaged in the lobster industry in the Maritime Provinces, soliciting his intervention with the British Government with the view of having canned lobsters omitted

from the list of imports prohibited. In former years the British market was the most important market for those engaged in the canned lobster business.

Mr. HAZEN: We have had representations of that sort. Of course, it is a matter that more directly comes within the purview of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I took the matter up with the Minister of Trade and Commerce who, I understand has made representations. Up to the present, no embargo has been placed upon canned lobsters, I understand, and I am hopeful that none will be.

Civil Government—Department of the Naval Service—to provide for one clerkship in First Division, sub-division "B," $2,100; to provide for one clerkship in Second Division, sub-division "B," $800; to provide for four clerkships in Third Division, sub-division "B," $2,000.

Mr. HAZEN: The first item is to provide for the appointment of an officer to act as assistant to the Superintendent of Fisheries. This officer is being brought in from one of the outside divisions to assist the superintendent in the important work of this branch. It is proposed to appoint this officer at the minimum of $2,100.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is he?

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Ward Fisher. The second item is to provide a vacancy for the appointment, at the minimum salary of $800 of an officer in the hatcheries branch of the fisheries. It has been necessary lately to employ a temporary officer for this purpose. The third item is to provide for the appointment of four stenographers at the minimum salary of $500 yearly. A large number of temporary stenographers are at present employed, and owing to the great inconvenience of changing these clerks repeatedly it is considered that four permanent appointments should be provided for.

Mr. MACDONALD: I assume that Mr. Fisher will be employed in the Fisheries Branch.

Mr. HAZEN: Entirely.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has he any qualifications for the position?

Mr. HAZEN: He was a fishery inspector in Nova Scotia, and his services as such were so extremely satisfactory that the officials of the department recommended his appointment.

Mr. MACDONALD: His qualifications must have been gained very speedily because it is only within the last few years that he changed from being a fisher of men to a fisher of fish; he was a clergyman in western Nova Scotia. He seems to have been anxious to serve his country for a consideration and he is made a fishery inspector largely on account of his political activity, so I understand. What particular duties is he performing in the department?

Mr. HAZEN: His duties are to assist the Superintendent of Fisheries. The work of the department has increased very largely. The superintendent needs his assistance in order to carry out successfully the work of his department. Mr. Fisher, in addition to being a preacher, was a newsman, and therefore is an all round man. At any rates his services are thoroughly satisfactory to the fishery officers of the department; they regard him as a very intelligent and competent man.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would have thought that Mr. Hockin, who was fishery officer in Northumberland straits, would have been—

Mr. HAZEN: He is a gentleman of over seventy.

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not know that he was that old.

Mr. HAZEN: He is a pretty old man.

Mr. MACDONALD: How old is this gentleman of varied occupations?

Mr. HAZEN: I am told that he is 43 or 44.

Mr. MACDONALD: He has managed to combine, within a very brief span, varied and interesting occupations. I fail to see, however, how he could have developed in the space of two or three years the special qualifications that would entitle him to precedence over other fishery officers in the Dominion. Some of my hon. friends from Nova Scotia who are interested in this matter would like to refer to it; or if my hon. friend has any other items perhaps he would just wait a minute.

Mr. HAZEN: These are all the items.

Mr. MACDONALD: Who is succeeding him in his former position?

Mr. HAZEN: The appointment of the local inspector has not been made yet. It will be made in a very short time.

Mr. MACDONALD: What are the counties in his district?

Mr. HAZEN: From Halifax west.

Mr. MACDONALD: On the south shore, or does he take in the Bay of Fundy?

Mr. HAZEN: On the south shore and up into the Bay of Fundy. His district would take in Kings and Digby.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has he passed the Civil Service examination?

Mr. HAZEN: No, he does not have to.

Mr. HAZEN: He has to get a certificate from the Civil Service Commission as to his qualifications.

Mr. LOGGIE: I regret that I was not in when the item to provide for the inspection of pickled fish and fish canneries was under consideration. May I ask the minister what is included in the provision made for the inspection of fish canneries? Has there been any appointment made in connection with this inspection, and what is the nature of the work?

Mr. HAZEN: Wherever necessary we ask our local inspectors in the different localities to inspect canneries.

Mr. LOGGIE: That is to inspect the quality of the products of the canneries?

Mr. HAZEN: No; the Act does not provide that. The inspection is made under the provisions of the Canned Food Act.

Mr. LOGGIE: The Canned Food Act does not take in canned fish.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes. The duty of administering that part of the Act which applies to fish canning establishments was handed over by the Department of Agriculture, which previously administered it, to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We are using our own staff for that purpose now. We have not appointed any new officials or added to the expense in consequence of it.

Mr. LOGGIE: Your regular officials are to pass upon how to pack the goods and give directions as to how they are to be packed?

Mr. HAZEN: No, the Act does not make any provision of that sort at all. Under the Act, their duty is to see that the operations in the canneries are carried on in a sanitary manner.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who has been appointed to the steamer Princess which was formerly commanded by Commander Wakeham?

Mr. HAZEN: Dr. Joseph Bernier.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who is he?

Mr. HAZEN: He comes from Chandler, Gaspé county, Que. Like his predecessor, Commander Wakeham, he is a physician. Dr. Wakeham was a physician when he was appointed. Dr. Bernier is a gentleman who has taken a very great interest in the fisheries, he was recommended by a gentleman in whom we have the greatest confidence and the officials of the department thought he possessed the qualifications to enable him to carry out this work in a proper manner. I do not expect that for a little while he will be the equal to Dr. Wakeham, who had a very long experience and to whom the work was a labour of love. He did a great deal of good along the coast entirely apart from the fact that he was the fishery inspector. He did much work of a benevolent and philanthropic character, and being a physician, and a very good physician, in many cases he gave free of charge his services to people in out of the way places. I only hope that Dr. Bernier will discharge the duties of his office in a way that will measurably compare with the satisfactory manner in which Commander Wakeham discharged his duties.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I concur in what has been said by my hon. friend about Dr. Wakeham. His loss is Canada's loss. He was possibly one of the best officials any Government has ever had and in the distant regions of the Gulf his name is a household word. He was not only an able and experienced physician, but he was a peacemaker. On many occasions Dr. Wakeham was called in by the fishermen to settle any possible conflict arising between them, or between them and the Crown or the department. He was also exceedingly well versed in knowledge of the fisheries. He had been on several occasions requested by the Washington, as well as the Ottawa, authorities to report on the condition of the fisheries in the Gulf. No man was more interesting to listen to than Dr. Wakeham on that special subject. He was also an authority on winter navigation and on the harbour facilities of the indented coast of Labrador. In fact, I do not know how Commander Wakeham can be replaced. I have been for several years connected, politically as its representative, with the county of Gaspé. I do not know Dr. Bernier personally. I wish him all success in his new career. I hope that he will never forget that he succeeds—he does not replace—Dr. Wakeham, and that he will have

to measure up to a pretty high standard if he wishes to become the able public servant that Dr. Wakeham was.

Mr. MARCIL: I am very glad to corroborate in every respect what the hon. member for Rouville has said about the late Commander Wakeham. I have had the pleasure of coming in touch with him, and I know that he was a very painstaking official, probably one of the best in the department. He followed another distinguished man, the Hon. Pierre Fortin, who was the first commander of La Canadienne. and who established the fishery service shortly after Confederation, his work extending away up to the coast of Labrador. Both these gentlemen were of very high standing and rendered valuable service to the people along the gulf of the St. Lawrence. I hope that Dr. Bernier, who is a very young man, will be able to measure up to the position that has devolved upon him. It will be time enough to judge of his worth when we have heard of his actions. I should like to know how Quebec stands regarding the tidal fisheries. Does the department intend giving licenses this year.

Mr. HAZEN: We are awaiting the decision of the courts, and shall issue no licenses until the court decides we have a right to. By agreement between the Department of Justice and the Attorney General's Department of the province of Quebec a stated case is to go to the Court of Appeal, I think it is, in the province of Quebec this year, with the understanding that an appeal shall lie from that Court to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. LOGGIE: I understood the minister to say that the inspection of fish was turned over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by the Department of Agriculture, and I think the minister implied that the inspection was of the building only.

Mr. HAZEN: That is so.

Mr. LOGGIE: Under the Agriculture Department they inspect the product as well —canned fruits, for instance. The inspector goes around the factory and sends samples to headquarters, and they are then passed upon. I understand the situation now. It is simply an inspection of the building that the department carries out, to see whether it is in a sanitary condition. Am I right?

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: Are the licenses of traps for bait fish confined to any area, and what responsibilities devolve upon them?

Mr. HAZEN: The area within which a man must fish is stated in his license.

Mr. HUGHES: Do any restrictions accompany the license, as to whom the bait shall be sold? If not, the man can sell fish to his friends and refuse to sell to other people. He would have great power in his hands.

Mr. HAZEN: He is a free agent and can sell to whom he pleases. The licenses for lobster fishing are not restricted as regards the selling of the fish.

9 p.m.

Mr. HUGHES: I was speaking of bait fish.

Mr. HAZEN: They are not restricted either.

Mr. HUGHES: The minister can see what power that gives the licensee. He could refuse to sell to some fishermen and practically put them out of business.

Mr. HAZEN: The number of traps are not limited; any one can get a license.

Mr. HUGHES: What about the area within which a man can fish? In the ordinary harbour there would not be room for more than one trap.

Mr. HAZEN: A man is given a license to fish in the area for which he applies, provided there are not too many people fishing there already. Speaking off-hand, I think these traps must not be within 2,000 feet of one another; that is the only limitation.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the licensee to pay a fee?

Mr. HAZEN: Only a nominal fee.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this a new regulation?

Mr. HAZEN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: It does not apply to the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. HAZEN: There is no trap fishing there, but if there was, this regulation would apply to the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. HUGHES: The licenses are granted yearly?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. LOGGIE: What is the rate?

Mr. HAZEN: Five dollars for the first ten fathoms, and 10 cents a fathom after that.

Mr. HUGHES: Is that for the leader?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: The last time these Estimates were up I made the suggestion that on the permanent Shell Fish Commission there should be at least one representative from the mainland of the province of Quebec. The only representative we have now is Mr. Azade Arsenault, of the Magdalen Islands, and he is not at all familiar with conditions prevailing on the north shore of the Baie des Chaleurs, in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. In the last sixteeen years I have repeatedly made the request to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a change in the dates of the lobster fishing season. This industry in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure is in a very precarious position, and has been for years past. It is claimed, whether rightly or wrongly, that the dates are not what they should be. It is well into May before the fishermen can start and they are stopped too early in the season. It is claimed that they would do better with an open season in the fall. The officials of the department have had very decided views on this and I do not think they have changed their views in these many years. I think if a competent man from the mainland of Quebec, who was familiar with the conditions, were appointed to this commission, he might be able to bring before the department the views of the residents of that locality. This Mr. Azade Arsenault is a very good man, as far as the Magdalen Islands are concerned, but they are hundreds of miles out at sea, and conditions there are altogether different from what they are in Quebec.

Railways and canals, chargeable to capital—to the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, for a subsidy for a branch line from a point on its line as located, situated near the Spirit river settlement, to and through the Grande Prairie Land District, Alberta, for a distance not exceeding sixty miles; on the same terms and conditions as subsidies were granted in aid of the construction of certain railways as embodied in the Act 3-4 Geo. V, Cap. 96, 1913, $384,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I want to protest against this system of providing for subsidies. I am not arguing against the payment of this subsidy; I am rather in favour of it; I am arguing against the system that has been adopted of putting the aid to railways in the Estimates instead, as has always been the custom so far as I can remember, of bringing them in by way of resolution upon which a Bill will be founded and finally passed. Whether designedly or not, the placing of aid to railways in the Estimates restricts the rights of the members of this House. Estimates are introduced by the minister as a message from His Royal Highness the Governor General, signed by his own hand, and every one knows that the power of a member to deal with an item in the Estimates is very limited; he can move to reduce or to strike out, but from a practical standpoint he can make no amendment. While that objection might possibly not be serious in this case, the aid of $15,000,000 to the Canadian Northern is put in the Estimates in this hitherto unheard of way which restricts the members of this House from expressing their views as they would like to, and of making amendments that might be made if the aid were brought down by way of resolution. The same is true with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Therefore the members of the House will have to take these Estimates and move for their reduction, or that they be struck out, or else let them go through. In the ordinary way questions of aid are introduced by way of resolutions which have to go through a certain routine, which routine gives many opportunities to members to discuss them, to vary them, to reduce them, to change them, to make amendments in any way they like. The resolutions, after they are introduced, go before a committee and are taken up clause by clause and amendments can be made, and not one case out of a dozen goes through without amendments being moved and many of them adopted. When the Canadian Northern railway resolution was going through the Government accepted amendments from this side, but here the opportunity of making amendments is very much restricted, and members will find, when they come to move, if they do, amendments to the aid proposed to be given to the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific that they are very much curtailed in their privileges, and unless they are prepared to reduce the aid, or to strike it out, they might as well not say anything.

Further, this method of procedure is not fair to the upper chamber, because it practically precludes that chamber from dealing with the matter at all. Whether that was the design or not, that is the result.

Estimates for money expenditures originate in this House, and, after they are passed, they are embodied in a Supply Bill, which is passed by this House and then goes to the Senate. The only power that the Senate has is to throw out the entire Supply Bill that has been passed by the House of Commons, and that would be a pretty serious matter. If a subsidy Bill were brought in by itself the Senate could discuss it, as they have a right to do; they could make amendments if necessary, and refer them back to the House of Commons for consideration.

Mr. REID: I cannot agree with all that the hon. member has said. It is true that when the Estimates are brought down they must be signed by His Royal Highness the Governor General, but the same thing applies in the case of resolutions; before we can introduce a money resolution the Governor General must sanction.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a different matter.

Mr. REID: No, it is an expenditure of money.

Mr. GRAHAM: He does not sign it at all?

Mr. REID: As to the subsidy resolutions that have been brought down for many years, the roads proposed to be subsidized were still to be built. There are often amendments made as to the conditions under which a road should be built, or the route may be changed, and so on. But the proposed aids to the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific are not like the usual subsidies per mile; they are simply loans to pay interest that has been paid, or is payable, in connection with a railway that is completed and in operation.

Mr. GRAHAM: What about this one?

Mr. REID: I was referring to the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific first. I cannot see any objection to bringing the aid down in that way. No amendments could be made to the aid even if it were introduced by resolution. It is simply an amount loaned to the railways to pay interest and the deficit on operating expenses.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does not my hon. friend see that if this aid were brought in by way of resolution, a member could move an amendment to the resolution that the money be given on the condition that the Canadian Northern should do such and such things? By putting this aid in the Estimates, a member is precluded from doing that.

Mr. REID: A member might move an amendment such as is suggested by the hon. member, but the aid is intended only to pay interest, etc. No matter what the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk Pacific may do—

Mr. GRAHAM: It does not make any odds what the aid is for.

Mr. REID: You might move an amendment that, if carried, would embarrass the roads.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the right of Parliament.

Mr. REID: A member has the right to move to reduce the amount.

Mr. MARCIL: Why did the minister not bring the matter down in the ordinary way as a money resolution?

Mr. REID: That might have been done, but I do not see any objection to this method of procedure. So far as the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific are concerned, these aids are not subsidies at all, they are loans at a simple rate of interest, charged up to the road.

Mr. GRAHAM: What does the minister say in regard to my other point? By putting the amounts in the Estimates, the Government has deprived the Senate of dealing with the matter except by throwing out the Supply Bill, which covers all the money required for all the purposes of Canada for the coming year.

Mr. REID: They cannot throw those items out without throwing out all the other Estimates.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is not that a perfect answer to the remarks made by the minister a few minutes ago, and does not it support the contention of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), that when any moneys are being voted for a special purpose that should be a matter of a special Bill, because it may be subject to a variety of amendments to which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House may agree? No one cares very much whether the aid is brought in by way of resolution or by placing an amount in the Estimates, so far as the early stages of the matter are concerned, but it should pass through Parliament in the form of a Bill because it is special legislation. I submit that the

remarks made by the hon. gentleman from South Renfrew are perfectly correct, and they have not so far been answered.

Mr. REID: I do not agree with the hon. member that the Upper House would throw this out.

Mr. GRAHAM: We did not insinuate that it would.

Mr. REID: The conclusion I draw from the remarks of these hon. gentlemen is that perhaps that would be the result.

Mr. MACLEAN: Even though they concur in these votes for $8,000,000 and $15,000,000 I would still say that this is not the proper course to pursue.

Mr. REID: We will have to agree to disagree on the subject of procedure, so far as these items are concerned. But as to the item now before the committee——

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a subsidy.

Mr. REID: Yes, that is entirely different from the other two. This is a subsidy for the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway for a branch line, from a point on its line as located, situated near Spirit river. I may explain that the matter of railway facilities for the handling of grain produce and supplies required by the settlers of the Spirit river settlement and through the Grande Prairie district of Alberta was brought to the attention of the Government, and it was decided that, as the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company had a charter to build a line to these districts, a vote should be given to cover a line sixty miles in length, the same to be given under the conditions of a subsidy granted under the Subsidy Act. A few words in answer to the hon. member for South Renfrew. If I remember well, last spring the question was brought before the Minister of Railways of having this sixty miles of railway completed at once, for otherwise the large quantity of wheat in that section could not be brought out. After the facts had been laid before the minister, and an assurance given by the railway company that they could not complete the railway without a subsidy, he agreed to give them a subsidy for this line. The reason why it is put in this form is that the Minister of Railways had decided that this year, owing to war conditions, he would not bring in a subsidy Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: But he grants this subsidy.

Mr. REID: This is really for last year. Many subsidies have expired the renewal of which is asked for, and some want new ones. But this vote is made to assist in getting the grain out of that country during the past season, and, as we are not having any regular subsidy Bill, the amount was put in the Estimates to carry it on the terms here mentioned. It was simply because of the promise the minister had made that we would not have a subsidy Bill that this is proposed in this form. Of course, if there had been other subsidies, a regular subsidy Bill would have been introduced.

Mr. GRAHAM: I want it clearly understood that I am not dealing with these items because they are these items, but I am objecting to the principle on which they are submitted to Parliament, and I am taking the earliest possibility opportunity of doing so. The principle is wrong. As explained by the Acting Minister of Railways this subsidy is put in this form merely to protect the Minister of Railways against the direct violation of a promise, but it protects him only by violating that promise in an indirect way. He told applicants that he was not going to have any subsidy Bill, and they, of course, thought he was not going to give any subsidies—for that must have been the idea they took away with them. He now proposes this way of giving a subsidy which ought to be given through a Bill.

Mr. REID: This was earned.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister is not to be excused for violating his pledge by bringing this subsidy in, as it were, by the back door. I want to go on record as objecting to this as a violation of a principle. If this is to be made a precedent hon. members on either side are going to be deprived of opportunities which they now enjoy to deal in a practical way with matters of this kind, and the Senate will have practically nothing to say about aids to railways or anything else. These things ought to follow the safe parliamentary practice and ought to go through the regular appointed stages. A money measure has to go through stages which other Bills have not to follow. The measure is first brought down in the form of a resolution, and then a Bill must be introduced founded on the resolution, and the Bill cannot be altered materially from the resolu-

tion on which it is founded. The Bill must go through first, second and third readings and be passed by the House, and then must be sent to the Senate. Ample opportunities are afforded for hon. members to discuss the measure and to deal with it, and of those opportunities they will be deprived if these subsidies are allowed to go through in the Estimates.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is quite right as to the procedure, and there is no desire to vary that procedure. But this item, as I have said, was agreed upon long ago, and the minister informed the officials of what had been done. Many other lines, in the West particularly, are asking for subsidies, and many of them ought to be granted subsidies as soon as we are in a position to do so. But, as we are not able to take them up this year, and as this is the only item, we thought that under the circumstances not much fault could be found with it. When more subsidies are to be granted, I have no doubt the minister will bring them in in the regular way as outlined by the hon. member for South Renfrew.

Mr. OLIVER: This particular item relates to a railroad development in the constituency I have the honour to represent. From the discussion that has taken place it will be apparent to the committee that there probably appeared to the Government to be some special reason why this aid should be given. I desire, if I may, to take a little of the time of the committee to explain the railroad situation in that part of the country. In that explanation will appear, to some degree, from one point of view at any rate, the reason for this special aid. The minister has already stated that there was a settled and productive area having a surplus of product which had to find markets, or the people had to go broke. It was a matter of extreme urgency to give that settlement railroad facilities during this season. Circumstances were such that it was possible to give facilities, but it was necessary that substantial assistance should be received, and the minister has said that a promise was made that this assistance would be given. At any rate, I wish to inform the House that whatever the minister has said here to-night in regard to the desirability and the urgency of the construction of this piece of road is absolutely supported by the facts. I have pleasure in informing the House that the rails have actually been laid, and that although the line has not been ballasted, traffic is now being carried over this piece of road, to the great advantage of the large and important and productive settlement that it is intended to relieve and to connect with the outside world. But I think it would not be fair to the House or to the country, and it would certainly not be fair to my constituency, if I did not take this opportunity of placing before the House the general reasons which led up to this proposed subsidy. It will be within the knowledge of those who have followed the question, that during the great rush of immigration and expansion that took place in the prairie regions of the West in those better years before our friends took office, the prairie area of the Saskatchewan country was practically occupied; it had been practically alienated; it is now in private hands, not in the hands of the Government. There are still vast areas of timbered land or partially timbered land available for settlement, but there are practically no prairie lands available in the Saskatchewan country, speaking of the southern part of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. But there is in the Peace River country, in northern Alberta, a number of prairie areas of a very desirable character which have attracted settlers to such an extent that they have gone in to a distance of 300, 400 and 500 miles, over roads through wooded country, and have opened up the country, established farms, created production, and carried that production to such an extent in the case of this Grand Prairie, and in other areas that I desire to mention. that they cannot go any farther unless they can get an outlet for what they have produced. The Provincial Government, recognizing the needs of the people who had already gone into the country, entered upon a policy of railroad guarantees with a view of ensuring the productive development of this Peace river country. A federal charter was held and was acquired by one J. D. McArthur, a charter under the name of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company. This charter was to carry a line from Edmonton to the British Columbia boundary, passing a few miles south of the main stream of the Peace river, at the point Dunvegan. The company were fortunately able to realize on the guarantee of the Provincial Government to an extent that enabled them to carry their construction as far as Spirit river, 357 miles from Edmonton, 15 miles

south of Dunvegan on the Peace river, into the centre of a very desirable prairie area known as the Spirit river prairie. But at that point the railroad was 50 or 60 miles from the central point of the Grand Prairie, a large prairie area and was really of no very serious value to the settlers on the Grand Prairie. Certainly it was an advantage to have a railroad within 60 miles instead of 300 miles, but as a matter of actually producing grain and selling it at a profit, the railroad might just as well have been almost anywhere else. The Provincial Government gave a guarantee for this 60 mile branch to Grand Prairie, but in the present condition of the world's finances I presume the company would have had difficulty in financing for the construction of that road, had it not been for the assistance promised by this Government.

The Peace river itself is one thing; the Peace River country is another thing. The Peace river itself is a large and navigable stream, navigable for a stretch of 500 miles, from the foothills of the Rocky mountains to the chutes below Vermilion, and on each side of that river there are large prairie areas which we speak of as the Peace river country, areas which are desirable for settlement and which attract settlers by reason of the fact that they are prairies. A settler going into occupation of these areas does not have to clear his land and does not have to wait so long for production as if he went into the wooded country. Because of this advantage of getting prairie land, the settler is willing to travel far from railroad communication. He is willing to undergo certain hardships, finding his compensation in the advantage that he does not have to clear his land of timber or wait many years for the clearance to take effect so that he can get crops. That is the reason why the Grand Prairie was settled so far in advance of railroad construction.

But there are other areas in the Peace river country also which have been settled in advance of railroad construction, and it is to the condition of these areas that I desire to call the attention of the House and the Government for present or future consideration. On the north side of the Peace river, extending from Peace river crossing for a distance of sixty miles to Dunvegan, is another area of beautiful prairie country, occupied by settlers, producing largely, and still, so far as the main line of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway is concerned, just as far from reach of the actual advantages of railroad communication as the Grand Prairie was, because these people are on the opposite side of the Peace river, and the valley of the Peace river is a tremendous impediment to travel, being a valley 800 feet in depth. In order to reach the navigation of the Peace river—because it will be observed that the route of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway did not contemplate reaching the actual valley of the Peace river—and at the same time approximately reach this large settlement on the north side of the Peace river, the Provincial Government, or possibly this Dominion Government, chartered a branch line of railroad leaving the main line of the Dunvegan railroad at McLennan Junction and reaching the Peace river in a distance of fifty miles. The charter, I believe, carries the railroad across the river, and the Provincial Government gave this branch a guarantee of $20,000 a mile, the same as in the case of the main line and the Grand Prairie branch. But the railway company was unable, under present conditions, to market the bonds, even with the Provincial Government guarantee. The Provincial Government believed it was so urgently necessary that that railroad should reach the navigation of the Peace river, and give approximate advantages of railway connection to those settlers on the north side of the river, that a year ago the Provincial Government raised a loan on their own credit, and then gave a loan to the railway company of 80 per cent of the actual cost of construction of that 50 miles, in order to link up the 500 mile stretch of navigation on the Peace river with the railroad system of Canada at Edmonton. As the result of the action of the Provincial Government in making that loan, the company has been able to construct that 50 miles of road, and the rails to-day are either actually at the bank of the Peace river or within a mile or two of it. At any rate, by reason of the action of the Provincial Government in guaranteeing the bonds of the railroad from Edmonton to McLennan, and by making an actual loan of 80 per cent of the cost of construction from McLennan to Peace River Crossing, the country has the advantage of the linking up of the navigation of the Peace river with the railroad system of Canada, and the settlers on the north side of the Peace river have the railroad brought at any rate to one end of the

settlement, the river intervening between them and the railroad.

Up to the present, then, the situation is that by guarantees amounting to $8,000,000, and by a loan, which I will estimate at $1,000,000, with aid from this Government to the amount, approximately of $300,000 in cash, there has been opened up to settlement that great Peace river country. By the use of the credit of the Provincial Government, we have 400 miles of actually constructed railway, which is absolutely necessary to bring that country within range of profitable and actual settlement. With the assistance of this Government we have 50 miles more, bringing another large important productive area within the range of railroad communication. What I want to bring to the attention of the House is this: The Provincial Government has put up, as I have said, $9,000,000 in credit and cash for the development of the Peace River country, as far as it has yet gone. This Government has put up between one quarter of million dollars and half a million dollars, or will do so when this vote is passed. Now let me point out that the responsibility for the development of the western country does not rest properly upon the provincial governments. It does rest properly on this Federal Government. It is the Federal Government that owns the land, the timber, and the minerals. It has absolute control and ownership of all the natural resources of that country, and it is recognized to be responsible for its settlement and development by the control and direction of immigration. It may be asked, why did the Provincial Government go so far in order to secure that development for which it was not responsible. The Provincial Government is responsible to the people who are there. The people had gone into that country, in spite of all the difficulties, and they turned to the Provincial Government and said, you must give us assistance in order to enable us to live in this country into which we have gone. The Provincial Government is responsible to that extent, but I desire to lay before the House my opinion, and I do so without consultation with the Provincial Government. I am responsible for the representation of the constituency in this case. In my judgment, the Provincial Government has gone approximately as far as it can go in that work. Whatever their intention or desires may be, I do not conceive that the Government of the province of Alberta can continue indefinitely to guarantee railroad bonds and expect that guarantee to remain of serious value. A time must come when, if the guarantee is continually extended, it will be reduced in actual value, and therefore be of no effect.

I desire to take this opportunity of saying to this House that in my judgment the responsibility for securing the development of the Peace River country, as well as of all the new countries of the West, rests primarily upon this Government; and while giving this Government credit for the aid it has given in this case, I propose, so far as I can, to place upon it the full responsibility for the further development of that country, and to come right down to details and make certain suggestions, if I have the privilege of doing so.

The suggestion I make is this: The railroad having reached the eastern bank of the Peace river, in order that the country on the west side of the river may be developed—a country, remember, 500 miles in length; 200 miles up stream to Hudson's Hope at the Rocky Mountain portage, and 300 miles down stream to the chutes below Vermilion—it must have railroad communication. You cannot have profitable production and development without railroads. Therefore, a railroad must get across that river before we can see the development of that country. On the west side of the Peace river, as I have said, there are 60 miles of solid settlement, and there is no better settlement in the Dominion than that which lies north of the Peace river. Those people just as urgently need railroad facilities as did the people of Grand Prairie last year, but there lies between them and the present railroad terminus on the right bank of the river the width of the river, with the difficulties of climbing the hill on the west side over and above the ordinary cost of constructing a line of railway through level country. I have not consulted engineers on the subject, but my information is that the Peace river is a stream 1,800 feet wide at high water, that it has depth approximately of 16 feet in the channel at low water, that it has a rise of 20 or 30 feet and that ice forms in the winter of not less than 4 feet in thickness. It is evident that to construct a permanent bridge across such a stream is a great and costly work and a work of such a tremendous character that no provincial government could reasonably be expected to finance it, nor could any colonization railway company. If the railroad being built in the Peace river country were of a transcontinental character, then we might

say that the company would be able to finance such a bridge, but a branch road to Peace River crossing is not a transcontinental project, it is purely a colonization project and, stating my own opinion only and not having consulted the company, I cannot imagine that a colonization railroad being backed only by a province, which already has guaranteed railways very largely, is likely to be in a position to finance the cost of a bridge to be built at that point. It would be a calamity if money were spent in putting a bridge across that river at that point that would not be of a substantial character. If a company with limited resources, or with limited backing, undertakes to put a bridge across there, it may be tempted to take a chance and make the same error as was made in the case of the Quebec bridge, by having light construction instead of heavy construction with the result that the whole expenditure may be lost. This Peace River Crossing is a geographical strategic point. It is the natural gateway to the Peace river country and any bridge that is built there might very well be built for all time, to use a common expression, and consequently should not be built to be held in the hands of any single railway company to the exclusion of any other company that might wish to enter the Peace river country by that route. Therefore, my suggestion to the Government is that in due course they recognize their responsibilities in the development of the Peace river country, the necessity of railway connection and, particularly the necessity of railway extension across the Peace river, and that they either assume the responsibility of putting a railway bridge across the Peace river at that point or give such a substantial subsidy to a railway company as will enable the company to put a bridge across the river there that will be a thoroughly substantial and reliable bridge, such bridge to be for any other railway company that may desire to cross the river there, subject to reasonable charges for upkeep or use.

Following the construction of the bridge comes the question of rising out of the river valley. A rise of 800 feet of clay bank necessarily means very expensive construction. I would think that, in addition to the construction of the bridge, there might very well be considered the question of assisting the railway financially to rise out of the valley by a reasonable grade. At that point, in getting down to the river valley on the east side, the railroad company has at present a grade of about 3 per cent or perhaps a little over. That is an abnormal grade. It is not a good working grade for hauling heavy traffic but it is such a grade as was possible with the money that was available. It enabled the company to get their road down to the river practically last fall when, if they had tried to get a lighter grade, they would probably not have been there for a year or two yet. But in any case the problem of rising out of the river valley is a serious one and I would suggest that the Government might very well take that into consideration, in recognizing their responsibility for the development of the country west of the river.

The main thing, the immediate thing, is the construction of the bridge and I would certainly say that aid at the hands of this Government towards the construction of such a bridge as that might very well go to the amount of $1,000,000. If it were settled that this Government would make itself responsible for the construction of the bridge across the Peace river then settlement would go in west of the river and occupy the prairie all the way from the crossing to Hudson's Hope, a distance of 200 miles, because people would feel that there was a probability of getting railroad communication within a reasonable time. But, with that tremendous river unbridged, there does not appear a reasonable possibility of railroad construction on the west side of the river and therefore it is a great drawback to settlement because settlers under these circumstances will not go in and occupy the country.

There is another settlement that I wish to draw attention to in this connection. I have been speaking of a point entirely within my own constituency. I desire to speak now of a settlement that is not within my own constituency, but which immediately adjoins it. Under the arrangements by which British Columbia entered Confederation, in some way in consideration of the building of the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Government acquired 3,500,000 acres of land in the Peace river country in British Columbia. It is called the Peace River Block. The area has been set apart, it is administered insofar as the land ownership is concerned by this Government but it is under the jurisdiction of British Columbia. The Edmonton and Dunvegan railway charter reaches the

British Columbia boundary at this Peace River Block. The Government of Alberta has guaranteed its bonds to that point. Immediately west of the British Columbia boundary, in the Peace River Block, is a settlement called Pouce Coupè, a beautiful prairie area that is entirely occupied by settlement. There are about four townships of solid settlement on this Pouce Coupè prairie. It is 60 miles distant from Spirit river. A preliminary survey of the railway has been made, the charter has been granted, the bonds have been guaranteed, but I presume that the construction of the railway for that distance will be in very much the same position as the construction of the line to Grand Prairie; that is to say, the guarantee will hardly be found sufficient to enable the company to finance the construction of that piece of road. Now the settlers are there; many of them have been there for four or five years; they are producing on a very considerable scale; and it is necessary that they should have railway communication, or they cannot continue to produce. If we want to increase production in this country—and I understand that that is what we do want—surely it is our business to see that where the people are on the land, and production has been undertaken, the railroad facilities should be provided that are absolutely necessary to success in the matter of production.

Let me go a step further and discuss this question of railroad extensions and of aid to railways. At the present time there is a considerable feeling that Canada has gone too far in railroad building, has spent too much money, and that we should restrict our efforts in that regard in the future. I do not want to argue the question from the point of view of those who hold that idea, but from the point of view of the man upon whose exertions and upon whose success the future of this country absolutely depends; and that is the man who has gone out beyond the frontier of present settlement, in order to bring into cultivation and production land that without his enterprise and without his labour would be of no value either to this country or to anybody else. That man cannot succeed unless he gets railroad facilities; he cannot provide those facilities for himself; some one must provide them for him, or he cannot succeed. And naturally and necessarily it is to the great mass of the people at large, who are looking for their prosperity to the development of that area the settler is occupying—it is to the nation at large that we must look for the financial risk that must necessarily be taken by somebody in order that that man may have the possibility of success brought within his reach. We may have over-built in some particulars, we may have over-spent in some particulars, we may have shown lack of good judgment in some particulars; but when a man has severed himself from the associations of his lifetime, and taken his wife and children out into the wilds, fifty or a hundred, a hundred and fifty, or two or three hundred miles away from those facilities which necessarily go with railroad communication, and is fighting the battle with nature—for his own benefit, it is true, but still for the nation at large—it is no use telling that man what you have done in other places. What you must do is to provide that man with railroad facilities, or he cannot succeed, and then you cannot succeed because he did not succeed.

10 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know that I have much fault to find with what my hon. friend from Edmonton has said in regard to conditions in the northwestern portion of the province of Alberta. As a western representative, I am one of those who believe that this Parliament has never yet fully recognized the importance of the development of the great prairie provinces of western Canada. It is true that in the early stages of construction assistance, by way of land grants, and so on, was given to the Calgary and Edmonton, and the Regina and Long Lake railways, and, perhaps, one or two other branches in the Prairie Provinces. But for many years no assistance had been given towards the construction of railways in any one of the three Prairie Provinces, except that this Parliament seemed to recognize the great importance of the construction of transcontinental railways, and, contributing in that direction, had probably brought about the construction of one transcontinental railway too many. The fact remains that the local development of railways in the Prairie Province of the West has not in the past received proper consideration from the Parliament of Canada. For example, it was very necessary about the year 1900 that the people living in what was then know as the Northwest Territories, west of the province of Manitoba, should have an outlet to lake Superior for the transportation of their grain. There

was a pressing need for this; railroad rates were so high that it was almost impossible to hope for the development of that western country without providing cheaper means of transportation for its products. When the Government of the province of Manitoba undertook to remedy this condition, they found that it would be necessary for them not only to guarantee bonds for the construction of lines in several directions within the borders of the province, but also to guarantee the construction of a line in Ontario for a distance of something like 290 miles. They gave the guarantees; the road was constructed, and freight rates were brought down by something like 4 cents a bushel or 4 cents a hundred pounds —I forget which just at the moment— which was of great benefit to the people of western Canada. This policy of guaranteeing bonds of railways was followed by the new provinces when they were created; it was followed by this Parliament shortly afterwards, in the construction of the Transcontinental. The item now before us is, I think, the first direct grant by this Parliament in the last twenty years, to any branch line in any one of the three Prairie Provinces. I endorse what my hon. friend from Edmonton has said as to the necessity not only of this grant, but of additional grants for the purpose of bringing about the construction of branch lines in the different provinces of the West; and in no section of the country, I think, is there greater need for such assistance than in the Peace River district west of Edmonton. We have there what is recognized by every one who has studied the possibilities of that country practically an empire in itself. We have millions upon millions of acres of the finest land that can be found in probably any part of the civilized world; and having to-day three transcontinental railways, none of which has a sufficient amount of traffic to maintain it as it should be maintained, we must see to it that feeders are constructed in the various provinces to supply those railways with additional traffic, thus relieving this Parliament of being called upon year after year to grant aid to those railways. Were it not for the war conditions and the circumstances which exist at present, I am free to acknowledge that, if the matter were in my power, this Parliament would be asked to continue to subsidize in a large measure the construction of railways in the Peace river district, as well as in other districts in Western Canada. The present conditions are the only reason why this Parliament is not asked even at this session to give assistance towards the construction of those lines of railway. There is this justification why those lines should be built, that the people of Canada own and control all the lands in all the provinces in the West; that they own and control all the timber and all the minerals, and in that respect those provinces are therefore differently situated from the other provinces of Canada. Consequently it is our duty and responsibility to assist in the construction of those lines for the development of those great prairie provinces, and, above all, for the development of the Peace river country, where we have such magnificent possibilities. I trust that in the near future this Parliament will recognise its duty towards Western Canada in this respect.

As regards the criticism offered by my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) as to the manner in which the Estimates for the assistance and loans proposed to be given to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern have been presented to Parliament, it is quite true that perhaps the common practice in this Parliament in the past has not been followed. I would, however, like my hon. friend and other hon. members to understand that conditions are entirely different from those which have existed in former years. We find it necessary, on account of war conditions, in view of the heavy responsibilities involved, to keep those railways from defaulting; and in view of the heavy assistance which has been granted in the past, we have been obliged to place in the Estimates a further item of $150,000 to provide for an inquiry into the general railway system of Canada to consider the advisability of the nationalization of those two railways in particular, and probably of other railways in the Dominion as well. This is an important undertaking, and the items in the Estimates represent simply temporary assistance that this Parliament would be obliged to give were we to take over those two railways to-day, and until we have made a thorough investigation into the general railway system, we do not know whether that might or might not be the best course to pursue. With a national system of railways in Canada, we in the prairie provinces of the West would have reason to hope that this Government would recognize the importance of that great territory, and that it would secure the construction of the additional branch lines so necessary for its develop-

ment and to make profitable the great transcontinental railways that are already in operation. That is the position we take. We have introduced the items in this form and when they are reached they will be discussed in the House by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance in detail, and the House and the country will be given every particular that they should or could expect to receive.

I want to assure my hon. friend from South Renfrew and this House and the Upper Chamber that there never was a thought, and I never heard it mentioned by any of my colleagues, either in council or elsewhere, that by the introduction of these items in the Estimates, the powers of this Parliament or of the Upper Chamber might be curbed in any way, and I would not wish to have any misunderstanding about the matter. We acted in the manner in which we did, giving a direct and temporary loan, in order to maintain the conditions that exist to-day, believing that it would not be desirable at the present time to allow any default to take place, especially when we have in view the wider idea of bringing about the nationalization of the railways of Canada, with a view of ending, once and for all, this procedure of the coming to Parliament, from year to year, by the various railways of Canada, asking for assistance. I am sure when the matter is explained in detail, it will meet with the approval, not only of this Parliament, but of the Canadian people as a whole.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister given any thought in regard to the personnel of the commission to be appointed to inquire into this matter?

Mr. ROGERS: The idea has not yet been considered.

Mr. MARCIL: Would the proposition mean the acquisition of the railways by the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. ROGERS: That would be for the commission to consider.

Mr. MARCIL: That would be a pretty heavy undertaking just now.

Mr. ROGERS: Well, we will have to have very heavy men on the commission.

Mr. McKENZIE: I see that this resolution refers to chapter 96 of the Acts of 1913. I have looked up the Act and I do not see anything in that legislation which refers to the Canadian Pacific railway, that will help out in this connection. I thought it was the charter of the company and I cannot find anything in it that has any bearing on the subject at all.

Mr. REID: The Subsidy Act of 1913, 3-4 George V, Chapter 96.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is what I have here. I have not read it carefully, but glancing over it I do not see that it relates to this matter. I will pass it over to the minister.

Mr. REID: I find that it was a misprint of " 96 " for " 46," which is what is shown in our memorandum. I move that the item be amended by striking out " 96 " and inserting " 46 " in lieu thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM: To have an opposition is worth while sometimes; criticism is good.

Railways and Canals, chargeable to capital —Welland ship canal—construction, $4,500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is this all for the Welland?

Mr. REID: Yes. For the construction of the Welland Ship Canal five contracts were awarded. The first was awarded to the Dominion Dredging Company. The estimate of the work to be done under that contract was $3,487,725. They were paid, up to 31st December, for work done by them, $1,523,910, so that their work is nearly half completed. The second contract was awarded to Baldry, Yerburg & Hutchinson. The estimate of their contract was $5,377,-185.75, and they have been paid $2,300,680; not quite half of that contract is completed. Section 3 was awarded to O'Brien & Doheny & Quinlan & Roberston. The estimated amount of their contract was $9,540,050, and they have been paid $2,207,970, so that less than twenty-five per cent of their contract is completed. Section 4 (a) was awarded to McGuire & Cameron. The estimate was $88,030.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where was that?

Mr. REID: Section 4 has not yet been let, but this portion was urgently required and therefore the contract was made.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it dredging work?

Mr. REID: Making an entrance into the old Welland canal, the entrance being blocked by the work on section 5. Section 5 was the last contract awarded, and it was given to the Canadian Dredging Company.

The estimate was $1,945,788, and they have been paid $842,850.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who compose the Canadian Dredging Company?

Mr. REID: I know the names of several who have been mentioned as members of that company; Mr. Finn, Mr. Pratt, Mr. Playfair, Mr. Shepherd.

Mr. GRAHAM: What has been spent up to date on these contracts?

Mr. REID: The amount paid to the contractors is $6,948,141. But the total expenditure up to 31st October, 1915, was $7,796,260.47. That includes engineering, operation, maintenance, right of way, and cement.

Mr. GRAHAM: How much do you pay for cement?

Mr. REID: We have a blanket contract for the whole work at $1.85, made some time ago.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the minister any reason to change the estimate of the cost of the work? What was that estimate?

Mr. REID: The estimate as stated by the minister at the time was about $50,000,000 for the whole work when completed. The officials tell me they have no reason to change that estimate.

Mr. GRAHAM: Too soon it will be changed all right. If I remember rightly, the location of the canal and the depth of the sill are so arranged that when it is desired to deepen the canal further, all that will be necessary will be to dredge the canal between the locks.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The depth over the sills will be what?

Mr. REID: It will be 30 feet on the sill and 25 feet in the canal.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the depth on the sill at the American Sault canal?

Mr. REID: 25 feet.

Mr. GRAHAM: I understand that they are making their harbours 26 feet, perhaps in some cases 30 feet.

Mr. REID: The water on the sill in the American canal at extreme low water is 24½ feet. That occurred last year, when the water was very low, and may not occur again for many years. In the harbours they are making a little greater depth, as is necessary, because they can drag the boats over the sill.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can the minister give an idea when the Welland canal will be completed?

Mr. REID: I cannot very well do that, because we have not yet let the contract for the other parts, and are not pressing it perhaps as quickly as we would have done had it not been for the war. We do not intend to let any additional contracts for the present year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have read in the press of the plot now being exposed in New York to blow up the Welland canal, and I see an item in the newspapers to-night connecting some other names with that plot. It may be that we were nearer to trouble than we anticipated. How efficient are the steps that are being taken to prevent anything of that kind? An Order in Council has been passed by the British Government, and has been promulgated in the Canada Gazette, which I suppose means that it is adopted in Canada, forbidding, unless by the consent of the authorities, the further employment of foreigners of enemy nationality in the manufacture of munitions. A great many of the munition manufacturers in Canada have quite a number of foreigners in their employ, and that Order in Council, if carried out strictly, will interfere seriously with the manufacture of munitions, although the risk from having them employed may be considered serious. In the construction of the new Welland canal it strikes me that the same danger may exist to some extent. There must of necessity be quite a number of foreigners engaged in the canal work. Has it struck the minister that there may be some risk in allowing contractors to employ men who come from enemy countries? That would be a very natural channel for the enemy to work through. If they had men employed in the construction of the canal who would be willing to plot with them something might happen which no person would understand except those who had designed the plot. This scheme, hatched in New York, having failed in its object of injuring the present Welland canal, the enemy might begin to work through other channels, and, when many millions had been expended on the new canal, it might all be destroyed in a night.

Mr. REID: We have given a great deal of consideration to the protection of the

Welland canal now in use for the passage of vessels. It is well guarded by a great number of the militia. I have been there myself and I have seen that the militia are all along the canal that is now being operated. In addition to that, no person is allowed along the canal without a pass, so that it is almost an impossibility for any person, especially a stranger, to get to any part of the canal without some militia man seeing him and preventing him from doing any damage. With reference to the work that is going on, of course that is under construction and the contractors may have foreigners in their employ. We have militia stationed, so far as possible, even around the new works, but some damage might be done to the work. That, however, could only be done to the contractors' plants or to work that they have under construction, and would in no way interfere with the operation of the canal system between lake Erie and lake Ontario. That, of course, is what we must be most careful of. There would be no danger of any damage to the new canal interfering with the preseent transportation between lake Erie and lake Ontario. I am satisfied that everything is being done to ensure the safety of that transportation route. All of the items which have appeared in the paper have been brought to the attention of the Government, and we have made inquiries in each case and have found that every precaution is being taken. I do not think it is possible for anything to happen. Of course, even with the best protection, something might happen, but I do not think any fault can be found with what has been done up to the present.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not finding fault, but I am calling attention to something which did not impress me until I read the Order in Council with reference to the employment of foreigners on munitions work. Then it struck me that, in connection with the Welland canal or the Quebec bridge, we might be a little lax in our precautions. It might not be a bad idea for the minister to call attention to the necessity of exercising the utmost rigour in looking after the parts of these works under contract, because while, technically, any damage to them would be a loss to the contractor, still if the new Welland canal is necessary, the delaying of its construction for a couple of years would be a great loss to the country, and the contractors would, of course, have some claim arising out of the damage. So it would be very much better to have every precaution taken in advance. I was going to ask the same question in reference to the Quebec bridge, which in its present condition would be easily destroyed if not safeguarded. If it were destroyed transportation facilities would be put back eight or ten years. Is every precaution taken for the protection of the Quebec bridge?

Mr. REID: The Chief Engineer of the Quebec bridge has informed me that every precaution has been taken. However, the remarks of the hon. member are very important, and I am glad he has made them. I believe that, as a further measure of precaution, it will be well to again remind those in charge of the different works of the importance of taking every possible precaution and I will make it a point to send Hansard to Mr. Monsarrat and to those in charge of other works, and to draw their attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. I think that this little discussion, when brought to the attention of the officers in charge, will impress on them the importance of taking every possible precaution for the protection of the different works. If these officials think that further protection is required, it will be their duty to advise the minister of the department in order that the necessary steps may be taken. Therefore, I think the discussion will be of great benefit in helping to carry out the protection that we are now carrying on.

Mr. OLIVER: Reverting to the Transcontinental item. The other night when we were discussing the transport of grain, the minister was not able to give detailed information as to what had become of the grain that had been carried over the Transcontinental railway last winter, and he promised to have the information later. Is he able to give us that information to-night?

Mr. REID: I made inquiry of the general freight agent of the Government railway system, and I received a memorandum. I understand that about 1,600,000 bushels were taken to Quebec. The balance was taken to Montreal and put in the elevators there. The whole object of that six cent rate last year was to fill the elevators in Montreal and Quebec, and, to that extent, to relieve the West. How the grain that was carried to Montreal and Quebec will eventually be disposed of we

cannot tell until we get the returns from the elevators at the opening of navigation. We have no information that any of it has gone other than from these two ports. That was the object of the six cent rate, and it has certainly been of some advantage, if the statement is true that the lake and rail rate at the opening of navigation has been 9 cents per bushel from Port Arthur to Montreal.

Mr. OLIVER: That would be 15 cents per bushel from Winnipeg?

Mr. REID: Yes. I have not that from the steamship owners, but I was told by a railway official that the lake and rail rate from Port Arthur and Fort William at the opening of navigation was 9 cents. If the grain were carried from Winnipeg on the Transcontinental, the rate would be 12 cents to Montreal or Quebec.

Mr. OLIVER: There is a Government elevator at Halifax.

Mr. REID: Yes, a small one.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood from the debate the other night that that elevator had not been filled.

Mr. REID: The elevator at Halifax is only a small elevator used more for transferring grain.

Mr. GRAHAM: It has a capacity of 500,000 or 750,000 bushels.

Mr. REID: 750,000 bushels, I think, but that elevator is only supposed to keep one or two cargoes on hand. The chief storage is at Montreal and Quebec and in the West.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to draw attention to what appears to me to be a very serious situation, to relieve which, some measures should have been taken by the Government during the past winter. I have a statement here which was given to me by the Minister of Trade and Commerce the other day in reply to a question which I asked when his Estimates were under consideration. He gives a statement of the stocks of wheat in Canada on March 31, 1916. It is as follows: Terminal elevators, 25,528,440 bushels.

Mr. REID: That is at Port Arthur or Fort William?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. Hospital elevators, 534,876 bushels. Winter storage in vessels, 2,447,386 bushels; that would be at Fort William. Inter-terminal elevators of the Dominion Government—Calgary, 629,956 bushels; Moosejaw, 2,820,523 bushels. Saskatoon, 1,632,692 bushels; interior terminal elevators of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Transcona, 633,327 bushels. Public elevators, that would be elevators east of the lakes, 3,326,417 bushels. Country elevators, that is, elevators west of Winnipeg, 43,996,131 bushels. Flour mills, 5,277,196 bushels. Transit by rail, 23,349,356 bushels. Farmers' hands, 86,854,000 bushels. Total wheat of last year's crop still in Canada, 197,030,300 bushels. Out of a total crop of 309,000,300 bushels. It appears to me that a situation which finds us at the opening of navigation with two-thirds of our total crop still in our own country, when we must look to market at least two-thirds of it across the water, is a very serious one; and, while I do not wish to harshly criticise the Government, it seems to me that it is a situation which should have been recognized earlier in the season. To repeat what has been said already, instead of the Government being satisfied with utilizing the storage capacity at Quebec and Montreal, which was, of course, in itself, very desirable, there should have been the most strenuous efforts to rail haul as much of that wheat as possible to tide water and to get it across the ocean during the past winter. Unless the wheat is carried across the ocean very much more rapidly during the coming summer than it was during the past winter, the next crop will find us with a large part of this wheat still within the country, and therefore not actually realized upon as it must be if the financial condition is to be properly maintained. I certainly cannot help thinking that the Government has not recognized to the full their responsibility when they had available the Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to handle an enormous quantity of that grain to the ocean ports during the past winter. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has said and repeated that it was not possible to get that grain shipped across the ocean during the past winter. If it was not possible during the winter, there is no reason to suppose that it will be more possible during the coming summer. The urgency of getting the grain forward over the railroads should certainly have been supplemented with an equal effort to get it across the ocean. The situation is so very serious that I do not apologize for bringing it to the attention of the House and of the country, or for placing a very serious measure of blame upon the Government which has the fullest responsibility in the matter and, in some degree, the control of the situation in its hands.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is absolutely right so far as the seriousness of the matter is concerned, but as I stated before, and as his own argument shows, the Government were powerless to do more than they did. If you could not get it across the ocean, you could not do any more than fill the elevators at this end. The next difficulty that the Government was up against was this: It was intended when the Transcontinental railway was started that the Grand Trunk would have engines and cars ready to operate it, but they only had equipment for the western part of the road. We took it over but we have not been able to get sufficient cars and engines to transport all the grain. I was in the same difficulty here the other evening. I explained why we could not do more work with the Transcontinental and the reason I gave them is the reason I give to-night, that we did not have sufficient equipment. Then I was met by hon. gentlemen from the lower provinces who criticised us because we took 75 engines and a number of cars from the Intercolonial. They claimed this was an injury to the Maritime Provinces. Seventy-five engines are nothing on such a long road as the Transcontinental. But we hope to be in a better position next winter because we are ordering a large number of cars and engines to handle the western crop in a much more satisfactory way than we have done during the past winter. It takes time to get the equipment and organization necessary to handle the western crop. I am quite sure that everything was done that could have been done although there is no doubt that much more was required to meet the demand for the transportation of grain from the West.

Mr. OLIVER: One reason why I am so insistent in bringing this matter to the attention of the Government is that we have two lame-duck transcontinental railways on our hands. The assertion is made very frequently, and is generally accepted, that the reason these are lame ducks is that we have not sufficient business for them to carry. I desire to say that we have the business that should have been carried by these roads during the past winter, in which case they would have served the purpose for which they were created, and I presume that, had they done this businss, they would have helped to carry themselves to a certain degree. Therfore, the argument that we have not the business does not stand on a sound foundation. But the other alternative is that those who are responsible for handling the business have not discharged their duties with success or credit. I do not wish to press that point, but it has to be one way or the other. There is no doubt that we had the business this year. Perchance we will not have it next year because the fact that we were not able to handle the business this year satisfactorily necessarily restricts production for the coming year; so that we have made a double loss by not being able to handle the business we had in hand during this past year.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I call the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) to a matter that I think deserves consideration. I refer to the propriety of giving some recognition to persons living alongside the line of the Intercolonial railway who have been instrumental in saving life and property. I have two special cases in mind. I have tried for four years to secure a reward for the men to whom I refer, but I have never been able to succeed. Just a few days before the declaration of war it happened that a poor farmer living beside the Intercolonial railway noticed two tramps engaged in the act of tying something around the rail. He investigated the matter, walked upon the track and found a tube tied around the rail. He succeeded in unfastening that tube, after which he was chased into the bush by these men. He threw away the tube. Subsequently the inspector of the trackmen was told about the matter, he called upon the man and they went to the bush and found the tube. They took the tube to the station, submerged it in water and upon examination found that it contained a powerful charge of dynamite. Two or three hours after that I am told that a train loaded with pilgrims en route to Ste. Anne de Beaupré passed over that road. I have reported the matter to the department, but I have never succeeded in getting a reward for this man. I have the certificate of the trackman who found the tube and who, upon investigation, ascertained that it contained a charge of dynamite. Four years ago two flat cars loaded with rails escaped from the siding upon which they had been standing at River Ouelle and managed to get upon the main line. A farmer who saw these two cars running wild remembered that it was nearly time for the Maratime Express to come along. He ran after the cars, jumped upon them, set the brake and stopped them. More than that, he went ahead, waved his handker-

chief and stopped the Maritime Express. It happened that I was on board the train that morning, and everybody admitted that if it had not been for this man's timely action there would in all probability have been a great loss of property if not of life. I have tried to get some reward for these two men, but I have failed. I hope the minister will realize that these men deserve some recognition at the hands of the Government. We give medals and money to those who save one or two lives. These men, I am sure, saved a large amount of property and perhaps many lives. I want to profit by the occasion and to ask the acting minister to take note of these cases and see if he cannot reward these men as an encouragement for others to follow their example.

Mr. REID: I am very glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Gauvreau) has brought this matter to my attention. I had not heard of these cases before. If such a thing has happened—and I am not disputing it at all—I believe these men have saved life, and I am surprised that these incidents have not been brought to my attention, because I think matters of that kind should be reported to the minister himself. If a charge of dynamite was found upon the railway track, or if attempts have been made to destroy property or endanger life as the hon. gentleman has stated, the matter should be brought to the minister's attention. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has mentioned these cases, and I shall call them to the attention of the management, because certainly if these men did these things they are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I hope the minister will allow me to write to him and state the facts of these two special cases.

Mr. REID: I will be obliged to my hon. friend if he will send me all the information he has.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I have the certificate of the trackmaster who found the charge of dynamite in the tube.

Mr. MACDONALD: Some time ago the minister said that he proposed to use the surplus of the Intercolonial in the purchase of equipment. What equipment has been purchased?

Mr. REID: The final contracts for equipment have not been made. I asked the general manager the last time he was here to prepare the specifications and plans for a certain amount of equipment. He asked for tenders. The tenders were to be received up to May 1 for a certain number of freight cars—I think it was 1,000—25 engines, and some snow ploughs and passenger cars, I have not the figures before me, but the tenders would amount to between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000. I asked the general manager to come to Ottawa as early as possible in order that we might award the contracts and get the equipment at the earliest possible date. Unfortunately he could not get here the middle of this week. The last message I had said that he would be here on Monday next, when we expect to award the contracts for cars and equipment, to the extent I have stated.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am told that the general manager has purchased 27 second-hand passenger coaches in the United States, instead of buying them from our own Car Company. My information from the manufacturers is that they could have taken on this contract easily enough.

Mr. REID: I can hardly believe that 27 passenger coaches have been purchased in the United States. The general manager would have no authority to purchase these without first seeing me. The only purchase the general manager asked me to consent to was for some 8 or 10 Pullman cars that he could get at once.

Mr. GRAHAM: What date was that?

Mr. REID: Within the last three weeks. On some roads in the United States they are doing away with the regular Pullman cars, and as we had this opportunity of getting 8 or 10 we purchased them, because we want to get the service on the Transcontinental started at the earliest possible moment. It would take a very long time to build these Pullmans with the buffet. We were only able to get 8 or 10 of them, and they are in first-class shape. That is the only lot of cars that have been purchased in the United States, so far as I know.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have two faults to find: First, the cars were bought in the United States, and secondly, I think it is a mistake for the Government not to seriously consider the advisability of buying no more wooden cars.

Mr. REID: I agree that it is not advisable to buy wooden cars, but we must get the service started between Winnipeg and

11 p.m.

the east, and those are the only cars we can get at the present time. This is the kind of car that is being used throughout Canada; the regular Pullmans are all wooden cars. Our intention is, of course, to get steel passenger cars as soon as possible, and steel freight cars too. But if we ordered steel freight cars now we could not get them in time to haul next season's crop; so we came to the conclusion that it would be better to order 50 wooden freight cars for the present. We shall have to use wooden passenger cars until we can get the steel ones.

Mr. GRAHAM: Now that the Ocean Limited is not running, could you not use some of those coaches?

Mr. REID: She will be running on the 14th of May.

Mr. GRAHAM: That makes a difference. Would the minister kindly let me have a statement as to the cars that were bought, from whom purchased, and what they cost?

Mr. REID: I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. GRAHAM: The information I have is that there were more than 10 cars purchased in the United States; I understand 27 were purchased, and the manufacturers are feeling quite uncomfortable because the Government are buying cars over there at a time like this, when we are preaching "production," "patriotism," and "buy made-in-Canada goods." I suppose the Government paid duty to themselves on these cars?

Mr. REID: They will, as the cars come in. I will get my hon. friend the statement he asks for. We are not asking for any tenders for cars built outside of Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: You buy them without tender outside of Canada.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman knows what a long time it would take to build these cars. There were only 8 or 10 purchased in the United States.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: The minister's excuse for going to the United States is that the cars were needed at once on the Transcontinental. The general manager must have known a year ago that these cars would be required. Surely he didn't wake up just about a month ago to the fact that Pullman cars would be needed on the Transcontinental. The order for these cars should have been given a year ago, immediately the Government took over the road. The equipment would have been ready by this time, if any prudence or foresight had been shown by the department in this matter, for the car plants of this country have not been busy. The congestion of railway traffic on the Intercolonial during the last few months has been the worst in the history of the road, and it is very largely due to the fact that no foresight is displayed by the management. The acting minister tells us very plausibly that the congestion was due to the moving of large bodies of troops and supplies. That may be true; but the department knew a year ago that these troops and supplies would have to pass over the Intercolonial. Apparently, however, they did not wake up to the fact until the middle of winter, and they were entirely unprepared for the rush of freight. The only excuse the minister can give for the congestion is the hauling of troops and supplies, and he thinks that is a sufficient explanation. It seems to me it is about time the general manager of the Intercolonial looked ahead six months to see what is going to happen in regard to railway matters. If this gentleman who is earning—I will not say earning, but drawing—this big salary cannot devote some time to considering what is going to happen a few months ahead, I do not see what he is getting his salary for. Any railway man at all can deal with the situation from day to day, but what distinguishes a man in any business is prudence, and the capacity to foresee conditions that might arise. The purchase of cars in any shape or form in the United States by this Government is wholly indefensible and absolutely unjustifiable. The same remark applies to the failure to spend the money which six months ago the minister knew he was going to have available in the way of a surplus from the Intercolonial. This surplus was not a thing that accumulated within the last three months; it was accumulating every month since March 31, 1915, and as it accumulated the general manager and the minister, realizing the absolute certainty of the tremendous demands in the way of traffic that would be made upon the Intercolonial, should have seen that those things were provided. Does the minister think that the statement which he made a few weeks ago that they needed

Pullman cars on the Transcontinental, a sufficient justification for providing them?

Mr. REID: We gave orders for twelve sleeping cars to be made in Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD: When?

Mr. REID: Last spring. Nearly a year ago.

Mr. MACDONALD: What did your contracts provide for?

Mr. REID: The contractors have not been able to build them in the time specified.

Mr. MACDONALD: To whom did you give the contracts?

Mr. REID: The Preston Car and Coach Company and the National Car and Coach Company. One order was for eight sleeping cars and the other for four. We had to extend the time.

Mr. MACDONALD: They knew in advance they would be able to get you to do that.

Mr. REID: That is not a fair statement. We gave them the orders, and they expected to be able to do the work, but they have had more than they can do. We order all our equipment, locomotives, cars and everything else in Canada. So far as the general manager is concerned, he has known that we wanted more equipment, but until the money is voted by Parliament, or until we know exactly what we have to spend on equipment, we cannot order it. I am satisfied that any minister of railways would bear me out in this, that it has never been the custom to award contracts on any surplus there might be on the Intercolonial until the end of the session in each year. When there has been no surplus, and an amount has been placed in the Estimates for equipment, that has never been done until the end of the session. If the same custom had been followed this year, we would not even yet have been considering the letting of contracts until the close of this session. At the end of last year all those contracts for all those care were let to people in Canada, and the same thing will be done now; not a single car nor any equipment of any kind will be ordered outside of Canada if it is at all possible to get it in Canada, and I am satisfied that everything that we shall require in the way of such equipment can be made in Canada. The ordering of a few cars in the meantime at a reasonable price can easily be justified.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why did you not anticipate the conditions on the Intercolonial?

Mr. REID: We would have had plenty of equipment on the Intercolonial if we had not had to take it for the Transcontinental.

Mr. MACDONALD: You knew that a year ago?

Mr. REID: We took over the Transcontinental on the 1st of July, and it was about the first of May when the correspondence ended, but the hon. member knows that we had no vote by Parliament for any equipment for the Transcontinental and we could order only on the amount that was placed on the Estimates or on the surplus, and therefore we were not in a position to order in advance any equipment for the Transcontinental.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why did you not ask for it? You passed legislation last winter by which you took the right to take over that railway.

Mr. REID: We took the right, but the matter was not decided until after the session. According to the Grand Trunk Pacific Act, that company were to have equipment for operating the Transcontinental when it was completed, and we believed that they would have a certain amount of equipment that we could get from them; but when we took over the Transcontinental, we could not get any equipment of any kind, and, therefore, we were compelled, in order to operate it as we have been doing, to take the equipment from the Intercolonial in the meantime until we could furnish more equipment. With the orders which we have given and which will be given, we are going to have a very large amount of equipment which will be used on the whole Government railway system.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then the real reason for the congestion of traffic and the interference with transportation on the Intercolonial this winter has been that the equipment of the Intercolonial was taken for the Transcontinental.

Mr. REID: It is hardly fair to put it that way. That, of course, was one reason why we could not have a better service on the Intercolonial. In addition to that, the amount of freight traffic was very large on the Intercolonial this year; in fact, there has never been anything like it in the history of that railway. I had the figures here

a few minutes ago and the increase in freight traffic was enormous. The passenger traffic was also much greater because of the large number of troops carried over the Intercolonial this year, and on each troop train we had to use two engines. In that way both the passenger traffic, on account of the troops, and the freight traffic made the traffic on the Intercolonial so enormous that even that alone might have prevented the local traffic from receiving the same service as it had in the past.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister then admits that his general manager did not foresee this additional traffic; that he took the equipment in order to operate the Transcontinental and that caused the congestion. Would the minister be good enough to tell me whether he has directed that the lower rates be given to the soldiers who have volunteered for overseas service? I asked him about the matter before the Easter vacation, and I understod that it was carried out, but I found out that it had not been done until a few days ago.

Mr. REID: I took the matter up with the general manager and I understand the notice has been sent out. I telephoned to the secretary of the department to-night, and he advises me that soldier on furlough and on public holidays can get return tickets at single fare, that the management was so instructed, and that the rate went into force on Good Friday. The soldiers must present certificates from the commanding officers.

Mr. MACDONALD: The rate was not in effect on the Saturday after Good Friday, because I saw some soldiers travelling and they told me that they had paid the single rate and a third. Would the minister be good enough to give me a statement of the allotments of coal contracts on the Intercolonial for this year?

Mr. REID: I have here a memorandum made by the secretary of the department which, if the hon. gentleman desires, I will read, in order that it may appear in Hansard. Orders for coal for the Intercolonial and Transcontinental have been closed as follows:

Name of Co.	Where to be delivered.	How to be delivered.	Quantity Gross tons.	Kind of Coal.	Price.
					$ cts
Dom. Coal Co.....	Sydney.....	F.o.b. cars and f.o.b. vessels...	120,000	Run-of-mine.....	3.40
Dom. Coal Co.....	Springhill Junction...	F.o.b. cars.....	90,000 to 100,000	Screened	3.65
				Run-of-mine.....	3.40
Maritime, Coal, Ry & Power Co. ...	Maccan.....	"	90,000 to 110,000	Screened	3.65
"	"	"	15,000	Run-of-mine.....	3.40
Minudie Coal Co...	"	"	25,000	Screened.....	3.60
A. Baile.....	Lévis.....	F. o. b. vessel....	50,000	Run-of-mine.....	4.95
				Screened & slack.	4.80
Acadia Coal Co....	Stellarton.....	F. o. b. cars.....	100,000	Screened.....	3.65
				Run-of-mine.....	3.40
N. S. Steel & Coal Co.	Montreal...	F. o. b. cars.....	65,000	"	4.62
do	St. Hyacinthe....	do	60,000	"	4.58
do	Sydney Mines ..	do	30,000 to 40,000	"	3.40
Intercolonial Coal Mining Co.....	Westville.....	do	75,000	Screened.....	3.65
W. L. Barnes.....	Maccan.....	F. o. b. cars.....	5,000	"	3.45
Dr. M. F. Keith....	Adamsville.....	do	6,000	"	At going price
Dom. Coal Co.....	Springhill Jct....	F. o. b. cars.....	About 4,000	Culm.....	2.15
Maritime Coal Ry & Power Co.	Maccan	F. o. b. cars.....	5,000 to 10,000	Slack.....	1 75
Minudie Coal Courpany.....	"	"	5,000 to 8,000	Slack (Victoria M.).....	1 75

N.T.R., West Quebec.

Name of Co.	Where to be delivered.	How to be delivered.	Quantity Gross tons.	Kind of Coal.	Price.
					$ cts.
Can. Import Co.....	Quebec	F. o. b. cars.....	28,000 net tons..	Run of mine.....	4 70 gr. ton.
Valley Camp Coal Co.....	Fort William ...	F. o. b. vessels ..	352,000	¾ lump.....	Average 3 01 ton net.
		F. o. b. cars.....	....	.....	3 31 "
" " ..	"	F. o. b. vessels...	25,000	Slack.....	2 26½ "
		F. o. b. cars.....	.....	.....	2 56½ "
" " ..	"	F. o. b. vessels...	1,000	Blacksmith.. ..	3 49 "
		F. o. b. cars.....	....	....	3 79 "

That is the list I have, but I understand that there were a few small amounts not included in this list.

Mr. MACDONALD: Purchases from smaller companies?

Mr. REID: Yes. The idea was to get all the coal we could in the lower provinces, so there is no trouble about any of them supplying all the coal they can give us during the present year.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is the Valley Camp Coal Company of Fort William supplying American coal?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: And is there any other supplying American coal to the Intercolonial?

Mr. REID: Baille and the Nova Scotia Steel Company, I think, supply Montreal too. It is possible they will have to bring some American coal as well. They have the right according to my recollection if they cannot get the coal in Canada to supply American coal.

Mr. MACDONALD: And what about Baille at Quebec supplying the Transcontinental?

Mr. REID: Is that the Canada Import Company? I do not know who manages that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Can they give American coal?

Mr. REID: If they cannot get Canadian. We are taking all the Canadian coal we can get, and if we take American it is only because we cannot get the Canadian coal delivered. The hon. gentleman knows the coal situation in the lower provinces. They are giving us all they can spare for Montreal. There is the difficulty of getting it through because of lack of vessels, a difficulty we have never experienced before.

On motion of Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Friday, May 5, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PRIVATE BILL INTRODUCED.

Bill No. 100, to incorporate the Manitoba-Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Carrick.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Probably I may be permitted at this stage to lay on the Table two copies of a deed of trust securing an issue of $16,000,000 of Grand Trunk Pacific bonds, guaranteed by the Dominion Government; also two copies of a deed of trust securing $45,000,000 of Canadian Northern securities issued under the legislation of 1914.

COLLECTIONS ON HOMESTEAD PURCHASES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. REID: An hon. member asked me to have placed on Hansard a statement with regard to the amount collected on the purchase of homesteads to the 31st March, 1916, including interest. The amount is $1,615,666.13.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that the amount of cash received or is it the total amount of sales? Sales would be on the instalment plan, I suppose?

Mr. REID: If the hon. member will allow this to go as it is, I will take the additional

question he asks and be prepared to answer it to-morrow.

REBUILDING OF PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

FAIR WAGES CLAUSE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. VERVILLE: I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) or the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) if there is to be a fair-wages clause respecting hours of labour and wages, incorporated in the contracts for erecting the Parliament buildings, and, if so, whether the minister will be kind enough to lay it on the Table early next week?

Mr. ROGERS: The committee having charge of the proposed reconstruction of the Parliament buildings is expected to meet this afternoon. We have not given consideration to any of the details up to the present time.

SHELL CONTRACTS.

ROYAL COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.) asked for leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the desirability, in the public interest, of immediately enlarging the power of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the contracts regarding fuses, etc., called the Meredith-Duff Commission, by providing for widening the scope of the inquiry into the matters referred to the commission.

And leave having been granted,

He said: I wish to present to the House certain facts as the result of the investigation of the Meredith-Duff Commission, so called. In doing so it is not my intention to in any way refer to any evidence given before the commission as indicating what has been proven or has not been proven, or anything of that kind. I realize that this is a matter which is really sub judice at the present time, and a matter to be desired by the commission, and that it would be highly improper on my part, especially as I am a counsel before the commissioners, to make any comment or reflection of any kind. Therefore, in the remarks I make, I will endeavour to confine my statements and my arguments entirely to the question of whether or not it is in the public interest to enlarge the scope of the inquiry. And in order to make the discussion as short as possible, I wish to refer to many things generally, without quoting page and date. It is within the knowledge of every member of this House that some weeks ago the right hon. leader of the Opposition moved that a Committee of this House be appointed for the purpose of investigating matters relating to the Shell Committee, which ceased to exist some time in the latter part of November, 1915. That motion was voted down by the House, and two days afterwards the right hon. Prime Minister informed the House that the Governor General in Council had appointed a commission for the purpose of investigating three contracts specially mentioned and one other in case it should come within the purview of the commission, or words to that effect. I am not going to read that Order in Council, because it is on Hansard and is a matter of record. Since Wednesday of last week that commission has been proceeding under the terms of the Order in Council, witnesses have been sworn and examined and cross-examined. Perhaps it would not be amiss if I should take this opportunity of stating publicly that I feel that counsel representing the Government is presenting the case in as fair and as able a manner as is possible—and that is saying a great deal when I am discussing Mr. I. F. Hellmuth. But, Sir, the investigation is developing a condition of affairs regarding the doings and status of the old Shell Committee which was certainly a revelation to every person who had anything to do with the commission, and which, I think, must be a revelation to a large majority of the members of this House. I refer to the fact, brought out before the commission, that at least from and after the first day of October, 1914, down to the day when the Shell Committee ceased to exist, on November 30, 1915, four members of that committee, namely Messrs. Bertram, Cantley, Watts and E. Carnegie, legally occupied the position of contractors with the British Government, as represented by the Minister of Militia and Defence. All of these gentlemen have not in any way claimed that they were entitled to any part of the profits which may have come out of the transaction. I want that to be particularly stated, because three of them have already been examined and have repudiated the idea of taking profits to themselves. But they all contend that legally they would be entitled to the profits if profits were made, and I think the converse would be true—at least, I know that this was admitted by one of them—that if

losses were made they would be responsible for them. I think they all say that they approached the Prime Minister and brought up the question as to what their position would be in case of losses taking place. The Prime Minister was very careful, they say, not to make any promise; he told them that they would cross that bridge when they came to it. They went on; that bridge was not reached; therefore they were not called upon to discuss it. The substance of it all, however, was this: the Prime Minister said: "We want the shells; go on, and if there are losses we will have to discuss that later." That, I think, would be a fair way of putting it; at least, that is the way the witnesses have placed it before the commission.

I shall not go over the correspondence leading up to the first contract, because it was placed on Hansard by the Minister of Militia in an address delivered in this House on the 25th or 26th of January last. However, the sum and substance of it was that a number of cablegrams having passed between the British War Office and the Minister of Militia, we had authority—I say "we;" I mean the Dominion of Canada; I would call that the Government of Canada—had authority to supply the British Government with 100,000 empty shrapnel shells, 18-pounders, at $8.55 each, and 100,000 empty 15-pounder shrapnel shells at $8.30 each. On the first day of October a contract was entered into between the Minister of Militia and Defence, representing the British War Office, and four gentlemen of a committee of seven or eight. I want to read this agreement, as found on page 30 of the evidence taken by the commission: EIGHT

Witnesseth that the parties of the first part agree to manufacture and deliver to the party of the second part one hundred thousand shrapnel eight-pounder—

That should be eighteen.

—Mark III shells (empty) and one hundred thousand 15-pounder Mark VII (empty) subject to the following terms and conditions, and at the following rates:

I do not want to weary the House by reading all the details of this document. I am reading, as I say, from the official document, and if I could have the whole placed on Hansard it would expedite matters.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What does it refer to?

Mr. CARVELL: It proceeds to deal with the drawing of specifications, contract to be fulfilled according to the specification, and things of that kind. (Reading):

The said shells shall be made of such materials and components and in accordance with the drawings and specifications hereto annexed, and signed by the parties hereto.

The parties of the first part agree to deliver the said shell as follows, viz. 18-pounder mark III shells, delivery to be made to the party of the second part or to his authorized officers f.o.b. Montreal to the order of the party of the second part.

The shells shall be subject to inspection and such tests as may be required by the party of the second part during the process of manufacture, and shall moreover, be subject after manufacture completed to inspection and acceptance at the factory by the party of the second part; the approval and acceptance of any one lot of shells shall not be evidence of approval of acceptance of any other lot.

The prices to be paid for the said shells shall be for 18-pounder shells, $8.55 per shell.

For 15-pounder shells, $8.30 per shell, to be paid within ten days after the date of delivery, subject to certification of the invoices by the authorized officers appointed by the party of the second part.

In witness whereof the parties have hereunto set their hand the day and year first herein written.

The signatories to this document are Alexander Bertram, Thomas Cantley, G. W. Watts, E. Carnegie, Sam Hughes, Minister of Militia and Defence for Canada; and the document is executed in the presence of D. Carnegie.

A second contract dated October 20, was entered into between the same parties for the supply of a certain number of boxes in which to transport these shells, also some cartridge cases. That will be found on page 33 of the proceedings of the commission. I do not think it is necessary to read it, because the wording is almost exactly the same as the one which I have just read, except, of course, as to the quantities, prices and specifications. Then they immediately entered into negotiations for the third lot, and in order to make myself thoroughly understood I feel that I shall have to read the negotiations with regard to this particular lot. This was for 200,000 18-pounder shrapnel, fixed ammunition, and 400,000 empty shrapnel shells. In this correspondence by cable the War Office was always addressed and signed as "Troopers" and the Militia Department of Canada was addressed as "Militia." This is a cable to "Troopers in London, the War Office," dated November 24, 1914:

Referring to your cable 2025 A-2 and our cable No. 1811-cipher, can undertake supply 200,000 18-pounder shrapnel shells fixed ammunition including propellants but without

fuses and packed in ammunition cases delivered f.o.b. Montreal or Halifax by June first. Prices seventeen dollars and sixty-five cents each including boxes.

Can also supply further four hundred thousand 15 or 18-pounder shrapnel shells empty packed in ammunition boxes same delivery, price nine and a quarter dollars each, including boxes, not including cost of inspection. Can also supply fuses and will name price on receipt of specification and drawings. Early decision necessary as price raw materials advancing rapidly.

Please hasten despatch of specifications, gauges, etc., of 18-pounder cartridge cases and fuses and any other ammunition you may require manufactured in Canada will save time.

The answer to that came back on the 26th day of November, from the War Office to the Militia Department, as follows:

Regret that unless price of 18-pounder ammunition without fuse can be reduced to $15 and that of 18-pounder shells to $6, we cannot place orders.

That was answered on the 2nd of December, 1914, from the Militia Department to the War Office, as follows:

Number 196 cipher. Referring to your cable 2287 A-2, November 30th and our cipher 191 27th November. My committee are proceeding with order, prices being fifteen and six dollars respectively not including wood boxes. Please cable confirmation.

I do not know that we have any evidence of the confirmation, but it was confirmed in some way, and they started out to make the ammunition. Those documents will be found on pages 32 and 33 of the printed report. A number of orders were given from that down to the first day of July. I shall not weary the House by going into the details; in fact, we did not have many details. But we do know that large numbers of orders were given, and that these orders were given out by the Shell Committee, sub-let as they would call it, to different people in different parts of Canada, and I believe that in some cases, when they could not get the parts in Canada, they went to the United States for them, and with that I am finding no fault. Further, they procured material to make shell boxes and things of that kind.

Finally we come to the third contract, which will be found on page 138 of the printed report. As this is a very important contract, I shall take the liberty of reading it:

This agreement made this 1st day of July, 1915.

Between

Alexander Bertram of Ottawa, in the province of Ontario, Thomas Cantley of New Glasgow, in the province of Nova Scotia, George W. Watts of Toronto, in the province of Ontario, and E. Carnegie of Welland, in the province of Ontario, Manufacturers,

Of the first part.

And

Major General, the Honourable Sam Hughes, His Majesty's Minister of Militia and Defence of Canada, acting for and on behalf of His Majesty's Secretary of State for war,

Of the second part.

Witnesseth that the parties of the first part agree to manufacture and deliver to the party of the second part the ammunition, and deliver to the party of the second part the ammunition specified in attached schedule, which forms parts of this contract, subject to the following terms and conditions, and at the stipulated rates;

1. The said ammunition shall be made of such material and components and in accordance with the drawings and specifications hereto annexed and signed by the parties hereto.

2. The parties of the first part agree to deliver, as far as possible the said ammunition in accordance with the said schedule. Delivery to be made to the party of the second part or to his authorized officers f.o.b. Montreal or other Atlantic ports, to the order of the party of the second part.

3. The ammunition shall be subject to inspection and such tests as may be required by the party of the second part during the process of manufacture, and shall moreover be subject after manufacture is completed to inspection and acceptance at the factory by the party of the second part; the approval and acceptance of any one lot of ammunition shall not be evidence of approval of acceptance of any other lot.

4. The prices paid for the said ammunition shall be in accordance with the said schedule, same to be paid not later than ten days after the date of delivery, subject to certification of the invoices by the authorized officers appointed by the party of the second part.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have hereunto set their hands the day and year first herein written.

Alex. Bertram,
Thos. Cantley,
Geo. W. Watts,
E. Carnegie,
Sam. Hughes.

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of

D. Carnegie.

Attached to this is an exhibit containing a copy of every order given by the War Office to the Militia Department of Canada, after the first 200 rounds mentioned in the first contract I have read, and also excluding the contract for the shell boxes and the few shell cases referred to in the second contract, which I have read. This schedule figured out really amounts to around $148,000,000, and according to the evidence, which I know I am stating accurately, it was a resume of all the orders given to the Militia Department or the Shell Committee, either by cable or by letter, between, we will say, the 1st of October, 1914, and the 1st day of July, 1915. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have this placed on Hansard

if I could be allowed to do so without reading it. It is a long, technical schedule, but of course if it is thought necessary I shall read it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not see that there is any necessity of reading it.

Mr. CARVELL: That document is as follows:

Ammunition Orders from War Office to Shell Committee.

Nature of Order.	Number Ordered.	Promised Delivery.
18 Pr. Cartridge Cases— Mk. II Dwg. No. 20711 Spec. L Cable 1718 Cipher —— 19/10/14 3307	100,000 at $2.55	10,000 per month commencing March, 1915.
18 Pr. Shrap. Empty— Mk. III Dwg. No. 17072-A (1) Spec. L Cable 2287 A-2 —— Our cipher 196 3181 4/12/14.	400,000 at $6.00	To complete by end June, 1915.
18 Pr. Shrap. Fixed— Ammunition complete without Fuses. Cable 2287 A-2. Our cipher 196 4/12/14 Dwg. 17072 A (1) Spec. L 3181	200,000 at $15	To complete by end June, 1915.
18 Pr. Shrap. Fixed— Mk. II Dwg. 17072-A (1) Spec. L Ammunition complete without fuses. Cable —— 26 Dec. 14. 3181	150,000 monthly at $15. Six months certain. Three months notice.	Commencing May, 1915. Can increase from August.
18 Pr. High Explosive— Fixed Ammunition Complete without Fuses and Explosive charge. Dwg. No. 22326 Spec. L 2760 Cipher 16/1/15 3511	100,000 monthly at $15. Six months certain. Three months notice.	Commencing April.
18 Pr. High Explosive— Fixed Ammunition, without Fuses and explosive charge. Dwg. No. 22326 Spec. L Cable 3511 2371 Feb. 18th. Hanson to Carnegie.	100,000 monthly at $15. Six months contract. Three months notice.	Commencing June.
18 Pr. Shrapnel— Fixed ammunition without fuses Dwg. No. 17697 Spec. L 3192-C Cable 2371 Feb. 13th.	100,000 monthly at $15. Six months contract. Three months notice.	Commencing June.
4·5 How. Empty— With cases and Primers empty Cable 2044 8/2/15 from Army contracts 1-a.	100,000 monthly at $15. Six months contract. Three months notice.	Commencing deliveries 50,000 May 100,000 June.
4·5 How. Empty— With cases and Primers empty also Fuses, 4250 Cy. A-7 and 4091 Cy. A-7 and Cipher 352 23/4/15 No. 100. Fuse without gaine.	1,666,666 at $16.50 ⅓ of five million contract.	Commencing deliveries 50,000 July and complete March, 1916.
4·5 Cartridge Cases Empty— Mk. L. Dwg. No. 1794-F Spec. L 3085-A Cable 4586 Cipher A-7 11/5/15 our 373 Cipher.	3,000 per week at $2.10. Six months contract. Three months notice.	Commencing deliveries September.

Ammunition Orders from War Office to Shell Committee—*Con.*

Nature of Order.	Number Ordered.	Promised Delivery.
18 Pr. Cartridge cases Empty— Mk. II Dwg. No. 20711 Spec. L 3307 Cable 4856 Cipher A–7 11/5/15 our 373 cipher.	5,000 per week at $2.10. Six months contract.	Commencing deliveries September.
18 Pr. High Explosive— Fixed ammunition with Fuses but without gaine or bursting charge. Dwg. No. 22326 Spec. L 3511 Fuse 80 44 American tolerance proof at rest. See 4091 Cipher A–7 18/4/15 and our cipher 352 23/4/15.	1,666,666 at $16.50 ⅓ of five million.	Commencing deliveries 50,000 in July and complete in March, 1916. Fuses will not be ready until November but we propose shipping rounds without fuses.
Fixed ammunition complete with Fuses. Dwg. No. 17697 Spec. L 3192–C Fuse No. 80 to American tolerance proof at rest. See 4091 cipher A-7 18/4/15 and our cipher 352 23/4/15.	1,666,666 at $18.00 ⅓ of five million.	Commencing deliveries 50,000 July, completing by, March, 1916, Fuses will not be ready until November but we propose shipping rounds without fuses.
60 Pr. H.E. Mk. V.— Dwg. "22156 (1) Spec. L 3466 and L 3477-C Cable 3839. Cipher A-7 2/4/15 Our cipher 307 28/3/15.	50,000 per month at $16.50. Six months contract. Three months notice.	Commencing August.
Friction Tubes— T. Push Mk. 1. Dwg No. 14531-B (1)..... Spec. L 3088-A and L 3378 Cables 4832 and 8928 14th May. Our 106 code April 15th.	20,000 weekly at 45 cents until three months notice. Six months contract.	Sixty days after receipt of drawings and specifications.
Friction Tubes— T. Mk. IV. Dwg. No. 10283 C (1)..... Spec. L 2682 nd L 3377 Cables 4832 and 8928 our 106 code.	20,000 weekly at 45 cents until three months notice. Six months contracts.	Sixty days after receipt of drawings and specifications.
Primers— Mk. II. Dwg. No. 15031–C..... Spec. L 2986 Cable 4315 Cipher A–7. Our 379. 12/5/15.	2,000,000 at 45 cents have asked for 50 cents due to increase in price.	Deliveries by March 31st, 1916.
4·5 How. H.E.— Empty complete with cartridge case without propellant and clips, but with primers loaded. Cable 5110. Cipher A–7.	5,000 per week at $16. Six months contract.	Commencing delivery October, 1915.
18 Pr. High Explosive— Empty shells Mk. II Dwg. No. 22004–D..... Spec. L Cable 5141 3438 Cipher A–7.	10,000 weekly at $5. Six months contract.	Commencing delivery October, 1915.

Exhibit 122.

You will see by looking this over that it includes the 5,000,000 rounds of ammunition to which would be applied and of which would form a part, the 5,000,000 fuses under investigation by the Commission, under contract with the International Arms and Fuse Company and the American Ammunition Company.

I wish to refer to the examination of Mr. D. Carnegie, who from about the 24th of September, 1914, up to about April, 1915, was an employee of the Shell Committee in an advisory capacity, I think as ordnance adviser, and who some time around the first part of April, was made a member of the Shell Committee, still remaining ordnance adviser. Mr. Carnegie has stated on two or three occasions, although I have not the reference with me, that as they were contractors, it was practically their business what price they paid for any component parts of this fixed ammunition, so long as they did not exceed the prices authorized by the War Office, as in this schedule you will find prices for every different article.

Referring to the particular contracts which are being investigated by the Commission, on page 140, the first would be 4·5 Howitzers, empty, 1,666,666, at $16.50 each. Then you will find the same thing with reference to the 18-pounder high explosive, 1,666,666 at $16.50, and the 18-pounder fixed ammunition, that would be shrapnel, 1,666,666 at $18 each. Now, their contention was that, so long as the component parts all put together did not exceed the prices mentioned in this schedule or authorized by the War Office, it was their business from whom they were purchased, where they purchased, and at what prices, although I do not mean to say that the three gentlemen examined had intimated for a moment that they had any right to retain any of this money for themselves. There again I do not want to discuss the evidence, as I said in opening. But that is the attitude which they have assumed. That attitude was assumed to-day very distinctly by Mr. Cantley and Mr. Watts, I think perhaps more positively by Mr. Watts than the others; but all made the claim that they did not intend to take profits. But they claimed that they had legal right to take profits as long as the total cost of these articles did not exceed the cost authorized by the War Office; that they were within their right, and could act as to that as they had a mind to.

That is the substance of the foundation for the request which I wish to make of the Government. I have tried to give to the House as accurately as I could, and I only read from the official documents, the position of affairs as it stood up to yesterday morning. Yesterday morning the cross-examination of Sir Alexander Bertram was commenced by Mr. Johnston, and I am sorry to say it did not get very far along when a very serious question arose as to the powers of the Commission under the reference. But, Mr. Speaker, before I go into that, I have omitted one important thing in the direct examination of Sir Alexander Bertram. It will be found on pages 342 and 343 of the evidence, and as it is very important I wish to read the whole page. This was on the direct examination by Mr. Hellmuth, the Government counsel, and the examination proceeds as follows:

> Well, then, General, after that when did you first learn or appreciate the fact that there was going to be some difference, considerable or otherwise, between the War Office prices and the prices at which you had let these contracts to the sub-contractors. When was the earliest that you appreciated that?—A. Oh, it would be probably a week or ten days after. On the first order you mean?
>
> Q. Yes?—A. Yes.
>
> Q. A week or ten days after you appreciated the fact that there was going to be a profit?—A. Yes, sir. I began to collect prices of the component parts and estimated a surplus in the first place to carry on the business of inspection and the clerical work in connection with the Committee.
>
> Q. Well now was that probably discussed with other members of the committee at first?—A. No, sir.
>
> Q. Did you discuss it with any one at that time?—A. No, sir, I did not.
>
> Q. When did you first, if at all, discuss that with anyone and with whom?—A. With General Hughes.
>
> Q. And about when was that?—A. Oh, probably November or December.
>
> Q. That is in November or December of 1914?—A. Yes, sir.
>
> Q. And perhaps you will tell me what the discussion was?—A. I came up to Ottawa on some business in connection with the work and showed General Hughes a statement of the profits on the component parts of the shell, which amounted to a considerable sum.
>
> Q. Could you give me any idea of the sum?—A. I have the original. I think on the first 200,000 shells we estimated a surplus of $52,000.
>
> Q. It was quite a sum at all events. Will you continue then? When you told him that, what next?—A. Well, I found that our expenses in running the Shell Committee were a great deal less than I expected, and wondered what we were going to do with the surplus. I think I suggested that if we had a surplus we would turn it over to the Patriotic Fund. General Hughes said: "No, give it back to the War Office."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: I am certainly trying to give the House the whole story.

Mr. BEST: It is much milder than before.

Mr. CARVELL: I think I appreciate the position that I occupy to-day, and remarks like that coming from a farmer member of this House are very much out of place.

Mr. BEST: It is quite true.

Mr. CARVELL: I am going to argue this matter as a lawyer, and I am not going to be drawn away by any farmer back-benchers on the other side of the House. (Reading.)

Q. So that at that time, let me understand it, you were prepared to turn the surplus over to the Patriotic Fund. That is you were not suggesting keeping it?—A. Oh, no.

Q. That had not entered your mind then?—A. No, we were doing it as a patriotic job.

Q. And General Hughes said, "Turn it over to the War Office"?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now that is in December or November?—A. I couldn't tell. It was some time about November or December. You know at that time we had no idea of getting any future order.

Q. Then to follow this out for the moment, you did get a number of future orders as you know?—A. Yes.

Q. And was it borne in on your mind when you got these future orders that there were going to be future surpluses?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you do in regard to that, did you communicate that to anybody?—A. No.

Q. Until when? When did you next if at all speak of a possible surplus, and to whom? Carry along from the time you spoke to General Hughes in November or December, whom next did you discuss that with, that there might be a surplus?—A. I would rather not give that for publication, unless the Commission desire it.

Q. You did discuss it did you?—A. Yes, I was asked to report to a high authority on the progress of our work, which I did.

Q. And about what date was that?—A. Some time in May or June. It was after we arrived in Ottawa.

Sir William Meredith: When he speaks of high authority perhaps he would not object to say, does he mean Canadian or Imperial?

Mr. Hellmuth: My learned friend Mr. Johnston tells me that he is quite satisfied.

Q. And in May or June you say it was?—A. I think some time about the first week in June.

Q. May I ask whether then the amount was still about $52,000 or whether it had grown into millions?—A. No, it had gone up to $14,800,000.

That was in the first week of the inquiry. Then, Sir, I think it was on Monday of this week, a statement was submitted and admitted in evidence, as of date the 30th day of November, 1915, which is the date when the old Shell Committee ceased to exist and the Imperial Munitions Board was created. This will be found on pages 345-6-7 of this report. I do not know that it will be necessary to incorporate it in Hansard. It takes up every different item or every different contract given by the War Office. It starts in with 100,000 18-pounder shrapnel and 100,000 15-pounder shrapnel, which were included in a contract of the first day of October. It goes on and gives a statement of the value of the material ordered and the balance of the material, or labour—I think they are both called material—in each distinct contract, the total, the War Office prices, and the surpluses or deficits whichever they may be. The sum total of it is that the surplus—that is, the difference between the prices authorized by the War Office and the cost of the articles to the Shell Committee—would be $41,350,000, or, in other words, legally speaking, the four contractors would have the right to take $41,350,000; but, as they say, morally, they never intended to do it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Is not that $30,000,000?

Mr. CARVELL: I am coming to that in a moment. The statement was $41,360,000, but very shortly after the document was produced there was an error discovered in it, and that was in reference to the cost of 1,666,666 45-pounder howitzer shells, an error of somewhere around $11,500,000 That would bring the estimated profit down to the vicinity of $30,000,000 instead of $41,000,000. These matters have not been checked up, and of course, I do not know whether they are right or wrong; I simply take the document as it was placed before the Commission.

When Mr. Johnston attempted to cross-examine Sir Alexander Bertram yesterday morning, he was proceeding along a line that both he and I—I having consulted with him in regard to the matter—believed to be quite proper under the reference. In order that there may be no question as to what took place, I shall read from the record. I do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that you or the members of the House generally have had an opportunity of seeing this. I went to the gentleman who has charge of the reporting and asked him to get me a number of typewritten copies. He told me that the printed copies would not be ready until late in the afternoon, but I urged him to get me two printed copies if he could do so, and to my surprise, just as the committee adjourned at one o'clock, he brought me two printed copies, but containing only the first hour

or hour and a half's evidence. One of these I have given to the Premier, and the other I shall read from myself. I am sorry I was unable to get any more. I am reading from page 371, during Mr. Johnston's cross-examination:

Mr. Ewart: I wish to point out to the Commission that the contracts Mr. Johnston is referring to now are not within the scope of the Commission at all, the boxes, empty shells, and the prices for them.

Witness: I never heard of any $9.25. The four hundred thousand were taken at $6.

Mr. Ewart: I wish to press my objection, that this has nothing to do with the matters in question. If it is followed up it will lead to endless questioning and cross-questioning. If Mr. Johnston goes into these questions we will have to go into other things.

Mr. Johnston: I will read a portion of the letter so that it will call it back to your mind.

On page 32 of the printed record, in Exhibit No. 28 this appears: "Can also supply further four hundred thousand 15- or 18-pr. shrapnel shells, empty, packed in ammunition boxes same delivery, price nine and a quarter dollars each, including boxes, not including cost of inspection."

Now, will you tell me (and I am not asking for anything further than the mere fact) were you asked $9.25, which should be $9.25 with 20 cents off for the box, when you told us that you had made up your mind that there would be a profit of $8.55?—A. I will tell you why. $8.55 includes the box.

Q. Was that the only reason?—A. I don't know, I don't remember that price of $8.55.

Q. It is in Exhibit No. 16?—A. I don't remember that.

Q. On the 18th of September General Hughes sent to "Troopers" the following: "Reference your cipher September 17th, committee reports price of 100,000 shrapnel 18-pr. as per your cablegram specifications will be $8.55 each delivered at Montreal, 20,000 by November 1st, and at least 30,000 monthly thereafter." Do you remember that?—A. Was that the first one?

Q. That is the first offer I can find as to price?—A. Yes.

Q. And that was on the 18th of September?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then "Committee report 100,000 shrapnel price $8.30 each."—A. 15-pr.

Mr. Ewart: Better read it, Mr. Johnston.

Mr. Johnston: Very well. "Committee report 100,000 shrapnel 15-pr. shells." Then there was an acceptance of that price under Exhibit 18 on the 18th of September, but no fuses discussed at all.

Q. That you told us was, as I took it down, you were satisfied there was a profit on that contract?—A. Just go back now. At the time we realized we were going to get a profit was long after the 18th of September, I said several weeks.

Q. You said that in the end of November you would make up your mind that there would be a profit at $8.55, and you said to-day that long before that you had made up your mind that there would be a profit. You have sworn to it this morning?—A. Well, what about it?

Q. What do you say about it yourself—I am not giving evidence.—A. What is the question?

Q. The question is, that you said yesterday that about the end of November you made up your mind that there would be a profit at $8.55?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. This morning you said that long before that you had made up your mind that there would be a profit at $8.55?—A. I said that tentatively.

Q. Now, I am asking you how it was that you demanded for the same article $9.05, 70 cents difference on the shell, on the 24th November according to this cable; I want the reason for it?—A. I cannot remember.

Q. You cannot give me any reason for it?—A. No.

Mr. Ewart: He gave one reason, the boxes?—A. You must recollect that the first order was without boxes, which cost us $1 each.

Q. I am allowing you 20 cents, which is more than you say it cost, and allowing that I am asking you for an explanation why this took place?—A. I cannot go back.

Q. Your counsel seems to intervene and say you have answered it?—A. I cannot remember, I have never seen the letter or cable since; we do not sit pouring over these things every day.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Perhaps, Mr. Johnston, you might draw General Bertram's attention to a sentence lower down, to be quite fair.

Mr. Johnston: "Early decision necessary as prices raw material advancing rapidly;" what do you say as to that, do you remember that?—A. That governed the situation a good deal, and probably we had in mind that at the time, because we had information that they were giving higher prices in the United States—nothing like being on the safe side.

Q. To whom did you consult with reference to prices in that case?—A. With my secretary.

Q. Is that all?—A. Yes.

Q. Did Col. Carnegie know about these prices from you?—A. Nothing definite.

Q. What would he know if he did not know anything definite, because there was only the one thing, the quality of the shell and the price that you fixed?—A. At what date was that?

Q. I am speaking now about November?—A. Yes, yes, he discussed prices.

Q. Have you any recollection of discussing this particular matter with him?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. What is your recollection about that?—A. We discussed prices and the advance in the prices of material and a great many other things to arrive at a price on the shell.

Q. That would be before the 24th November, which was the day you fixed the price, I think?—A. Yes.

Q. You did fix a price on the 18th September at a lower rate, $8.55?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember any discussion with him, not generally you did have this or that, but did you remember any particular discussion as to price—this was the initiation you know, of the business?—A. On the 18th September.

Q. Or in September?—. I do not think he had arrived here in Canada at that time.

Q. What time did he join the Board?—A. Some time about the 20th.

Sir William Meredith: He was appointed inspector on the 24th September.

Mr. Hellmuth: Ordnance adviser?—A. Yes.

Q. When did he become a member of the

Board?—A. In 1915, about May or June, I do not know.

Q. It was after the occurrence anyway?—A. Yes.

Q. You see the reason I am troubling you?—A. You are not troubling me one bit.

Q. I am troubling you to get an answer which I am not getting; I am asking you if you recollect any particular conversation with Carnegie or anybody else when you came to fix the price at $8.55 or $9.25?—A. I cannot remember any conversation at all excepting what you see on record in black and white; I know we discussed it.

Q. You cannot tell me then as to what information you got from Carnegie or anybody else that brought you to these prices?—A. Yes, he had lots of information he brought with him from England.

Q. I dare say, but about these particular prices, if you will confine yourself to that, about these particular prices that I have referred to, can you give me any conversation or any interview?—A. No, I cannot; we were in constant communication; he was on one side the table and I was on the other.

Q. He was not on one side of the table until he came out in September?—A. No.

Q. The first one I am talking about is the 18th September?—A. Oh, well.

Sir William Meredith: Well what is the use of asking whether he talked with a man who was not here?

Mr. Johnston: Where the witness gives general evidence——

Sir William Meredith: This witness is to be treated at present as a respectable man.

Mr. Johnston: I hope I am treating him as that. If you take that view I shall not examine him.

Sir William Meredith: Certainly, the most searching, but treat him as a respectable man.

Mr. Johnston: In what way am I treating him as not a respectable man?

Sir William Meredith: It seems to me you are treating him just as you would treat the commonest kind of a witness that you thought was dishonest.

Mr. Johnston: Surely not; I certainly resent that accusation against my treatment of the witness.

Sir William Meredith: I cannot help you resenting it; it is my view of the way in which you are conducting the examination.

Mr. Johnston: If I am simply to go over in a polite manner with any witness I might as well not be here at all.

Sir William Meredith: As I say, the most searching examination, but do not make offensive observations.

Mr. Johnston: I do not know of any offensive observations I have made.

Sir William Meredith: I think that discussion as far as I am concerned will cease now.

Mr. Johnston: Did you consult any other colleagues at that time about prices?—A. No, sir.

Mr. Johnston: I did not intend to ask this witness—of course I felt somewhat hampered after the remarks made—

Witness: Do not feel that you are offending me, Mr. Johnston; I want to give you everything, and I will take it in the most pleasant way.

Mr. Johnston: I want to mention a matter to the Commissioners, General, just for a moment; I wanted to ask this witness, if I go on with him at all, as to certain matters in connection with that contract of the 1st October in which these four gentlemen for the first time became parties to the dealing in shells that I abstained from with the other witness because the question was reserved as to whether or not—

Mr. Ewart: We cannot hear you, and we really would like to hear.

Mr. Johnston: —as to whether or not I should go into that matter and that point I understand was reserved; if the Commission is of opinion that I ought not to ask questions in regard to that I shall not put any further question.

Mr. Hellmuth: May I intervene for a moment; anything that bears upon the question of contractual relationship or trustee relationship I would not desire to prevent, as far as I am concerned, any inquiry into that; going into the particular contracts were made outside of the scope of this is another matter, but the questions that would lead up to that I should think in view of the dealings with these particular contracts might be asked; that is the way it occurs to me.

Mr. Johnston: I may say that the question of what took place as gathered from various witnesses may be important from our standpoint, from my standpoint at any rate,and I so submitted at the time; in addition to that the contracts have been proved and they are before the Commission, and surely it is open to me to examine as to the contracts proved by my learned friend Mr. Hellmuth, and made part of the record. If they can be proved and nothing more said about it then of course my duty is very simple, as I should not ask if the Commissioners so rule, and I would not event attempt to lead up to that.

Mr. Hellmuth: I am not objecting to your asking any questions in regard to those contracts that were entered into between the Shell Committee or the four members of the Shell Committee and the Secretary of State for War through General Hughes; all I am objecting to is your going into the contracts that these parties made with others in regard to the matter, but I should think it is quite proper to find out from those contracts and from other circumstances what the relationship was; in regard to that I do not certainly interpose; I shall be glad if it were done.

Mr. Johnston: I answer that by saying that the question of the relationship having been asked yesterday and emphasized with General Bertram as to whether or not they were contractors or mere trustees or agents, or whatever one may choose to call them, that that question depends entirely upon what was done under these contracts after they were entered into, and the facts connected with the contracts themselves, and with the action of this witness or any other witness, ought to be available to me for the purpose of showing what the real relationship was notwithstanding the evidence my learned friend offered yesterday in regard to the fact that they were not in reality contractors but agents.

Sir William Meredith: You have not made it at all clear to me the scope of the inquiry you desire to enter into. Do you propose to enter upon an inquiry as to contracts, the details of contracts that were entered into with regard to other matters than the four that are referred to this Commission to examine into the prices at which those contracts were let or taken from the War Office, and the prices at which they were let to those who contracted with the Shell Committee—is that what you propose to do?

Mr. Johnston: And the relations between the parties as to their dealing and how the account was kept and the payments made; that is what I stated at the time, at least I intended to state that at the time, when the Commissioners thought until further consideration I ought not to deal with the matter, and I have ceased dealing with the matter.

(The Commissioners confer.)

Sir William Meredith: Mr. Johnston, the Commissioners are of opinion that you can make inquiries of this or any other witness as to the relationship between the Shell Committee and the War Office, or the Minister of Militia, but you cannot enter into the particulars of any of the transactions that are not the subject of this inquiry.

Mr. Johnston: It occurs to me with all deference, if I cannot go into the particulars—take, to make it quite clear I will give the dates of the contracts: October 1, 1914, Exhibit 23; October 20, 1914, Exhibit 31; July 1, 1915, Exhibit 122—now, the superficial facts or the facts that bear generally upon the contracts have been given; that, as I understand it is—

Hon. Mr. Duff: Let us take the first one and let us understand; this is the contract between the War Office and these gentlemen.

Mr. Johnston: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Duff: The observations of Sir William Meredith were not directed to this contract.

Mr. Johnston: Then 20th October, 1914, Exhibit No. 31.

Hon. Mr. Duff: That is the same thing, that is the contract between the War Office and these gentlemen.

Mr. Johnston: Yes. The 1915 one, July 1, page 139.

Hon. Mr. Duff: That is the same thing.

Mr. Johnston: They are all upon the same basis, and what I asked permission to go into was this, I wanted to show what these four gentlemen did, and in order to show that I want to ask the witness as to prices that they got from the War Office, and the prices that they paid to the sub-contractors.

Sir William Meredith: That involves going into each one of the transactions mentioned in that agreement; only four of them are the subject of this inquiry.

Mr. Johnston: I do not want to have any misunderstanding about what I desire to do, and I am putting it plainly now to the Commissioners as to what I propose to do subject to the ruling of the Bench, and I understand the ruling is I am not entitled to go into the particulars of these matters to ascertain the facts as I have outlined them.

Hon. Mr. Duff: The particulars of the prices of particular contracts other than these four contracts.

Mr. Johnston: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Duff: That is to say there is no question of contracts for fuses—

Mr. Johnston: No, I understand that, as far as the fuses are concerned, but the fuses are included with other matters in a contract of the 1st of July, 1915, because there was a lump sum of $16.50 as to these four contracting parties, nominally or really contracting parties, and as I pointed out, and as I again point out, that in order to ascertain the exact status of these gentlemen I ask to be allowed to go into the transaction, and let me make it as general as possible, into the whole transaction which will bear not upon the question of fuses but upon the position which these gentlemen actually occupied towards the War Office or towards anybody else with regard to these contracts for similar purposes.

Sir William Meredith: I think our ruling is plain, Mr. Johnston; you will proceed having regard to it, please.

Mr. Johnston: I do not know that I can make it clear to myself.

Sir William Meredith: If you will ask your questions and they are contrary to the ruling we will deal with them.

Mr. Johnston: Perhaps I can put in the form of questions that will explain what the ruling is and what my position is, that I should inquire and do inquire from this witness as to the persons to whom sub-contracts were let, and the prices under the contract of the 1st October, 1914—

Sir William Meredith: That is excluded except to these four contracts that were—

Mr. Johnston: I am speaking now about 1st October, 1914—

Sir William Meredith: As I understand what you have said, if there is a full price $16.50, part of it only the fuse, the ruling would not prevent you going into an inquiry as to the rest of the $16.50, whatever it is.

Hon. Mr. Duff: That is with regard to the five millions.

Mr. Johnston: Yes, I understand that.

Mr. Ewart: That is not the contract of the 1st October.

Mr. Johnston: But the 1st October contract, 1914, is not that kind of contract, as you will see; so that if that is the ruling I cannot go into these very matters I am speaking about, and there is no use putting questions which would be ruled out.

Sir William Meredith: No, no use taking up unnecessary time.

Mr. Johnston: Because each question would be ruled out, and I do not want to take that position at all.

Mr. Hellmuth: In regard to the ruling the questions that are directed towards elucidating the position of the four gentlemen with the War Office, whether they were, although legally contractors, treating themselves as trustees or agents, I do not understand any questions of that kind are ruled out.

Sir William Meredith: Certainly not.

Mr. Hellmuth: But if my learned friend Mr. Johnston wants to ask in regard to another contract or sub-contract made by these four gentlemen with somebody else in relation to a matter which is not covered by the terms of the Order in Council he cannot go into that.

Sir William Meredith: That is the ruling.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Or which has nothing to do with the contract of the five million.

Mr. Johnston: I have raised the question because I have taken one contract as a sample of the 1st October which has nothing to do with fuses, and is only brought forward by myself for the purpose of showing the actual contractual or other relationship of these parties, and in order to do that it would necessitate by going into the question of their sub-contracts, or payment, and the method of payment, and method of book-keeping and so on, which of course would be necessary to show whether they were contractors or agents.

Sir William Meredith: You are aware, of course, the Order in Council provides for the reference of other questions to this commission

if it is thought expedient to do so. If anybody thinks that these matters ought to be inquired into, and we are to stay here all summer doing it, I suppose representations can be made—Mr. Carvell is a member of the House, he can bring the matter up and ask that the power of the inquiry be extended, but we must keep within the terms of our map.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps it would be better to read the next dozen lines.

Mr. CARVELL (reading):

Sir William Meredith: You understand, Mr. Johnston, that with regard to this five million contract, the question of profits made by anybody is open to inquiry.

Mr. Johnston: I understand that.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Not merely as to the fuses, you know.

Mr. Johnston: Yes. And as to the five million fuses, not merely as to the price of fuses but the prices under the sub-contract, and so forth.

Hon. Mr. Duff: As to profits, as to fuse contracts, made by anybody. The fuse contracts were—speaking very roughly—an element in the transaction with regard to the five millions and what has been said with regard to other contracts does not apply to the five millions.

Mr. Johnston: I understand that the five millions is open to all investigation and all inspection of papers and all examination that may be deemed necessary.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that is enough.

Mr. CARVELL: I was not going to read that part, because it is only a repetition of what had been stated earlier. To summarize the matter, you will see, Mr. Speaker, the position in which Mr. Johnston finds himself in this investigation. The Government counsel, without asking the consent or advice of any one—and, I must say, I think quite properly—placed in evidence all the correspondence leading up to the contract of the first day of October, a part of the correspondence leading up to the contract of the 20th day of October, and a very small part of the correspondence leading up to the contract of the first day of July. And the statement is made, without any substantiation, without any book, any document, any paper, or proof of any kind, that the net profits of the first contract would be about $52,000. I wish to state at once that, later on, that was reduced to $42,000, and, so that there may be no question about the actual facts, in future I will discuss this as being about $42,000. He says there is no evidence given as to the profits of the second contract, because that was for shell boxes and cartridge cases; but the amount of profit is given as about $14,800,000. And these three documents are in evidence and they are simply bald statements made up, I presume, by bookkeepers; for when General Bertram was asked, he did not know about it, but said that that was what he was told. The moment Mr. Johnston attempts to cross-examine into the manner by which they arrived at the estimated profit of $42,000 in one case and $14,800,000 in the other, he is prevented from going into that. It seems to me that is a violation of the most elementary rules for the conduct of legal examinations in courts; and I am assuming—in fact I know—that the commissioners are attempting in this matter to apply the same rules as would be applied in court.

3 p.m.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does not it depend on the status of the committee?

Mr. CARVELL: The rules by which evidence would be received or rejected would be the ordinary rules governing the reception or rejection of evidence in a court of law. I do not know that that is so stated, but it is so elementary that I am satisfied that if the commissioners were here they would agree with me.

Mr. MORPHY: Was the statement to which the hon. gentleman referred, relating to $42,000, sworn to by any official of the Shell Committee to be correct?

Mr. CARVELL: General Bertram stated that he admitted the profits to be $52,000 in one case, and later a document was put in, not sworn to by anybody, showing that the net profits by that contract were $42,000.

Mr. MORPHY: Did you have General Bertram's oath?

Mr. CARVELL: I read his statement, and for the information of my hon. friend I will refer to it again.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not wish it.

Mr. CARVELL: I read every word he said.

Mr. BURNHAM: If he had a right to it, what difference would it make what the amount was?

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid my hon. friend is not following the argument. I stated half a dozen times that General Bertram and his associates were not claiming that they had the right to take the money. Probably it would be better to let me go on, and when I have finished I shall be glad to answer any questions hon.

gentlemen may ask me. Now, the legal position in which we find ourselves is that a number of very important statements have been made—that profits amounting in one case to $42,000, in the second case to $14,800,000, and in the third case to about, we will say, $30,000,000, have been made in the operations of the Shell Committee. I am not saying now that they intended taking them, but that they had made them over and above the prices authorized by the War Office. But we do not know how these prices were arrived at except as I have explained in the two or three different instances referred to. We thought we should have the right to show exactly how these figures were arrived at; we should have the right to know how much it cost to maintain and operate the Shell Committee; we should have the right to know whether the profits or the savings—I do not want to use the word "profit"—on the second contract, instead of being $14,800,000, should not have been $25,000,000 or possibly even $30,000,000. But we are simply met with a bald statement. We are told that the amount is $14,800,000, and are not vouchsafed any of the particulars upon which that is arrived at, nor are we allowed to ask any questions in order to satisfy ourselves how they were arrived at.

Mr. BURNHAM: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. BURNHAM: I was there and heard the argument. The point, it seems to me —and as a member of the House I must try to understand this matter—is that, if these gentlemen were contractors, you have no right to inquire into these matters. Therefore it is the status of the committee you must inquire into first.

Mr. CARVELL: If this House and the Government, or if the Shell Committee themselves, want to take the ground that they were contractors, if they wish to say, "That is our business and none of yours, we can make what profits we want to, we can pay one friend $5 for a given article and another $2 for the same article—"

Mr. BEST: Did they do that?

Mr. CARVELL: Now, if that farmer over there will just keep quiet—

Mr. WILCOX: I resent this casting of aspersions upon the farmer members of this House.

Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WILCOX: I want to say that if there were a few more farmers in this House and a few less like the member for Carleton it would be a good deal better.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BEST: I may be a plain farmer, but I would not associate myself with him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BEST: I firmly believe—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BEST: I firmly believe that if he was in Ireland he would be hot.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BEST: He is a rebel to the Empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BEST: A rebel to the Empire.

An hon. MEMBER: That is a fine specimen.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to say that for myself, I know many members of this House on both sides who are farmers—

Mr. CARVELL: I am one myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: —and they have my greatest respect; I consider them as gentlemen.

Mr. CARVELL: I think, perhaps, I should not have made the remark I did to the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best). I am a farmer myself.

Mr. DAVIDSON: "This was the most unkindest cut of all."

Mr. WILCOX: We know what you are.

Mr. CARVELL: I have been trying to discuss this matter as a pure matter of legal argument, and have refrained from making any comment upon the evidence. I was trying to answer the question put by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) as to whether or not it was anybody's business, assuming that these gentlemen were contractors. I say that if the four working members of the Shell Committee take that ground, if the House takes that ground, if the Government takes that ground, that these gentlemen have made a contract with the War Office to supply shells at a certain price, and that is

nobody's business whether they paid to their friends higher prices than they should have paid, nobody's business what they did, nobody's business whether they made a loss or not, so long as they delivered the goods—then I do not think I should have the right to come here. But I have stated to the House that the members of the Shell Committee do not take that attitude. They say that while it is true that they took the legal attitude of being contractors, they always intended to hand this money over, and that they did hand it over, and it went to their successors, the Imperial Munitions Board. I hope I have sufficiently answered the hon. member for West Peterborough; I have tried to make it as plain as I possibly can. In order to arrive at any just conclusion as to the conduct of the members of the old Shell Committee; in order to come to any conclusion as to whether or not they conducted themselves in a proper manner, speaking from the commercial standpoint; in order to satisfy ourselves and the country as to whether these munitions which were bought on account of the British Government, and, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance some months ago, to some extent for the Government of Canada, were purchased as cheaply as they should have been purchased and whether the transaction was as sound a business transaction as it should have been, I submit, Sir, that the scope of this inquiry should be so enlarged that we should have the right to go into the method by which they made up the estimate that they saved $42,000 in the one case, $14,800,000 in the second case, and $30,000,000 in the third case. That is what I want to bring before the House and especially before the Prime Minister, because, being a good lawyer, he can appreciate exactly what I am talking about. I do not go so far as to question the ruling of the commissioners; I want to keep entirely away from that phase of the case. I have tried to place these facts before the House in order that they might be treated by the House entirely as a legal matter, coupled, of course, with the public interest; in order that the matter might be discussed from that standpoint and not in any way from the standpoint of what may have taken place or what will take place before the Royal Commission. I do not have to remind the House that in my judgment it would be entirely improper to discuss that, and I do not propose doing so, because the Royal Commission is not more than half or one-third through with its business. It will be time enough to discuss the doings of the commission when the witnesses have been heard and the facts are before the public.

Before I take my seat I wish publicly to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister —and I hope that I shall be allowed to do so, even though the matter is not contained in the notice which I gave to you, Mr. Speaker,—the fact that under the terms of the Inquiries Act there is no provision for taking the evidence of a witness outside the Dominion of Canada; that is, there is no provision for compelling the attendance of such witness. You are well aware, Mr. Speaker, that most of the states of the Union have provisions for compelling the attendance of witnesses before commissions issued out of our courts under certain conditions. In the state of New York the statute reads practically in this way—I think I can give it almost verbatim, although I have not the citation before me—I think it is section 915 of the Code of New York: "Any party to a suit, cause or action pending in any court may apply to have commissioners appointed, subject to the procedure afterwards given, which commissioners shall have the right to examine witnesses under oath, ask for and compel the production of documents," and generally to go on and work it out. There are decisions in the state of New York providing that a judge under the procedure granted may subpoena and force the attendance of witnesses before the commission appointed just the same as would be done in our own courts. There is no provision of our Inquiries Act which brings us within the purview of that sort of condition. That is to say, our Inquiries Act does not recognize the existence of parties; it does not recognize a Commission under our Act to be a court. As I view it, therefore, our Commissioners would have no power to appoint a Commission to go to any state in the Union and compel the attendance of witnesses the same as they could if these were applied for out of a court or by a party to a cause in that court. I make this suggestion to the Prime Minister, with the intention at the earliest possible moment—

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman will pardon me, is it not quite true that the statute that he is referring to of the State of New York, and statutes generally dealing with the subject, are limited entirely in their application to civil or criminal proceedings, and that, therefore, unless we have

a civil or criminal proceeding, it would not help the matter to call this commission a court? I may point out that when we get ready for any civil or criminal proceedings, of course we have plenty of courts before which we can proceed and on the proceedings before these courts we might invoke that statute.

Mr. CARVELL: I am bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and I hope that the Minister of Justice will be able to devise a scheme by which a commission of inquiry such as I refer to will come under the provisions of the New York statute.

Mr. DOHERTY: We should have to be able to amend the New York Act.

Mr. CARVELL: I have stated my object in bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I had intended asking the Prime Minister if arrangements could be made by which an Act could be passed bringing our commission under the Inquiries Act within the purview of the statute of New York or other statute, in order to obtain the evidence of witnesses who cannot be brought from the United States to Canada as the law now stands.

I have tried to place this matter before the House as plainly as I can. I only hope that the House will agree that I have presented a case, and that the scope of this inquiry will be so extended that we may be enabled to give to the people of Canada not merely a certain disjointed portion referring to three or four matters out of questions involving hundreds of millions of dollars, but the whole facts in connection with the case.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): My hon. friend has placed his position very clearly before the House. I should like to make an observation with regard to the concluding portion of his remarks. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House spoke of the possibility of some amendment being made to the Inquiries Act which would facilitate the summoning of witnesses and the enforcing of their attendance in another country. When that suggestion was made, early in April, I think, I wrote to the Minister of Justice, directing his attention to the suggestion and said that any legislation for that purpose might very properly be brought in if it were feasible. The difficulty that he has found—one which, I think, is very obvious to all who consider the question—is this: The statute, as he has observed, which really requires amendment for this purpose, is that in force in New York. If that statute were so amended that commissioners acting under the authority of the Government of any other country should have in New York power, through the medium of the courts there, of enforcing attendance in the cases mentioned by the hon. member for Carleton, there would be no difficulty. It has not been made plain to the Minister of Justice or to myself, although I have not given it the same consideration that he has, that any amendment of the Inquiries Act would affect the purpose which the hon. member for Carleton has in mind.

The hon. member for Carleton observed that the Government or the Shell Committee might take the ground, if they saw fit to do so, that this was not really a committee, but that these gentlemen occupied the position of contractors. We have not taken any such ground in this House, so far as the Government is concerned. The first information of an important and definite character that came to me with regard to the operations of the Shell Committee was that which I quoted in a speech delivered in this House on the 15th day of April, 1915. The members of the Shell Committee had called upon me with the Minister of Militia shortly before and described the extent of the operations of the Shell Committee and their possible development in the production of munitions in Canada. I asked them at that time to make a written statement which they afterwards prepared and which I read in the House on the 15th April, 1915. And certainly, whatever the legal forms may have been which were observed between the Shell Committee on the one hand and the War Office on the other hand, the memorandum which I then read to the House conveyed to me the most distinct impression, as I am sure it did to all members of the House, that they were acting as a committee and were not acting in a contractual relation. I will quote just a few paragraphs of that memorandum, which very probably has escaped the recollection of most of the hon. members. It was headed in this way: "Report on the Formation and Work of the Shell Committee by David Carnegie, M.I.C.E., Ordnance Adviser." One of the paragraphs in the introduction was as follows:

Details of the committee's formation, constitution and operation are given in the follow-

ing pages. Tabulated facts of the materials used in the contracts and their value are also recorded together with notes on the progress and nature of the work involved in the various contracts handled by the committee.

Under the heading of "Formation of the Committee," this paragraph appears:

Before actually forming the committee the Minister of Militia asked Colonel Greville Harston and Lt.-Colonel F. D. Lafferty, to get in touch with all manufacturers in Canada who they thought could make the component parts for shrapnel shells. He particularly emphasized his desire to have the steel manufactured in Canada.

On the 8th of September, 1914, at a meeting held by the minister at the Dominion Arsenal the following committee was appointed to organize the work throughout the Dominion:

Colonel A. Bertram, Chairman; Thos. Cantley, Esq., Geo. W. Watts, Esq., E. Carnegie, Esq., representing the manufacturers; Colonel T. Benson, Master General of Ordnance; Colonel Greville Harston, C. I. Arms and Ammunition; Lt.-Colonel F. D. Lafferty, R.C.A., superintendent of the Dominion Arsenal, representing the Department of Militia and Defence.

Lt.-Colonel Lafferty undertook the technical instruction of the manufacturers in shell construction, and it was decided that the examination and inspection would be carried out by the chief inspector of arms and ammunition.

About two weeks after the organization of the committee, Mr. David Carnegie, of London, Eng., was appointed by the minister as ordnance adviser to the Shell Committee.

Then, further, under the heading, "Work of the Committee:"

The work of the committee in the early stages was that of formulating definite plans of procedure. They determined that, as far as possible, all the materials employed in the shells would be made in Canada; up to that time, for instance, no Canadian steel had been used for the production of ammunition.

To Colonel Cantley the committee is under obligation for having rapidly installed and equipped plant for producing the first steel made in Canada for shell manufacture.

With the exception of the copper bands all ports of the shells now produced are made in Canada, and it is hoped that, before long, these also will be included amongst the Canadian industries.

Another important decision made by the committee was to supply to the shell assembling manufacturers, all the component parts of shells, free of charge. By this means many of the smaller manufacturers have been relieved of the financial strain of carrying a heavy stock of raw materials.

Under the heading "Executive Work," we find:

The executive work of the committee has been very wisely entrusted to the chairman, Colonel Bertram, who reports weekly to the Minister of Militia and also to the committee when it meets (which is usually monthly) or more often, at the call of the minister.

The work consists of controlling what might be regarded as a huge combination of factories in which various contracts are being executed to British War Office specifications, which entails constant attention and queries regarding the selection of suitable factories, the placing of contracts, instructing manufacturers in the art, inspecting the parts made, and the payment and auditing of accounts, etc.

And further on under "Executive Work:"

A chartered accountant recommended by the general manager of the Bank of Montreal checks the accounts of the committee every month. These are then forwarded to Mr. J. W. Borden, chief accountant for the Militia Department. It might be said in passing that the committee's accountant has expressed himself in gratifying terms of the highly efficient way in which the accounts of the committee are kept.

Then under "Shell Contracts:"

The result of his visit has been fully reported to the Minister of Militia, but it might be briefly stated here that the War Office officials did not fully understand the nature and importance of the committee's work, and had no idea that the factories in Canada were capable of undertaking such contracts, until these facts were placed before them.

Under the head of "Miscellaneous:"

In addition to the foregoing, the Minister of Militia, through his committee, has made several investigations for the War Office in connection with the supply of propellants and high explosives. An investigation was undertaken regarding the supply of nitro-cellulose powder by a large firm in the United States. Other matters have been investigated, such as the supply of rifles and ammunition for the Russian Government.

So that, whatever forms may have been devised between the committee and the Minister of Militia and the War Office, the impression conveyed to my mind by that report was that the committee were really acting as a committee in organizing the industries of Canada for the production of munitions of war, and were acting in that regard for the War Office and under its direction, with the co-operation, wherever necessary, of the Minister of Militia and Defence.

The hon. member for Carleton has gone over a considerable portion of the proceedings of the commission. I shall quote, before I conclude, some portions of what he has already quoted, in order to arrive at the exact status of the matter as it presented itself to the commission and to the counsel who are engaged. Let me call the attention of the House for a moment to the circumstances under which and to the reasons on account of which the commission was issued to the Hon. Sir William Meredith and the Hon. Mr. Justice Duff. I said in this House on the 30th day of March last:

If a member of this House desires to make a charge against any member of the Government, or any member of the House, the proper course is for him to rise in his place, make a personal statement on his responsibility as a member of

the House, and conclude the statement with a charge.

This has not been done, and thus the course which I am about to announce is, strictly speaking, not demanded by any action which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken. No one of them has risen in his place and taken the responsibility of making a charge in the sense above set forth.

The hon. member for Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Kyte) however, made statements late on Tuesday evening the 28th of March, as to the connection of the Minister of Miltia with certain contracts entered into by the Shell Committee, and as to enormous profits or commisions arising out of these contracts to certain companies which he mentioned. It is alleged that Mr. J. Wesley Allison had a very large interest in those profits or commissions, and it is suggested that through his influence with the Minister of Militia the Shell Committee were induced to make the contracts in question. The Minister of Militia and Defence had previously stated to the House his close relationship to Mr. J. Wesley Allison, and his great confidence in that gentleman.

Then I went on to say:

Having regard to these considerations, the Government propose to issue a Royal Commission.

And on the following Monday, the 3rd day of April, I announced that that commission had been issued on that day. There is one portion of it which I desire to read, in order to make the position of the Government absolutely clear with regard to what was then proposed. The relevant portion of the Order in Council is as follows:

The Prime Minister, therefore, recommends that a commission for the purpose aforesaid to issue under the said Part One of the Inquiries Act directed to the Honourable Sir William Ralph Meredith, Kt., Chief Justice of Ontario, and the Honourable Lyman Poole Duff, one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of Canada, authorizing and requiring them with all reasonable diligence to make full and complete inquiry into the contracts aforesaid and each of them and into the acts and proceedings of the Shell Committee, whether by themselves or by any other person or persons directly or indirectly, and of the Minister of Militia and Defence whether by himself or by any other person or persons directly or indirectly in relation thereto or in connection therewith and into the negotiations therefor, the profits or prospective profits arising thereunder, the disposition, division or allotment of such profits or prespective profits, or of any commission or reward for procuring the said contracts or any of them and as to the persons interested in any such profits, prospective profits reward or commissions, and generally speaking into all other acts, transactions and matters of every kind relating to the said contracts and each of them and to report the result of such inquiry with the evidence taken therein. Also to inquire into such other matters relating to the acts or proceedings of the Shell Committee as may be referred to the said commissioners by Order in Council from time to time, and to report the result of any such further inquiries with the evidence taken therein.

I did not explain to the House at the time the purpose or object of the concluding portion of what I have just read. It had been freely stated along the corridors of this House that the alleged charge of the hon. member for Richmond was only an instalment of the charges, or rather insinuations, which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House proposed to make. If any such further charges were to be made with reference to this matter, we did not propose to sit silent, but we did propose to have them investigated. Therefore that clause was inserted in the Order in Council. We had also in mind this: We proposed to send over to the Government of the United Kingdom the whole debate on the motion proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, with the assurance that if an inquiry into the matter were desired at this stage, we would be prepared to give every possible assistance and co-operation in such inquiry, and that as far as we were concerned the Government of Canada had absolutely no objection to such inquiry. So, the clause in the Order in Council fulfilled a double purpose in that regard.

Thereafter, on the 17th day of April, I read to the House an Order in Council which was passed on the 15th of April, setting forth in terms the motion proposed by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition with regard to this matter, and my observations in regard to it. That Order in Council concluded as follows:

Having regard to these considerations and to the statement above quoted, the Prime Minister recommends that the Hansard report of the debate upon the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier be transmitted to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with the assurance that the Government of Canada is prepared to assist and co-operate, as stated by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, in any inquiry or investigation into the transactions to which reference is made in the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and that so far as the Government of Canada is concerned there is no objection whatever to the fullest investigation that may be thought desirable at any time.

It is not necessary for me to do more than allude to the reasons which were set forth as to why we declined to enter upon such an inquiry without consultation with the British Government. There were two main reasons: One was that the expenditure was not by the Government of Canada, but by the Government of the United Kingdom, and another consideration was

this, that during the progress of a great war such as that in which we are now engaged, the Government of the United Kingdom might not think it desirable that an inquiry should take place at the present time. So, we sent the debate, we sent all that was alleged, to them for their consideration with the assurance that if they thought any inquiry desirable we would be prepared to co-operate in it to the fullest extent.

Now, the matter has reached a certain stage before the commissioners, and I would like to quote just a few portions of what has been already quoted to the House by my hon. friend from Carleton. At page 373 Mr. Johnston is reported as saying:

As to whether or not I should go into that matter and that point I understand was reserved; if the Commission is of opinion that I ought not to ask questions in regard to that I shall not put any further question.

Mr. Hellmuth: May I intervene for a moment; anything that bears upon the question of contractual relationship or trustee relationship I would not desire to prevent, as far as I am concerned, any inquiry into that; going into the particular contracts that were made outside of the scope of this is another matter, but the questions that would lead up to that I should think in view of the dealings with these particular contracts might be asked; that is the way it occurs to me.

Mr. Johnston: I may say that the question of what took place as gathered from various witnesses may be importance from our standpoint, from my standpoint at any rate, and I so submitted at the time; in addition to that the contracts have been proved and they are before the Commission, and surely it is open to me to examine as to the contracts proved by my learned friend Mr. Hellmuth, and made part of the record. If they can be proved and nothing more said about it then of course my duty is very simple, as I should not ask if the Commissioners so rule, and I would not even attempt to lead up to that.

Mr. Hellmuth: I am not objecting to your asking any questions in regard to those contracts that were entered into between the Shell Committee or the four members of the Shell Committee and the Secretary of State for War through General Hughes; all I am objecting to is your going into the contracts that these parties made with others in regard to the matter, but I should think it is quite proper to find out from those contracts and from other circumstances what the relationship was; in regard to that I do not certainly interpose; I shall be glad if it were done.

It will be noted that Mr. Hellmuth distinctly stated there that he had no objection whatever to going into these contracts in so far as that might be necessary to ascertain precisely the relationship of the committee to the War Office and its exact status. Further on, after the commissioners had conferred, Sir William Meredith said this:

Mr. Johnston, the Commissioners are of opinion that you can make inquiries of this or any other witness as to the relationship between the Shell Committee and the War Office, or the Minister of Militia, but you cannot enter into the particulars of any of the transactions that are not the subject of this inquiry.

The position, as far as I understand it, which Mr. Johnston took, and I am not presuming to criticise him in any way, was that the inquiry should be just as open to him as if all the contracts of the Shell Committee had been referred to the commissioners, and not merely the four contracts with respect to which the charges of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) were made. Of course, the commissioners could not acquiesce in any proposal of that kind. I would think that entirely obvious.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think my right hon. friend is stating the position exactly as it is, because, while if these contracts had not been put in in evidence and one side of the case had not been put forward, possibly my hon. friend's contention would be logically right; but Mr. Johnston's main contention was that, as these contracts had been put in evidence, and as the statement had been made about savings, he should have the right to cross-examine in order to test out the credibility of the witnesses and see exactly what the results ought to be.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not quite see the relation, because the charge made in this House was not in regard to the savings of the committee, that is, the difference between the amount which the British Government had authorized and the amount at which the committee had placed their contracts. The question was as to alleged exorbitant and inordinate profits made with respect to certain fuse contracts and other contracts, coupled with the suggestion, or the insinuation, that these contracts had been brought about through the instigation of the Minister of Militia and through some supposed influence that Mr. J. Wesley Allison had exercised upon him. That was precisely the issue which the hon. member for Richmond and other hon. members on the other side of the House proposed for investigation, and that is precisely the matter which the commissioners are proceeding to investigate, and as to which, so far as I understand, they are giving the fullest opportunities for in-

quiry. Sir William Meredith, further on, in reply to Mr. Johnston, said:

Sir William Meredith: That involves going into each one of the transactions mentioned in that agreement; only four of them are the subject of this inquiry.

And for the very good reason that in respect of only four of them was there any charge or even insinuation made in this House which affected in any way the status or honour of any member of this Government; and as to these, we promptly challenged inquiry, and have granted it. There now seems to be a disposition to raise some other question and ask for some other inquiry which is not covered by what hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House themselves suggested and asked for when this matter was brought up. Then, the Hon. Mr. Justice Duff goes on:

Hon. Mr. Duff: The particulars of the prices of particular contracts other than these four contracts—

Mr. Johnston: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Duff: That is to say, there is no question of contracts for fuses—

Mr. Johnston: No, I understand that, as far as the fuses are concerned, but the fuses are included with other matters in a contract of the 1st July, 1915, because there was a lump sum of $16.50 as to these four contracting parties, nominally or really contracting parties, and as I pointed out, and as I again point out, that in order to ascertain the exact status of these gentlemen, I ask to be allowed to go into the transaction, and let me make it as general as possible, into the whole transaction which will bear not upon the question of fuses but upon the position which these gentlemen actually occupied towards the War Office or towards anybody else with regard to these contracts or contracts for similar purposes.

Sir William Meredith: I think our ruling is plain, Mr. Johnston; you will proceed having regard to it, please.

Mr. Johnston: I do not know that I can make it clear to myself.

Sir William Meredith said further on:

Sir William Meredith: As I understand what you have said, if there is a full price, $16.50, part of it only the fuse, the ruling would not prevent you going into an inquiry as to the rest of the $16.50, whatever it is.

Hon. Mr. Duff: That is with regard to the five million.

Mr. Johnston: Yes, I understand that.

Further on Mr. Hellmuth makes these observations:

Mr. Hellmuth: In regard to the ruling the questions that are directed towards elucidating the position of the four gentlemen with the War Office, whether they were, although legally contractors, treating themselves as trustees or agents, I do not understand any questions of that kind are ruled out.

Sir William Meredith: Certainly not.

Mr. Hellmuth: Nor any inquiry in regard to any prices or any contracts that were made in regard to the fuses with the American Ammunition Company.

Sir William Meredith: Certainly not.

Mr. Hellmuth: But if my learned friend Mr. Johnston wants to ask in regard to another contract or sub-contract made by these four gentlemen with somebody else in relation to a matter which is not covered by the terms of the Order in Council he cannot go into that.

Sir William Meredith: That is the ruling.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Or which has nothing to do with the contract of the five million.

Further on Sir William Meredith observed:

Sir William Meredith: You understand, Mr. Johnston, that with regard to this five million contract, the question of profits made by anybody is open to inquiry.

Mr. Johnston. I understand that.

Hon. Mr. Duff: Not merely as to the fuses, you know.

Mr. Johnston: Yes. And as to the five million fuses, not merely as the price of fuses but the prices under the sub-contract and so forth.

Hon. Mr. Duff: As to profits, as to fuse contracts, made by anybody. The fuse contracts were—speaking very roughly—an element in the transaction with regard to the five millions and what has been said with regard to other contracts does not apply to the five millions.

Mr. Johnston: I understand that the five millions is open to all investigation and all inspection of papers and all examination that may be deemed necessary.

Under the circumstances, I hardly am able to appreciate the point or cogency of my hon. friend's suggestion that, by reason of anything that has transpired before the commissioners, there should be an amendment or extension of the terms of the Order in Council. The Government determined in the first instance that it could not undertake to authorize or proceed with a general inquiry into shell contracts, except after consultation with the British Government, and after submitting the whole matter to them. Later on, when a charge, or rather, a suggestion or insinuation was made on the other side of the House purporting to connect a member of the Government with contracts in respect of which it was said that inordinate and exorbitant profits had been made, although there was no direct charge in the ordinary sense, the Government determined that an inquiry ought to be made, and we brought down and laid upon the table of the House the Order in Council authorizing the present inquiry. That is the matter now being investigated and determined before the commissioners; that is the issue which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House themselves raised; that is the question, in so far as the status of any member of the Government is concerned, which they themselves asked to have determined; and

so far as I can understand from a perusal of the proceedings before the commissioners, a copy of which I have under my hand, the commissioners have not only granted but are disposed to grant in the future the widest latitude to those who are pressing this inquiry and endeavouring to support the allegations of the hon. member for Richmond. Under the circumstances it does not seem to me that either the Government or the members of this House are called upon to reverse a decision that was made after careful debate in this House, merely for the reason that an honourable member of the Bar, however eminent, may think it suits his purpose for the time being to pursue a particular line of cross-examination. So far as these contracts are concerned, everything is absolutely open to him.

So far as the status of the Shell Committee and its relationship to the War Office is concerned, the commissioners, if I understand their ruling correctly, will permit him to inquire, not only into the four contracts mentioned in the Order in Council, but, in a general way, into all the con tracts; he is not restricted or limited in any way whatsoever. But when he asks the commissioners to allow him the same scope of inquiry that he would have had if the whole proceedings of the Shell Committee had been referred to the commissioners for inquiry, why, naturally, no one would expect that the commissioners could acquiesce in such a course.

Under these circumstances, I can only say to my hon. friend that I do not feel there is any occasion whatever for an extension of the terms of the Order in Council authorizing the inquiry. If the British Government, after consideration of the documents which have been sent forward, should come to the conclusion that a general inquiry is desirable, we shall be most happy to refer that general inquiry to these same commissioners if they are prepared to undertake it; but, until some such desire or wish on their part is suggested to us, it does not seem to me there is any occasion for further action by the Government of Canada. The commissioners, as far as I understand—I have not had time to follow the evidence carefully—are giving, and properly giving, not only a fair but a wide interpretation to the terms of the Order in Council; they are giving a wide latitude to the inquiry. But when my hon. friend the member for Carleton suggests that there should be an inquiry into the estimated profits under other contracts, or as to how they were made, or how much the operations of the Shell Committee generally cost the British Government, I, for one, am unable to see how such considerations are relevant.

I for one am unable to agree that such considerations enter into this inquiry, or that they affect the particular question which was raised in this House by the hon. member for Richmond, with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite. Therefore I must say to my hon. friend that, so far as I am concerned, there appears no reason at present for extending the scope of the Order in Council which authorised this inquiry.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): Mr. Speaker, if my right hon. friend the Prime Minister had confined his observations to a statement that he would not consent to enlarge the scope of the commission, I do not know that I should have felt called upon to make any remarks; but the Prime Minister has said further that the Government had decided to issue a commission to investigate all the charges which in any way connected the Government or any member of the Government with mismanagement so far as the affairs of the Shell Committee were concerned, and then he has said that a perusal of the proceedings before the Royal Commission shows that they are giving the widest possible latitude and that no objection can be made against their proceedings. As to these two positions I desire to take distinct issue with my right hon. friend. I say that there was a distinct charge made against the Shell Committee with which a member of this Government was directly connected; that that charge pertained to the general conduct of the Shell Committee and was not limited to the purchase of fuses. That charge was made by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in the motion which he made for a committee of this House to investigate the conduct of the Shell Committee; that charge was reiterated by my hon. friend the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell); and then we had the statement of the Prime Minister that if any member of this House would stand in his place and make a formal charge and take the responsibility of his charge, the Government would grant an investigation. Then I, as a humble member of this Houses, and having a deep sense of the responsibility that rested upon me, did stand in my place and make a charge in

words as plain and clear and explicit as possible, and I took the responsibility of proving that charge, well knowing, if I failed to do so, the punishment that would be meted out to me as a member of this House. It is idle for the Prime Minister to say that no charge was made. Let me call your attention, Sir, to Hansard, page 1789, and see what was the charge and whether it was made in plain and explicit terms or not:

I, William Pugsley, a member of this House, in support of the motion now under consideration, standing in my place in this House and on my responsibility as a member of this House, declare and charge that the Shell Committee, appointed by the Minister of Militia and referred to in said motion, fixed excessive and unreasonable prices for shells and for other munitions and goods to be furnished to the British Government (which by arrangement between the British Government and the Canadian Government were to be paid for in part by Canada.)

That such prices were fixed with competition and were far in excess of what would necessarily have been paid if ordinary business methods had been pursued, thereby involving an unnecessary excessive expenditure of many millions of dollars, conservatively estimated at at least eighty millions, which will be improperly taken from the people of the United Kingdom and Canada.

That said committee gave large orders at such excessive prices and without competition to companies in which members of the committee were largely interested, and of some of which companies members of the said committee were the directing heads.

There is a charge, not confined to the purchase of fuses, but connected with the purchase by the committee of all goods for the purposes of the British Government. Later on in the charge which I made it is expressly declared that the actions of the Shell Committee were known to and were connived at by the Minister of Militia; and yet the Prime Minister says there was no charge connecting any member of this Government with improper conduct. Are we to understand that it will not be deemed a charge against this Government that they are guilty of negligence, that they are guilty by careless business methods, of allowing money to be taken out of the treasury of Great Britain and the treasury of Canada, and that, in order to make a charge against the Administration, you must charge personal dishonesty against some member of the Government? I have never understood that to be the rule applied to men in public life. I directed a charge against this Shell Committee, created by a member of this Government and acting for a member of this Government, that they, neglecting ordinary business methods and disregarding those ordinary rules of prudence which should guide the gentlemen who are carrying on the affairs of the country, paid excessive prices involving an unnecessary expenditure amounting to the enormous sum of $80,000,000; that that was done with the knowledge and connivance of the Minister of Militia to whom the Shell Committee reported from week to week. It astonishes me that the Prime Minister, in the face of that charge, rises to-day in his place and repeats the statement which he made some time ago in this House, that there was no charge in any way connecting any member of this Government with improper conduct so far as the Shell Committee was concerned. I charged further:

That there has been great and wholly unnecessary delay in furnishing the completed shells for use of the Canadian and British forces at the front.

That the said Shell Committee neglected and delayed for an undue period of time to provide the fuses necessary to render the shells effective, and, failing to endeavour to provide for their construction in Canada, as they might have done, proceeded to give and awarded, through J. Wesley Allison in the United States, contracts for fuses amounting to $22,000,000, on which they made an advance of $3,750,000. That the making of the said contracts through said Allison was unwise and improvident and was entered into with the knowledge and connivance of the Minister of Militia, and the said Shell Committee failed to obtain delivery of said fuses for an unreasonable time.

And I do also charge that the Government of Canada had, through the Minister of Militia, to whom the said Shell Committee reported weekly, knowledge of such irregular and improper methods and acts of the said Shell Committee, and while having the power at any time to put an end thereto the said minister improperly consented to such irregular and improper methods and acts and permitted the same to continue.

There was a charge directed against the Shell Committee, not limited to the purchase of fuses, but having reference to the various actions of that committee in the purchase of shells, shell boxes, and other materials, and charging them with improper and irregular conduct, and that such conduct upon their part was with the knowledge and connivance of the Minister of Militia. Yet my right hon. friend says there was no charge against the Shell Committee so far as any member of the Government being connected with it was concerned, except in reference to fuses, and that the latter charge was made by my hon. friend the member for Richmond. I feel constrained to make that statement in view of what my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has said in reference to there being no charge connecting any mem-

4 p.m.

ber of this Government with improper conduct.

The Prime Minister says that they have not dealt with this matter as if this committee had any contractual relations with the Imperial Government, but as if they were a committee. Does he forget that he and the members of this Government informed this House and informed the people that this Shell Committee was in no way responsible to this Government or to any member of this Government, but that all this Government did was to name seven reputable gentlemen for selection by the British Government as their committee for the purchase of munitions of war, and that it was to the British Government, and to the British Government alone, that that committee was responsible, that it was with that Government alone that they had relations? Does the Prime Minister forget that? Does the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) forget that? Does the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) forget that? If the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) were here, he might perhaps say something in a different way; but these gentlemen to whom I have referred, one after another, stood in their places in the House and said that this Government had nothing in the world to do with this committee. Did my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, when he made that statement in the House, know of these contracts which had been signed by Sir Sam Hughes, Minister of Militia, on the one side, and these four gentlemen, members of the committee, on the other? I cannot believe he knew of them. I cannot believe that had he known of them he would have concealed them from the knowledge of the members of this House and of the people of Canada. Some may think it strange that he did not know of these contracts, for they had seen it reported in the newspapers that at times he was acting Minister of Militia. It may seem strange to hon. members of this House that other gentlemen did not know of them, for we have seen the statement made at one time that the President of the Council, Mr. Lougheed, was acting Minister of Militia. Other gentlemen from time to time have acted as Minister of Militia. Some may think it strange that, taking charge of the department as they did, none should know of the existence of these contracts which, it has been said, had been so much a surprise when evidence of them was disclosed before the Royal Commission. These contracts were, as I have said, directly between these four gentlemen and this Government, through its Minister of Militia. Will it be said, in view of these contracts being now before the country, that this committee had nothing to do with this Government? Will it be said that they had nothing to do with the Minister of Militia? Will it be said that the Minister of Militia was not the man who took these orders from the British Government and then gave orders to these gentlemen who did so make the contracts? To-day we have the facts, we have the absolute confirmation of the statement of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made in this House when he quoted the remarks of Lord Curzon that these orders came directly from the War Office to the Minister of Militia of Canada. When that statement was made, hon. gentlemen on the other side were disposed to question it, but to-day we have the fullest confirmation of the position which the leader of the Opposition took in proposing his motion to the House.

The Prime Minister says that it is evident that there is no necessity for enlarging the scope of the commission, that it is evident the commission has been given the freest hand that any counsel can in reason ask to be given them. I am not disposed to agree with my right hon. friend in that. In a court of law, if the counsel for the plaintiff were to put in a document and examine the witness upon that document, whether the document was relevant or irrelevant, the counsel upon the other side would have the right to cross-examine with regard to that document. I ask any lawyer in this House if that would not be the case. That is one of the clearest and most elementary principles of law. Yet we find that the gentleman representing this Government and taking his instruction from this Government puts in these various documents, puts in the calculations of profits, and, with the consent of the commissioners, went fully and with very great detail into the actions of the Shell Committee so far as it pleased him to do so, but that, when Mr. Johnston proposed to cross-examine on these very documents the statement which Mr. Hellmuth, representing the Government, had placed before the Committee, he was denied the right to cross-examine, a right which would have been accorded to counsel in any court in this country. Does my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, as a lawyer of great

ability and large experience, say that that is fair play? Does he say that one side should be permitted to put in such documents as it pleases and that counsel representing a different interest shall not be permitted to cross-examine upon those documents? I deny that that is in accordance with the principles that govern ordinary legal proceedings; I deny that that is in accordance with the principles which should govern the Commission if they are desirous of having the fullest investigation and of the facts going to the public. If the Prime Minister does not feel like granting the request of my hon. friend from Carleton that the scope of the Commission should be enlarged, he should instruct Mr. Hellmuth, acting for the Government, to permit the fullest cross-examination upon all matters which he went into in his direct examination That would be only fair play, that would be only in accordance with justice and with the rules of procedure, which, as every lawyer knows, govern the taking of evidence in the courts of this country.

Just a word with reference to the suggestion of my hon. friend from Carleton that the Government should introduce legislation so as to give these judges, who are appointed under Royal Commission, the status of a court, in order that they may have power to issue a commission to the United States, and so be enabled to obtain evidence in that country. My hon. friend recognizes the desirability of doing that if it can be done. It is known that this very large contract was given in the United States; it is known that some of the most important witnesses reside in the United States; it is known that these witnesses cannot be compelled by any process to come to this country and that the only way in which their evidence can be secured would be by some procedure which would enable them to be brought before a representative of the commission in the United States. If the Government does not lend its aid—if that aid can be made effective towards this result—it would be putting a premium upon those acting for this Government going to the United States and there making their contracts, carrying on their business, and spending the money of this Government—or the money entrusted to the Shell Committee which is in reality the money of this Government and the money of Great Britain—because they would expect that no commission could follow them into a foreign country and obtain evidence which would be available if the transaction had been carried on in Canada. I hope my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice will bend their energies toward giving such a constitution to this commission as will prevent it from being deprived of the opportunity of taking the testimony of witnesses in the United States. It is admitted that if these commissioners were a court they could issue a commission to the United States and witnesses would be obliged to attend. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has said that that can only be done in a proceeding either civil or criminal. Well, no one pretends that it is a criminal proceeding that these commissioners are carrying on; but is it not a civil proceeding?

Mr. DOHERTY: Some very uncivil things have been said about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think so. We on this side of the House, while we regret that a committee of the House was not appointed to investigate this matter, and while the inquiry has not been broad so as to take in all the matters with respect to which we made these most serious charges, recognize that half a loaf is better than no bread, and that if opportunity is given for full inquiry it will be, to some extent at all events, satisfactory to the public. Why could not an Act be passed declaring that these commissioners shall be deemed to be a court of inquiry? Why should a clerk to this court not be appointed, and why should it not be provided that that court, so constituted—

Mr. DOHERTY: Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? Can this Parliament legislate that a body shall be deemed a court, and make that effective in the state of New York if the body is not a court?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes. The moment this Parliament, having jurisdiction to create a court for inquiry into public affairs, constitutes that body a court with power to take evidence under oath, to punish witnesses for contempt and to issue commissions to a foreign country, at that moment it becomes a court which will be recognized by the laws of a foreign country, the courts of which will then lend their aid to the bringing of witnesses before a commissioner appointed by our court to hear evidence. Does my hon. friend doubt the power of this Parliament to constitute a court? Only two days ago my hon. friend introduced a Bill to amend the Exchequer Court Act, in which he pro-

poses that the court shall carry on investigations and make inquiries even though they are not to pronounce judgment taking away property from the individual and giving it to the Crown. They are to carry on investigation and report to the Government as to the value of the property in regard to which they make the investigation. Suppose that was the whole power of the Exchequer Court; suppose it had not the power to give judgment, but were appointed simply for the purpose of making inquiry with regard to property which the Crown had expropriated and to report to the Government upon the value of the property. It would be equally a court; it could be equally given power to compel witnesses to come before it, to administer oaths, to punish for contempt. Equally could it be given the power to issue commissions to a foreign country in case it should be desirable to take evidence in such foreign country. I do not think my hon. friend will question the validity of the legislation that he himself is proposing with regard to the Exchequer Court. If that is so, then what is the difficulty in constituting these two judges a court of inquiry under the Inquiries Act? What is to prevent this Parliament from giving to the court so constituted the power to compel witnesses to attend before them, to punish for contempt, to employ all the powers of a court? What is to hinder this Parliament from giving that court power to issue a commission to a foreign country? If this Government will do that, I venture to say that we shall not require any amendment to the law of New York. I venture to say that upon application to a judge of the Supreme Court of New York an order will be made for the attendance of witnesses before the commissioner which the court so constituted may appoint. That is all the hon. member for Carleton asks for; that is what this Parliament has the power to grant if the Government choose to take that course, and if they desire that witnesses in the United States shall tell what they know about these facts. I am told that witnesses in the United States will be able to give the most valuable evidence with regard to the charges which have been made. That, I say, is the course which this Government ought to take if they are desirous of having a full and complete and thorough investigation and of having all the facts disclosed by this Royal Commission.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, when my right hon. friend the leader of the House closed his observations, I confess that I felt at that moment that there required nothing to be added to what he said in order to justify the conclusion at which he arrived and to demonstrate that there was no basis for the demand for the enlargement of this commission. I feel that I should apologize to this House for rising now to speak, because I have had such a strong confirmation of that view in the speech of the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley). Assuredly, if there had been something to be said that would tend to support the claim that at this stage and for the purpose suggested by the hon. member for Carleton the scope of this commission should be extended, I think we might have counted upon the hon. member for St. John to find it out. But apparently he has deemed it necessary to confine his observations almost entirely to matters which, so far as I can see, do not bear upon the question of the extension of the scope of this commission.

He made complaint that the right hon. Prime Minister had stated that no charges other than those under investigation affecting any member of this Government had been made in this House. He proceeded to read to us some extracts from a speech which he had made in the course of the debate upon the motion of the right hon. leader of the Opposition for an inquiry before a committee, and he told us that these were charges. If the use of the word "charges" made them charges in any proper sense of the word, I think it could not be disputed that they were charges, because he repeated the word "charges" in almost every paragraph. The hon. gentleman seemed to have almost extraordinary conception of the effect of the use of the word. We have an instance of that in another portion of his argument, where he gravely represents to us that if we just call a body a court, that makes it a court and there is nothing more to be said about it—all outside states will recognize it as being a court. I do not attach the same value to words that the hon. gentleman does; in that connection I will have something to say further on.

I do not purpose going into the question of these so-called charges. At the time that they were made, even with greater solemnity than they have been read to-day, my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) very fully and very adequately

disposed of them. I want to refer only to one paragraph of them, the one that comes nearest to accusing someone of something. It is the paragraph in which these contracts of $22,000,000 are dealt with, and I want to refer to that only to point out that these are the contracts that are now under investigation

The hon. gentleman gets up to contradict the right hon. leader of the House in his statement that no charges other than those under investigation were made, and he cites the charge that is under investigation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend pardon me? My information is, and I have not the shadow of a doubt about it, that the contracts put in by Mr. Hellmuth are not limited to fuses at all, but contain the contracts in regard to the shells as well as the fuses.

Mr. DOHERTY: How does that bear on what I am stating, namely, that the charges with regard to contracts for $22,000,000 are under investigation? The hon. gentleman rises to say that not only are they under investigation, but that other matters are under investigation; and yet the gist of his complaint was that he made charges and that they were not under investigation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend persists in misrepresenting me. What I said was that the counsel for the Government put in all those contracts, not limiting them to the fuse contracts, and then Mr. Johnson was deprived of the privilege of cross-examining upon the matters into which the Government counsel had examined in the direct examination.

Mr. DOHERTY: We will come to that in a moment; we have not come near it yet. The hon. gentleman accuses me of misrepresenting him; but if he will keep his mind on what I am dealing with at the moment, I do not think he will venture to deny that what he describes as a charge and what approximates most nearly to a charge in his very—I may be pardoned if I say verbose and numerous statements intended to look like charges—what comes nearest to a charge and looks most like one, is actually under investigation now.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My statement is only verbose as compared with the brief speeches of the minister.

Mr. DOHERTY: That may be; I do not know whether I am subject to the reproach of too great brevity. However, that is all I have to say about his charges. The nearest approach to a charge is actually under investigation, and the hon. gentleman takes up our time complaining that the right hon. gentleman has said that no charges other than those under investigation have been made. I entirely fail to see the bearing of the fact that the hon. gentleman made what he called charges upon the question whether this commission, having been issued to inquire into an issue tendered by the hon. gentleman upon the other side of the House, should now be extended to cover all of the contracts of the Shell Committee. The hon. gentlemen who made these charges which have been subjected to investigation were exceedingly brave when they made them. Their words were many and their words were brave, and they clamoured for a body before which they could make the proof of those specific things that are now under investigation; they have a body before which they are given the widest possible latitude concerning those charges which they so made, and are furthermore told that they may refer to any other contract in so far as it bears upon the status of the Shell Committee, and what do they do? I have not read the evidence and I do not want to draw any conclusion from it, but it does not seem very unfair to suggest that it looks at all events like running away from the issue that they tendered. They are given the widest possible latitude on the issue they tendered, and they are here before this House complaining that they are not allowed to go into something else, and all of that because they say, if I followed the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., aright, that there is a question of the status of the committee, and, in the second place, because there is in the evidence a statement showing that large savings were effected as between the prices agreed upon by the War Office and the prices at which contracts were actually made——

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the minister lay it down as a principle that in this tribunal or in any other court where counsel acting for a party having responsibility introduces evidence to show that there were profits or savings or whatever you choose to call them, the counsel on the other side cannot cross-examine in regard to that fact? That is the ruling here in the minutes.

Mr. DOHERTY: I venture to say so, and I say it is fortified by the ruling of the Chief Justice of Ontario and of Mr. Justice Duff,

one of the most distinguished judges on the Supreme Court Bench, which ruling is absolutely at variance with the suggestion the hon. member for Pictou has just made, and the suggestion which the hon. member for St. John made. The hon. member for St. John said he ventured to say that there was not a lawyer of any standing in this country who would question his proposition, and yet his proposition was in the teeth of the ruling of the Chief Justice of Ontario and of Mr. Justice Duff.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am putting that to you as a general principle. What do you say about it?

Mr. PUGSLEY: What does the minister himself say?

Mr. DOHERTY: What the minister says is that if, as has been held, these contracts are irrelevant to the matter to be inquired into, the fact that there had been introduced a statement showing the profits made by them, a statement introduced, so far as we know, without the slightest objection on anybody's part, does not make that statement a relevant statement pertinent to the inquiry, and consequently gives no right to cross-examine upon it. The suggestion of these two hon. gentlemen amounts to this, that if I should sue a man on a contract for $500, and I should go into the witness box and, in the course of my testimony, voluntarily observe that I made another contract and realized $10,000 profit at some other time, because that evidence had slipped in, because nobody has said anything about it going in, then the court would be called upon to investigate my statement, which has no bearing on my case at all, that I made $10,000 in some other contract at some other time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the minister say that in that very case there would be no right of cross-examination?

Mr. DOHERTY: Certainly and most absolutely I would say so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There must be something different in the Quebec code from what is in the common law.

Mr. DOHERTY: Hon. gentlemen laugh. If they were in a court I think the laughing would be at their expense.

Mr. CARVELL: I think you had better look for some other illustration.

Mr. DOHERTY: For what my capacity may be, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying and I feel somewhat fortified by the fact that this is the ruling of Chief Justice Meredith and of Mr. Justice Duff—

Mr. MACDONALD: Does not the minister's logic go to this extent, that if the decision of the Chief Justice of Ontario on this question is right, he should not have permitted the evidence in regard to shell savings or profits to go into the record before the commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: So far as contracts are concerned, the contracts between the Shell Committee and the Imperial Government were put in at the beginning, for the purpose, as I understand it,—and I am depending largely on the statements of the hon. member for Carleton which I have no doubt reproduces what happened, although there may be room for differences of impression—

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think so, I think you are pretty safe in accepting it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I take it that those contracts were put in to show the status as towards the War Office of the Shell Committee, and I understand a statement was put in, and, so far as I am informed, without anybody suggesting objection to it, that showed, in a general way, that a saving had been effected upon the prices at which the sub-contracts were let.

It dropped there. I do not know what would have been the ruling if it had been objected to; but this much is quite clear, that the two learned judges have ruled that cross-examination, going into the details of what profits were made on each one of these contracts, is not justified by the introduction of the statement, and that it is irrelevant to the matters being inquired into. I think it would not be unwise of this House to leave that matter to be determined by these two learned judges. There will not be much gained by my quarrelling with my hon. friends on the other side of the House as to whether this is a sound judgment or not. I am quite prepared, and I think that other hon. members of this House will also be, to abide by the decision of the commissioners on that question, and that is their judgment.

If one follows the argument of Mr. Johnston, it is apparent that he claims to go into these contracts as bearing upon the status of the Shell Committee towards the War Office. The declaration of the commissioners on the subject has been read here more than once, that in so far as they may be pertinent to establish that

status they may be gone into. The other assertion is the one I have just dealt with, namely, that because there happened to be a statement that these profits were made, although these profits have absolutely nothing to do with the issue that the commission was appointed to try, we ought to extend the scope of the commission in order to enable them to go into all the contracts made by the Shell Committee. I am not going into the question whether that should be done or not. That question was threshed out in this House on the motion of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Mr. CARVELL: On another supposed state of affairs.

Mr. DOHERTY: In what respect?

Mr. CARVELL: On the supposition that the Shell Committee were trustees instead of contractors.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not going into the question of whether they are in effect trustees or contractors. If I followed the hon. gentleman rightly, his contention was that legally, on the letter of the instrument, they were contractors.

Mr. CARVELL: There is no doubt about that at all.

Mr. DOHERTY: Very well; I am not questioning that; but they themselves say that morally they were representatives or trustees.

Mr. CARVELL: But with the right to pay any amount which they had a mind to for these articles so long as it did not exceed the estimated cost.

Mr. DOHERTY: That matter might very well be left to the commissioners to determine.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes. I do not wish to discuss it here.

Mr. DOHERTY: What their rights are may be left to the commissioners to determine; but how does that affect the question of the scope of the commission? The commissioners have told Mr. Johnston that, as far as anything bears on the question of the status of the Shell Committee, he may go into it. There can be no dispute about that question. All that has been ruled out is the details, the particulars, of the different sub-contracts which these parties made, other than the sub-contracts referred to in the commission, because they are all sub-contracts in this sense, in regard to fuses. That is all that has been ruled out. All I have seen, as a vestige of ground for suggesting that all these other contracts should go in, is the mere fact of the existence of that statement. I have dealt with that argument, and it seems to me that it requires no further observation.

The hon. member for St. John, taking up a suggestion of the hon. member for Carleton and harking back on something that was said by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald)—if I might be permitted to refer to something that was mentioned in a previous debate—calls upon the Government, and upon myself in a very particular manner, to legislate to make this commission of inquiry a court which will be recognized in the United States as being a court. He says that all I have to do in order to bring about that result is to give that body the powers of a court in regard to the summoning of witnesses, the examining of witnesses and compelling attendance, and to give them power to issue commissions themselves to other persons. May I point out to him that under the statute at present these are precisely the powers that this body has, and that the only modification he has suggested is that we should call this body a court. I would like to refer to the statute of the state of New York and to our own statute upon that subject. I do so simply for the purpose of making it perfectly clear that statutes of that sort are passed in order to enable courts of different countries to act in aid of each other, if I may so express it. I have here only the statute of the state of New York, but I feel fairly safe in saying that you will find the statutes of other countries on the subject are similar. They all have in contemplation a court, that is to say, a tribunal sitting for the administration of justice and holding trials between parties and carrying on proceedings either civil or criminal. The provision of the New York statute is:

> A party to an action, suit, or special proceeding, civil or criminal, pending in a court without the State, either in the United States, or in a foreign country, may obtain, by the special proceeding prescribed in this article, the testimony of a witness—

And so forth. The details of the procedure are immaterial. The right is given to a party in action, suit, or special proceeding, civil or criminal, pending in a court; so that you must have a court, you must have a proceeding to which there are

parties, and it must be a proceeding civil or criminal. With all respect to the hon. member for St. John, when he suggests that in a legal sense, and within the well-known meaning which the words have, as distinguishing between a civil and a criminal proceeding, this is a civil proceeding, I find it impossible to follow him. This is an inquiry directed to the ascertaining of facts. Upon the results of that inquiry a civil or criminal proceeding may be based; but we are at present at the stage when we have not got the material upon which to base a proceeding, civil or criminal. Our own statute, making a similar provision in favour of outside courts, is very much in the same terms:

> Whenever, upon an application for that purpose, it is made to appear to any court or judge, that any court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction, in any other of His Majesty's dominions—

This one deals with His Majesty's other dominions, but there is a provision in regard to foreign countries—

> —before which any civil, commercial or criminal matter is pending, is desirous of obtaining.—

Etc. We might call this a court if we chose, but it would not alter in any sense its functions; and as long as there is instituted before it no action or proceeding, and it is not competent to entertain any action or proceeding, none of these statutes will apply. If we were in a position to proceed before any court and institute any action or proceeding, we would not need to go before this commission at all. There are ample courts in this country if anybody has charges to make. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House said there were charges to bring, said they were in possession of evidence that would convict men under the Criminal Convictions Act—

Mr. CARVELL: Who made that statement?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot at the moment lay my hands on it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) came the nearest to it.

Mr. CARVELL: I think the minister should be a little more specific. If he will exclude me I shall not find so much fault.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the statement is questioned I will drop it, but I have sat here and heard appeals made to the Minister of Justice, "Why don't you prosecute the man for perjury?" When I used the words "criminal convictions," I realized I was not using the right words; I should have said, under the "Secret Commissions Act."

Mr. CARVELL: That is a different proposition.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would suggest that if hon. gentlemen had that evidence and wanted a tribunal to compel the attendance of witnesses, they should have gone to the courts of this country to lay their charges, and then they would have had the assistance of courts of other countries to compel the attendance of the witnesses wanted. When they refused that remedy, what was it they asked for in the same breath? They asked for a committee of this House, which manifestly and unquestionably would have had no greater power than this commission; would not have had the powers that a constituted court would have of compelling the attendance of witnesses. I was surprised when it was first suggested by the hon. member for Pictou; but, as the suggestion had been made by a gentleman for whose professional status I have the greatest respect, I made it my business to look into the matter as carefully as I could, and I am free to confess that for the reasons I have pointed out I think it is beyond our power. But if any method can be devised to compel the attendance of witnesses before this commission—whether it is called a court of inquiry or anything else—hon. gentlemen may rest assured that that method will be resorted to. They need have no doubt about our desire to do everything that can be done to bring before the commission witnesses that it is desired to examine, on all matters that are pertinent to the investigation being carried on.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If it is to be in the form of a statute, it should be passed before Parliament rises.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am free to admit that the hon. gentleman is a distinguished lawyer, and he knows or he does not know whether we can pass a statute of that kind. Personally, I know of no legislation that could be enacted. We cannot alter the real nature of the body, we cannot alter the real nature of the proceedings, by any legislation of ours that will be effective in the United States. We may legislate that a something that is not a court shall

be a court in Canada; but that would not carry in the United States, because we should only be giving the body a name. We have a body whose functions are essentially not those of a court, because the commissioners can impose no consequences upon people by reason of the findings of facts that they may make; they have no judicial function in that sense to exercise: they, therefore, are not a court or tribunal within the meaning of any of those statutes, and our calling them so will not create against people who are governed by the law of the United States rights that do not exist under the law of the United States or of the particular states in which the people may be found. We can neither make this a court that would be recognized in the United States, by merely calling it a court; nor can we make this a proceeding, civil or criminal, by merely calling it so, in such a manner as to have that recognized in the United States. If hon. gentlemen can suggest any method by which that can be done, I shall be more than happy to accept it. There is certainly an element of inconsistency in hon. gentlemen who would have nothing but a committee of Parliament to inquire into these charges complaining of the lack of power of this commission to enforce the attendance of witnesses. This commission has already, so far as the law of Canada can give it, all the powers of a court to enforce the attendance of witnesses.

Mr. CARVELL: Would not a committee of Parliament have the same power?

Mr. DOHERTY: What is suggested to me is that a court would have more power. What I say is that this commission has all the powers of a court with regard to the enforcement of the attendance of witnesses.

Mr. CARVELL: In Canada.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes; and so has a court in Canada. What power they may have outside of Canada depends upon the statutes of the country in which the power is sought to be exercised, and not upon our legislation. If the reasoning of the hon. member for St. John is correct, I would say that the State of New York ought to recognize this body as being a court, because it has been given, in regard to the inquiry, all the powers of a court. But I do not think that foreign States would recognize it as being a court, and I do not think they would be any more likely to do so if we called it a court. I am sorry to have detained the House so long, but I wanted to explain this matter with regard to the existence of the powers attached to this commission, and the possibility of our widening those powers. If that possibility exists I shall be more than happy to avail myself of it.

But to come back to the real question that is at issue, I must confess that I can see no ground suggested for an extension of the commission other than the mere fact that this statement has been placed on the record; and the conclusion drawn from that, that we are therefore to go into the minutiae of all those contracts, because, perhaps irrelevantly, the sum total of savings has gone on the record, seems to me a proposition absolutely untenable, and its consequences, I think, demonstrate that. If the conclusion were correct, then the accident of the going on the record of any irrelevant statement would open up in this inquiry—and would open up in any case—any number of cases that might happen to be referred to in that irrelevant statement. I think the conclusion condemns the proposition. Upon the whole I entirely fail to see what case has been made for the extension of this commission. And might I add that, if there were room to suggest that we ought to take up further cases, would it not be reasonable to dispose, first of all, of the case we have? Why do hon. gentlemen think it so necessary to get away from the case that is really before the commission, and with regard to which the doors are absolutely wide open, and at this stage, before that case is disposed of, want to run into an investigation of every other contract that was made by the Shell Committee? Surely, if the time ever comes when there will be occasion to do that, we shall be none the worse off for having at least dealt with and determined the one case which was put forward as the typical and the gravest case—the case upon which hon. gentlemen seemed disposed to stake their all in connection with their endeavour to cast reflection upon this Government by means of their accusations against the Shell Committee.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): The question involved in the matter brought before the House by my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) is one which it seems to me ought to have met with a more favourable reception from the Government.

In the course of the proceedings had before the tribunal called under the Inquiries Act by this Government for the purpose of investigating certain matters relating to

fuse contracts, referred to them by the Government, the counsel appointed by this Government proceeded to put in evidence certain documents and facts relative to the constitution of the Shell Committee and to the contracts entered into by them in connection with the manufacture of shells, which were not, strictly speaking, the subject matter of the charge. In the course of tendering that evidence and bringing that matter before the commission, Mr. Hellmuth, counsel for the Government, produced certain contracts and elucidated certain facts relative to the manufacture of shells, as we see in the report of the proceedings of the tribunal as, for instance, whether basic steel should be used, and so on. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice, who speaks about hon. gentlemen on this side wanting to go into the examination of the question of shells, forgets entirely that that tribunal, which is created by the Government of which my hon. friend is a member, permitted the Government counsel to raise that question. When, however, Mr. Johnston, who was also appointed by the Government, for the purpose, I presume, of cross-examining witnesses and placing before the public all the matters connected with the inquiry, following out what he deemed to be his duty, asked certain questions relative to shell contracts and to the way in which those contracts were carried out, the tribunal said: "That is not within our reference, and therefore we will not permit you to go on." I think that is a fair statement of the matter, as I gather it from the report of the proceedings. Apprehending that the situation created might be considered a singular one, Sir William Meredith, the presiding judge of the tribunal, suggested that this House should be approached in regard to the matter. He said:

> You are aware, of course, the Order in Council provides for the reference of other questions to this commission if it is thought expedient to do so. If anybody thinks that these matters ought to be inquired into, and we are to stay here all summer doing it, I suppose representations can be made. Mr. Carvell is a member of the House, he can bring the matter up and ask that the power of the inquiry be extended.

In consequence of the suggestion of Sir William Meredith, the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., came here, and I think the House will agree with me that he stated fairly the matters connected with the suggestion and the reasons why that suggestion should be accepted by the Government. When hon. members on this side point out that an anomaly is created by virtue of documents and other evidence being admitted in relation to shells in regard to which no cross-examination is permitted, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice affects to believe that it is an astounding principle to assert that the right of cross-examination ought not to be limited in such a case. With all deference to my hon. friend's legal standing, I am bound to say that I have never heard it stated in any court that, when documents are permitted to be gone into by the examining counsel, the cross-examiner must not deal with them. You may say that those facts were not relevant. If so, why was the examining counsel permitted to examine in regard to them? If the position is taken that cross-examination in regard to certain facts was not permitted because those facts were irrelevant, the proper course would have been not to have admitted those facts in the first instance. Mr. Johnston says, at page 373:

5 p.m.

> I may say that the question of what took place as gathered from various witnesses may be important from our standpoint, from my standpoint at any rate, and I so submitted at the time; in addition to that the contracts have been proved and they are before the commission, and surely it is open to me to examine as to the contracts proved by my learned friend Mr. Hellmuth, and made part of the record. If they can be proved and nothing more said about it then of course my duty is very simple, as I should not ask if the commissioners so rule, and I would not even attempt to lead up to that.

In answer to a further objection he says:

> I answer that by saying that the question of relationship having been asked yesterday and emphasized with General Bertram as to whether or not they were contractors or mere trustees or agents—

The question asked by Mr. Hellmuth, counsel for the Government.

> —or whatever one may choose to call them that that question depends entirely upon what was done under these contracts after they were entered into, and facts connected with the contracts themselves and with the action of this witness or any other witness, ought to be available to me for the purpose of showing what the real relationship was notwithstanding the evidence my learned friend offered yesterday in regard to the fact that they were not in reality contractors, but agents.

It was because Mr. Johnston desired to do that which he has indicated in the statement I have read, and because it was ruled by the commission that he could not ask those questions, that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., came to this House, in

accordance with the suggestion of Sir William Meredith whose suggestion seems to be a very reasonable one, and one which ought to be accepted by this Government.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman insist that that is a fair statement of the case?

Mr. MACDONALD: If my hon. friend does not think it a fair statement, he can answer it when I get through. My hon. friend's interjections in regard to matters about which he knows nothing have become very tiring in this House. If he wants to answer me, let him do so later. I have stated what is in the record; I have stated the facts, and the point is, is anything to be done in regard to the matter?

The position taken by the Government was this, that the Shell Committee were the trusted confidants of the British Government, their creation, their agents, and that to the British Government alone were they responsible. On that basis the matter was discussed in this House and the House voted. After the reference was had, counsel for the Government, by the production of contracts which are the very basis of this discussion, elucidated the fact that the members of the Shell Committee were not the agents of the British Government, were not their appointees, but were simply and solely contractors with them, and that the question as to what was to be done with the surplus left after paying for certain shells was a matter of doubt. It was doubtful whether the money belonged to the members of the Shell Committee or not; and a discussion was had as to whether the money should be given to the Patriotic Fund or returned to the War Office. In other words, the whole position of the Government with regard to the Shell Committee has been absolutely and totally reversed as a result of the facts elucidated by Mr. Hellmuth, as admitted by the right hon. Premier in his speech to-day. The whole point is whether the Government will, in view of those changed conditions, permit Mr. Johnston, as counsel appointed by themselves for the purpose of elucidating the truth, to cross-examine upon the points which are set out in the proceedings here, and enable him to ask all proper questions with regard to the evidence which has been adduced by Mr. Hellmuth, counsel for the Government. Either the Government will do that or they will not do it. They can refuse, and to that extent the inquiry will be ineffectual and incomplete, and the portion of the evidence that has been adduced by Mr. Hellmuth, the whole evidence not being elucidated, the whole ground not being covered, will, to that extent, be unsatisfactory. About that there can be no doubt whatever. Apparently the Government have taken the position that they do not propose to allow that matter to be gone into, nor to allow Mr. Johnston to undertake that cross-examination which he has indicated.

In this connection, another question has arisen: whether or not the powers of this tribunal created under the Inquiries Act are sufficiently wide to enable them to deal with the taking of evidence outside of the Dominion of Canada. To the suggestion made on that subject the Minister of Justice replied that this is neither a civil proceeding nor a criminal proceeding, and that being neither it does not come within the provision of the New York statute, that being the state within whose bounds witnesses are to be sought. But it may be that the witnesses will not always be in the state of New York. It may be that some of them will cross the river into New Jersey, and there they might be reached by the long arm of a Canadian court. And we have not heard the Minister of Justice discuss what may be the law of New Jersey in regard to taking evidence before a foreign tribunal. This much the Government can do—they can create a court for this particular purpose, endowed with all the powers of a court, and there being before that court a proceeding within the meaning of the statute cited by the Minister of Justice, you have a tribunal under which, I submit, some way would be found to secure recognition in the United States and in the several states under the Acts there in force. Power to do this, it is conceded, will be found in section 101 of the British North America Act, which is as follows:

> The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time, provide for the constitution, maintenance and organization of a general court of appeal for Canada—

—that is, the Supreme Court.

> —and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.

"For the better administration of the laws of Canada." The Minister of Justice would be doing only that which he ought to do, if, instead of acting under this totally

inadequate Inquiries Act, he should introduce into this Parliament a statute providing for the constitution of a court with all the powers of a court, to deal with this particular matter. It could then proceed in the way indicated by my hon. friend from St. John, and could take advantage of the statutes of foreign countries, to the extent of which those statutes exist, for the procuring of evidence there.

The Minister of Justice says: "We will not appoint a court, because I find that the New York statute, which I construe in a certain way, limits the right of taking evidence." The hon. gentleman takes the responsibility for that, of course. A peculiar situation arises under the Inquiries Act, as amended by chapter 8 of the statutes of 1912. It is provided that the commission may allow any person whose conduct is under investigation to be represented by counsel. But I can find no power here given to permit the party making the charge before that tribunal to be represented by counsel. If at any moment this tribunal, appointed under this Act, should choose to say to Mr. Kyte, for instance, "We do not propose to permit you to go on with this matter, because, while we can appoint counsel to assist us and can appoint counsel for the defence, no particular statutory power is given for the appointment of any one to represent the party making the charge," they would have the power to do so. That is an illustration of the wholly inadequate nature of this court—no, it is not a court, this tribunal—which has been erected for this inquiry. The tribunal is without power to go beyond the borders of Canada to take evidence or to appoint a commission for that purpose. And the position of the Government in regard to this matter is that it has refused to give the tribunal this power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman states that we have refused to give this tribunal the status we ought to give them of a court within the powers of the statute of New York. Will he state what additional powers we could give them to afford them that status?

Mr. MACDONALD: I have not the statute before me and am not able to argue with the closeness I should desire to do. I only heard the statute read by the Minister of Justice. But this tribunal is not a court established under section 101 of the British North America Act and has not the full powers with regard to the taking of evidence of the country which a court established under that section would have. All the hon. gentleman needs to do is to create by statute a court under section 101 of the British North America Act. Ample power is given. Let the court be endowed with the same power that is given to the Supreme Court of Judicature of every province of the Dominion. Then you will have a body which will have the right to send commissioners to a foreign country to take evidence there. You will then have a court, and you will have a proceeding before that court, which are the essentials of the statute of the state of New York to which reference has been made. But now you have neither a court nor a proceeding before a court, and consequently you have not a tribunal which can issue a commission to a foreign country and there command respect.

It has been disclosed before this commission that the Government's position in regard to the Shell Committee as taken in this House is absolutely incorrect. It has been shown that this Shell Committee were not the agents of the British Government but were contractors appointed by the Minister of Militia of the Dominion of Canada to enter into a contract under which action could be brought against them individually. Their position in that matter was such that they seriously consulted the Prime Minister as to their personal liability for debts they might contract. These facts have been disclosed before this tribunal for the first time. Yet Mr. Johnston, who is conducting cross-examination, is not allowed to go into the matters which are pertinent and necessary in order to get the full facts before the country. It is for this House and the country to understand that the Government refuse to permit an enlargement of the powers of the commission for this purpose.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Solicitor General): That this matter, or some similar matter, should come before the attention of Parliament at this time can be to none of us a matter of surprise. Those who have had the privilege of watching the proceedings before the Royal Commission whose name has often been mentioned in this discussion, and have also studied the strategy of certain hon. gentlemen opposite, could quite readily come to the conclusion that the time had about come when some

explanations of the course of events at that commission might well be sent out through the country on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite by way of excuse for what was transpiring, such explanations masquerading, of course, as grievances and complaints.

What actually is before the House, however, I find it very difficult to see. What the House is asked to do is a matter which, though the debate has proceeded for some length of time, and though we have heard from three hon. gentlemen opposite, we may well say we do not know as yet. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), came to the House yesterday, and again to-day, with a motion that this House adjourn in order that he might discuss "a definite matter of urgent public importance," that definite matter of urgent public importance being as follows:

> The desirability in the public interest of immediately enlarging the powers of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the contracts regarding fuses, etc., called the Meredith-Duff Commission, by providing for widening the scope of the inquiry into the matters referred to the Commission.

We are asked to discuss, to put it briefly, the desirability of widening the scope of the inquiry into the matters referred to the commission. We are not asked to refer any other matters to the commission. So far as the motion before the House goes, there is no suggestion that the scope of the commission as regards the matters before it is not wide enough. We are asked to consider the desirability of widening the scope of the inquiry into the matters referred to the commission. If the hon. member for Carleton really knew what he wanted—

Mr. CARVELL: I will save my hon. friend some difficulty when I tell him that I did not prepare that at all. The note which I handed to the Speaker yesterday asked for an enlargement of the scope of the inquiry. When I came to my place to-day the motion in its present form was sent to me from the Speaker's Chair; I accepted it and read it. I am not going to split hairs about what is in it or what is not in it; that is the way it happened. Please forget that and we will get along.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not one of those, Mr. Speaker, who can forget what we are discussing when I am doing the discussing. I need to have something before me to be discussed. I must commend the discretion of the hon. member for Carleton in renouncing the authorship of this resolution, although I think that the renunciation would have been more becoming had it come earlier in the discussion. But how can a man renounce what he moves the House ot adopt? Notwithstanding the fact that he absolves himself from the responsibility, there is nothing before us for discussion except this. I do not know what there is to talk about unless it is what is before us: the desirability of widening the scope of the inquiry into the matters referred to the commission. If hon. gentlemen knew how the scope of the inquiry into the matters referred to the commission could be widened, they would have said so; the hon. member for Carleton would have come to this House with a definite statement of how the scope of that inquiry into those matters could be widened, and he would have asked the House to grant such added powers. I say to him now that if he can still come with any definite, understandable statement or resolution widening the scope of the inquiry into the matters before that commission, it will get sympathetic consideration on the part of this Government. We thought we had given the scope the utmost wideness that the English language could give it in the Order in Council under which the commission now exists and is acting.

The course of the discussion has rambled from one thing to another. From their language, some hon. gentlemen would appear to desire that the commission be empowered to inquire into other subjects altogether. I think that actually is the desire of hon. gentlemen opposite, though it takes the guise of this rather meaningless resolution. Others argue that what they are bringing before the House is a complaint as to the soundness of a view of law entertained by the members of the commission. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) and the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley) assert that a decision on a point of law has been given that would be known to be wrong by any ordinary lawyer, and they ask the House of Commons of Canada to sit as a court of appeal from the judgments in law of the Chief Justice of Ontario and of Mr. Justice Duff of the Supreme Court. That is the second proposal made by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let us consider the first. They want us to widen the scope of the inquiry into these matters. The language of the commission says that everything relating to the four contracts may

be inquired into: everything relating to the relation, if any, of the Minister of Militia to them; everything relating to the relations with them, if any, of any one else directly or indirectly associated with the Government or the Shell Committee; anything relating to the subcontracting under those contracts; all things relating to the profits arising or accruing directly or indirectly under the contracts, and to whom they accrue. The powers of the commission in that regard have been acknowledged as ample by the members of the commission themselves. They have been stated in the widest possible language by the counsel for the commission, Mr. Hellmuth. More than that, they have been stated as complete by Mr. Johnston, named by the leader of the Opposition. This gentleman admits—and admits more than once in the course of the very quotation read by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B.—that in relation to the four contracts, the matters referred to the commission, he has every possible liberty, and asks for no more. Why, then, should this House inquire into the advisability of extending what already they admit is ample and complete?

A word more as to the second interpretation. It is said by two hon. members opposite: "We have not been treated fairly; Sir William Ralph Meredith has given a decision that is entirely unfair to us, and we want this House to review it." In the first place, even if there were any doubt as to its soundness, I must question the capacity of the House of Commons of Canada to sit in review over a commission of judges on a decision of law. In the next place, the very hon. gentleman who brings this resolution before the House admits that the decision is correct and that he has no fault to find with it. He admitted that yesterday, and he repeats his admission in still more emphatic language to-day. Here are his words:

> I wish here in the most emphatic manner to state that I do not wish to be considered as casting any reflections whatever upon the decision of the commissioners.

These are the words of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., who moves this resolution; so that it is not his desire to call in question the fairness of the treatment accorded hon. gentlemen opposite before that commission. Where then does the hon. member for Pictou stand, and the hon. member for St. John, when we compare their language and their accusations with the words of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., who brings the matter before the House? So that so far as these two suggestions of what it is we are asked to consider are concerned, hon. gentlemen have answered themselves so clearly and so manifestly that further discussion is superfluous.

May I at this point of the discussion, say that I feel no surprise that hon. gentlemen opposite find it impossible to explain what they want in language, which, while coherent, does not at once expose its own absurdity? The counsel who is acting for them—at all events acting for the commission but named by them—himself found it impossible to state to the commission in understandable terms what he wanted and what he complained of. As soon as he finished, the Chief Justice said, "Why, that amounts to inquiring generally into all that the Shell Committee did." So that the decision of the justices is this: "You ask us to inquire into the details of certain contracts that have no relation at all to these four contracts under inquiry, and you say you want it because you want to get at the status of the committee." They say: "There is plenty before the court to get at that status already; what you want to do is, under cover of inquiring into the status of the committee, to divert the inquiry from what we are here to inquire into and turn it away and scatter it off until it is lost in a wilderness where there are no charges to be found at all." That is substantially the answer which this disingenuous proposition received at the hands of the commission.

It was very plainly intimated yesterday by the hon. member for Carleton that this request had the endorsation of the justices. Here is what he said:

> Mr. Johnston rather persisted in the matter, and finally the commission made the statement that it might be advisable to apply to Parliament in order that further powers might be given to them.

The impression any one would get from that was that the commission were of opinion that their powers should be extended, and suggested that application be made to Parliament to that end. I did not think that was the case, and took occasion to inquire more definitely; and the second answer of the hon. member for Carleton was, I think, fairly in accord with what the commission did say.

But the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) comes in and says this very

thing is the suggestion of the commissioners themselves; they make, he says, the suggestion to Parliament that this be done. Have they done so? Have the commissioners made the suggestion to Parliament that their powers be extended in that way? Does any hon. member say that they have done so? The commissioners said: "If you want our powers extended, Parliament is the forum; this is not the forum; if you want it, go there and ask for it." It might be said that the commission suggested to them: "Go and ask for it." That suggestion has been fulfilled. But, so far from suggesting that it be granted, the commissioners very clearly discouraged any such idea. Here is what Sir William Meredith said, at page 374:

> You have not made at all clear to me the scope of the inquiry you desire to enter into.

I quite agree with him.

> Do you propose to enter upon an inquiry as to contracts, the details of contracts that were entered into with regard to other matters than the four that are referred to this commission to examine into the prices at which those contracts were let or taken from the War Office, and the prices at which they were let to those who contracted with the Shell Committee—is that what you propose to do?

I am afraid I have not the right quotation; but, as that one is somewhat pertinent, I do not regret having read it. I quote from page 376:

> You are aware, of course, the Order in Council provides for the reference of other questions to this commission if it is thought expedient to do so. If anybody thinks that these matters ought to be inquired into, and we are to stay here all summer doing it, I suppose representation can be made—Mr. Carvell is a member of the House, he can bring the matter up and ask that the power of the inquiry be extended, but we must keep within the terms of our map.

Any suggestion that Parliament should grant the request, or should seriously consider such a suggestion as this? Clearly a discouragement of the idea in so far as the commission felt justified in going. I have disposed of all I can find in the way of a suggestion by the commission to the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Apparently under cover of this application the hon. gentlemen propose to escape, if they can, from the position in which they find themselves at this moment. Instead of having their exact position, humiliating as it may be becoming, go to the country in its true form, they make this rather ungraceful attempt to hide themselves behind the dust of a purely artificial grievance.

They say to us also: "Why do you not make this a court? Why do you not erect this to the status of a court under section 191 of the British North America Act? If you do that, then it will have the power to issue a commission down in the United States, and that commission can summon witnesses there." What is the purpose of a suggestion like that? The purpose of that is one thing and one only: it is to have it go out to the country, if they can manage it, that there is somebody whom they want but cannot get. Who is he? Has his name appeared? We did hear names mentioned not long ago of men who, it was asserted, would not appear; but they are here. Who is this man in New York whom they have endeavoured, without success, to get, under their present powers. There is nobody, so far as I have been able to hear. We are told to erect this commission to the status of a court: a Commission of Inquiry under the Inquiries Act is not high enough. What did hon. gentlemen opposite want three weeks ago? They wanted a committee of Parliament. Would it have had the status of a court under section 191 of the British North America Act? It would have had no such status but would have had a history that would have done no credit to Parliament, if we may judge from these proceedings this afternoon. What would have been the character and volume of the complaints that would have been hurled at the doors of Parliament day after day if the decisions of a member of this House as chairman had to be taken, on a matter of law, instead of the decisions of the Chief Justice of Ontario?

They now want us to give this commission the status of a court, and they say: "If you will do that, there is a law down in New York which says that whenever there is a court in another country that has powers in relation to civil and criminal proceedings, that court may issue a commission, and if that commission sits in the State of New York witnesses may be compelled to attend." Now, they say, call this a court to-day, and put a clause in to say that this Commission of Inquiry under the Inquiries Act shall have all the status and powers of a court under section 191 of the British North America Act. We have plenary powers to put that in the statute. The question comes, what will be its effect after it is put in? If its effect is anything, it will be just the same as if we were to insert: "This commission shall be considered a court by the state of New York." That is another way of legis-

lating for the state of New York. Let me give an illustration. A town council, within the limits of its powers, has a certain power of inquiry delegated to it by the provincial authorities, whose powers are as plenary as ours. The town council appoints a committee of inquiry into some question in a certain ward. How would it be for that town council to solemnly enact that this committee shall have all the powers of a court under section 191 of the British North America Act, and must be so recognized by the law of the state of New York? Would it not follow that the committee would immediately be entitled to that recognition if the argument of the hon. member for St. John is correct?

A court is a court by virtue of its functions, not by virtue of its name; and you cannot make a committee a court or a commission a court acting under a statute that authorizes inquiry simply by calling it a court. However, it will be time enough to consider this when a case arises, and I say here and now that when hon. gentlemen come to this House and state that they have witnesses down in New York or in New Jersey—the hon. member for Pictou wants to discuss the laws of the state of New Jersey too—if they have a witness hiding in New York or New Jersey, and come before Parliament and say so and that they desire to get him and cannot, and bring to Parliament some means that will enable Parliament to procure his evidence, this Government will do everything in its power to meet their request to the full. All that hon. gentlemen have to do is to bring before us some means that will be effective, and if there is any means by which it can be effected we will effect it.

I have covered the only four possible meanings there can be to this remarkable motion. In such form the request of the hon. gentlemen is manifestly absurd. It was so denominated by the Chief Commissioner, so denominated by the counsel for the commission, Mr. Hellmuth, and so denominated by counsel acting for themselves. If they are asking us to sit in review upon a judgment in law of Chief Justice Meredith, I do not think Parliament will do itself any honour by acceding to that request. There are certain functions that others can exercise even better than we can. Besides if they are attacking that decision on the ground that it is wrong, we have the authority of the mover of the motion himself for saying that the decision is right. If they are asking for an extension of the scope of inquiry for a reference of other matters, or if they have intended to do so—for they have not done it—then I agree with the commissioners that all they want is to divert the course of the inquiry now proceeding in a defined field where charges of a certain attenuated character have been made and turn it into a field where there are no charges at all in order that its whole force may be dissipated and lost. If, on the other hand, they want the powers extended to get witnesses, if we have any means that will extend them, and if there are any witnesses who are not here already and will not come, we will adopt effective powers that may be suggested to us that will assist to bring such witnesses before this tribunal.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister appreciates the position which I take, and I must say that he handled it fairly and frankly and in a perfectly intelligent and logical manner, as he always does when discussing questions before this House. The position is simply this: We realize that the scope of the commission, in its ordinary acceptance, refers to the investigation of four contracts. During the investigation, as I have tried to make perfectly plain, from the evidence matters have developed that in our judgment have placed us at a great disadvantage. Statements have been made as to the alleged savings of the Shell Committee which we were not allowed to investigate, and a new position of affairs has been created, in view of the fact that the members of the Shell Committee are legally acting in a contractual relationship with this Government, or with the Minister of Militia as the representative of this Government. Therefore we consider that conditions have so changed that, acting on the suggestion of Chief Justice Meredith, we have come here, and I have presented the facts to this House as fairly, as truthfully, and as logically as I know how to present them.

I do not think I am called on to say much in reply to what has been advanced by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I do not find much fault with the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen), nor would I expect much else from him. I have tried to treat the House with absolute fairness and to state the facts as they are. I was somewhat pained that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) should have so far frogotten himself to talk of the politi-

cal side of this question rather than the legal side of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friends may say, "oh, oh," but I can assure them that I am not going to be drawn into that side of it no matter what the Minister of Justice may have said. I say that I was sorry that he should have suggested that we were running away from the position. I tried to discuss this question purely as a legal matter, and perhaps, if I retorted to my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) a little severely it was because I did not want to be drawn away from that phase of the question——

Mr. BEST: People know now that you are trying to get away from it.

Mr. CARVELL:—and I thought nobody else would treat the matter in a different way from that. I was discussing the matter purely with reference to the legal end of it. I would, however, digress to the extent of reminding my hon. friend that this matter is not being tried in an ordinary court, or in the way in which matters are tried in an ordinary court. In this case the defendant is putting in his defence first, and he has got about half way through with it. Therefore I would ask my hon. friend, before he passes final adjustment on this matter, to wait until the plaintiff, if there be such a person, or a person occupying that position, has had his turn. Then it will be time enough for the Minister of Justice to talk about running away from the position. I have nothing further to say upon that.

I hope the Solicitor General will pardon me if I do not travel over his somewhat technical discussion, because unfortunately I was compelled to take away from him the main ground of his argument by stating that the wording of the resolution was not mine. I adopted that which had been sent to me by Mr. Speaker. Of course, the Speaker's mind is broad enough to realize that we are discussing an important principle. I am not surprised that the Solicitor General attempted to get some comfort out of the actual wording of the resolution. As far as I recollect, and I have not been able to attend all the sittings of the House during the last ten days, I think the Solicitor General has had the first opportunity of exercising that fine talent for distinguishing the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum that his mind is so admirably fitted for since he was placed in a rather unfortunate position by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) about a month ago. Therefore it is not to be wondered at that he should seize the opportunity to rehabilitate himself amongst his friends. As to how he has succeeded I have no comment to offer. I hope he will pardon me if I do not make any further reference to his argument, because it was of such a hair-splitting character that I could not understand him and I am sure that nobody else could. I am satisfied that I have presented this matter in good faith, I am sincere about it, and I believe that the scope of the inquiry can be broadened so as to go into the matters to which I have referred. I do believe, notwithstanding the arguments of the Minister of Justice—and I always like to listen to him, because he tries to elucidate matters—that the Inquiries Act should be so amended as to give us the right to get evidence in the United States if it turns out that such a thing may be necessary. For these reasons I hope that the suggestion which I made will be adopted by the House.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Carvell:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Buchanan,	Loggie,
Charlton,	Macdonald,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Maclean (Halifax),
Copp,	McKenzie,
Fortier,	Michaud,
Gauvreau,	Oliver,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Proulx,
Lanctot,	Turgeon,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Turriff,
	Warnock—19.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong (Lambton),	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Ball,	Meighen,
Bennett (Simcoe),	Merner,
Best,	Morphy,
Blain,	Morris,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Patenaude,
Bowman,	Rhodes,
Brabazon,	Robidoux,
Burnham,	Rogers,
Clarke (Wellington),	Schaffner,
Cockshutt,	Sexsmith,
Davidson,	Smith,
Edwards,	Steele,
Elliott,	Stevens,
Fisher,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Fripp,	Sutherland,
Girard,	Thompson (Yukon),
Hanna,	Walker,
Henderson,	

Lalor, Webster,
L'Espérance, Weichel,
Macdonell, Wilcox—46.
McCurdy,

PAIRS:

Government.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
Alguire	McMillan
Arthurs	Truax
Baker	Kay
Barnard	McCraney
Boyce	Germain
Bristol	Bickerdike
Bradbury	Cruise
Burrell	Douglas
Casgrain	Lemieux
Chabot	Beland
Clark (Bruce)	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid)
Clements	Knowles
Crothers	McCoig
Doherty	Marcil (Bonaventure)
Fowler	McLean (Sunbury & Queen's)
Glass	Nesbitt
Green	White (Victoria)
Guilbault	Brouillard
Hartt	Thomson (Qu'Appelle)
Hazen	Pugsley
Hepburn	Molloy
Jameson	Power
Kemp	Robb
Lewis	Cash
McLeod	Carvell
Morrison	MacNutt
Munson	Boyer
Middlebro	Guthrie
Nickle	Martin (Regina)
Paquet	Cardin
Rainville	Seguin
Reid	Graham
Stanfield	Pardee
Sharpe	Ross
Smyth	Tobin
Taylor	Carroll
Tremain	Chisholm (Inverness)
White (Renfrew)	Devlin
Wilson (Wentworth)	Wilson (Laval)

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was paired with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen). Had I voted, I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. CARVELL: I was paired with the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod). Had I voted, I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was paired with the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain). Had I voted, I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. DEVLIN: I was paired with the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. G. White). Had I voted, I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. SEGUIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Rainville). Had I voted, I should have voted for the motion.

Mr. KEMP: I was paired with the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). Had I voted, I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. DOHERTY: I was paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). Had I voted, I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I was paired with the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Had I voted, I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. JAMESON: I was paired with the hon. member for West Quebec (Mr. Power). Had I voted, I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. REID: I was paired with the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). Had I voted, I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. KYTE: As this motion arises out of a matter before the Royal Commission with which my name is associated, I preferred not to vote.

Mr. CROTHERS: I am paired with the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig). Had I voted, I should have voted against the motion.

Motion negatived.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

THE ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Acting Minister of Railways), Bill No. 98, to aid in the construction of certain lines of railway of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, and to confirm an agreement between the company and the Governments of Canada and New Brunswick, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

On section 1—short title:

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have already expressed my views with regard to what seems to be the unsatisfactory nature of the agreement which has finally been arrived at and which makes this Valley railway have one of its termini at Andover, a station of the Canadian Pacific railway, and the other at Westfield, another station of the Canadian Pacific railway. Having expressed my

views, I will not weary the House by repeating what I said upon a former occasion. I would like, however, to point out to my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways that the agreement provides that the running rights which may be obtained by the company shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. I would suggest that it would be desirable to make those running rights also subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province of New Brunswick. It would be very unfortunate if the company or this Government were not able to make a satisfactory arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company for running rights between Westfield and St. John. If they were not able to make such satisfactory arrangement passengers would have to change cars at Westfield and other inconveniences would arise. There should be provision for trains of the Government having running rights into the city of St. John to the station upon the eastern side and also for the Government freight trains to have running rights to their destination upon either side of the harbour. There has been passed at the present session a Railway Act, a very excellent Act in some respects and the provision which gives the Board of Railway Commissioners power, in order to prevent the paralleling of lines of railway, to order the owners of an existing railway to give running rights to another company whose railway is under construction, is an exceedingly good one; but, as the St. John and Quebec Railway Company is a company incorporated by the Legislature of New Brunswick, I would not think that the Board of Railway Commissioners would have power to order either the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company to grant running rights to that company, and therefore it would have to be a matter of arrangement. The difficulty could be gotten over if the minister would consent to place in the Bill a section declaring the undertaking of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. That would bring the road under the operation of the Railway Act and would give the Board of Railway Commissioners power to make the necessary arrangements for running rights. I am sure that the minister will see that that would be desirable, and I think he will also agree with me that a railway which is to be leased to the Government of Canada and operated as a part of the Intercolonial Railway system should be subject to the jurisdiction of that body, and that even upon that ground, if the other very important reason which I suggested did not exist, it would be desirable to declare the undertaking to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. REID: The hon. member mentioned those matters in the discussion the other evening. In regard to the running rights between Westfield and St. John, the Bill provides that the company shall acquire the running rights from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; but in the event of their failure to make a satisfactory arrangement that may be necessary, the Dominion Government will make the arrangement that may be necessary to operate the trains between Westfield and St. John. It is quite true that if the company were not able to make an arrangement themselves, the position would be a difficult one; but as the Dominion Government are to operate this road, they would have power, by making application to the Board of Railway Commissioners, to have that Board act in so far as the operation on behalf of the Dominion Government is concerned. I would have no objection at all to having this work declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. The only difficulty that I am in this evening is that I feel that any changes that we might make in connection with this agreement might not be in accordance with the wishes of the Provincial Government, who of course are the owners of the road. If the Bill as it stands covers all the points raised by the hon. member for St. John I should prefer to have it go through in that way. As I stated the other evening, the arrangements were satisfactory to the Provincial Government, and I have no doubt whatever that a satisfactory arrangement can be made with the Canadian Pacific for running rights over that portion of their road into St. John. But, as I stated, if the Dominion Government do not consider the running arrangements satisfactory they can provide a line of their own into St. John. The hon. member raised the point that arrangements should be satisfactory to the Provincial Government. The Bill provides that the company has to make the arrangement. But the company is really the Provincial Government; they name the directors by Order in Council, and can put them

in or put them out. In addition, they have really taken over the road, as I understand it. Everything in that way is working harmoniously. We discussed the several matters in connection with the running rights, and neither party anticipated any great trouble in getting in from Westfield to St. John. But, as I have stated, I should have no objection to putting in the clause suggested by the hon. gentleman if I were quite sure it did not affect the Bill as a whole. Of course, he is aware that this agreement has been passed and is now law, so far as the New Brunswick Government is concerned. What I fear is that any changes made here might affect the law as passed in New Brunswick. Perhaps we could let the Bill go on and discuss that a little later.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The remarks the hon. minister has just made would apply to an alteration in the agreement, but I do not think they would apply to the clause in the Act declaring the work to be one for the general advantage of Canada. However, I do not wish to press it if the minister thinks he would like to put that clause off in order to consult the Provincial Government. The road will probably not be finished before another session of Parliament, and if any question arises about getting running rights additional legislation can be passed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The principle adopted, though under somewhat different condition, two or three years ago, was that Parliament delayed any declaration until after the work was completed. There is disadvantage in declaring a work to be one for the general advantage of Canada while it is still in course of construction. The reasons are so obvious that I do not need to point them out.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the length of line from Levis to St. John by this route, and what is the length of line between the same points by the Transcontinental?

M. REID: I have not that information just now but I can get it in a few minutes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The distance from St. John to Quebec by the Intercolonial is 576·4 miles. By the Transcontinental, the distance from Levis to Edmundston is 236 miles, from Edmundston to McGivney Junction, 134 miles; McGivney Junction to Fredericton, 34 miles; and Fredericton to St. John, I suppose about 84 miles, a total of 488 miles. So, it is nearly 100 miles shorter.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Section agreed to.

On section 8—lands acquired near Fredericton:

Mr. MICHAUD: How much land?

Mr. REID: Just through the yard at Fredericton. It is necessary to put this in because it runs over the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. MICHAUD: Has any land been expropriated lately in connection with this Valley railway?

Mr. REID: Not that I know of.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill No. 99, amend the Exchequer Court Act—Mr. Doherty—was read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Militia and Defence—cadet services, $100,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: May we have an explanation of this?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is the same amount as was voted last year. The Estimate is as follows:

Pay and allowance of Director of Cadet Services at headquarters	$ 3,500
Pay and allowance of 14 organizers and inspectors at $2,190 each	30,660
Special living allowance to 6 organizers in the West	1,200
Transport, travelling expenses of 14 organizers and inspectors, say 200 days at $5 per day	14,000
Transport and travelling expenses of 15 physical training instructors R.C. R., say $100 each,	1,500
Subsistence allowance to same	8,500
Allowance to Instructors of Cadet Corps, $1 for each cadet instructed	40,000
Contingent expenses	640
Total	$100,000

Mr. TURRIFF: Is it the opinon of the Militia Department, now that we have had almost two years of war, that this service is of any real value? In times of peace it seems to me to be a waste of money to make this expenditure on the training of young boys, many of whom when they grow up will not join the volunteer force. It may, perhaps, be of some advantage during the war. I should like to have the view of the Prime Minister on this point.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that it is the view of the department that the service which is rendered by this vote is a very important one. The boys throughout the country do take a keen interest in it, and the training is of advantage not only to the country but to the boys themselves. They are taught habits of discipline and they receive certain military training at a time when what they do learn will remain with them always. The hon. gentleman doubts whether they are likely to continue their training in the militia force as they grow older. I am informed that the experience of the department, so far as they have had any experiece, is precisely the reverse; that the boys who receive training of this kind naturally take an interest in continuing their training as they grow older.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Some years ago when this question came before the House I was rather critical: if I did not oppose the item, I criticised it. Since that time, however, I have learned to know better. I am not a militarist, and I do not approve the movement because of any belief that it would promote militarism in Canada; but I believe that the principles upon which this movement is based in Canada, in England, and in France, which has copied it from England, are most excellent. I have seen these young men in Montreal and in Ottawa doing excellent service, and from what I have read I understand that in France, at the front, and at the rear of the armies, the cadets have been most useful as helpers in hospital work and in other work connected with the management of these large armies. I vote for this item with pleasure, for I believe that the movement is a healthy one in time of war or in time of peace. It teaches the young men to be manly.

Mr. OLIVER: Although these Estimates do not bear directly upon the war expenditure and administration, would the Prime Minister consider it to be in order to deal with such matters under these items if in the course of the discussion it should become desirable to secure information with regard to the administration of war affairs?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not any objection, if my hon. friend thinks that would be more convenient than to take it on the Bill when it comes up in committee.

Mr. OLIVER: The work is all carried on by the Militia Department, and necessarily it interlocks to a certain extent. If satisfactory to the Prime Minister, it might be just as convenient for the committee to deal with these matters now as at some future time. In regard to this vote for cadet services, I would like to offer this for the consideration of the committee and the Government. When there was no war, it was desirable that we should prepare for war, but now that we have war, it is desirable that we should meet that condition as promptly and efficiently as possible. I have nothing but praise for the idea of the training of young men for military service. But at the present time we have need, not so much of boys who will be of service some years from now, as of men who will be of service in case of emergency to-day. There are many men throughout the country who are willing and anxious to be enrolled for local service, as a military protection either as enrolled active militia or in corps similar to the cadets. There seems to be no disposition to encourage such a movement as this. These organizations get no pay, no arms, no uniforms, no consideration whatever, except the privilege of enrollment and of drilling without arms. This condition may be due to the stress of circumstances; but while the country is in this condition of war, while we hope that there may be no danger of complications of any kind arising in this country, at the same time it would be well to encourage such organizations for home defence or for military service in Canada. If we are not doing that because we have not the money, I would suggest that we would better spend this money on adults who are ready for service than on the boys, who no doubt are good boys, but who will not be ready for service until a number of years have passed.

Mr. MORPHY: I am surprised to find that the conditions in the Northwest are different from what they are in the part of the country from which I come. The hon. gentleman has just made a plea in which he characterizes the Government's inactivity, in terms that are not very complimentary, with regard to those men who would like to join units that are not intended for overseas service. He says they do not receive good treatment when they make application to the department, that no consideration is given to them, that they have no uniforms and no rifles. Why, that is true in the case of the forces that

are going overseas. This country is pressed to the utmost limit to provide uniforms and rifles and equipment for those who are going to fight, and how the hon. gentleman can attack the Militia Department and the Government for not having this equipment for men who are not going to fight, passes all comprehension. In the neighbourhood in which I live, and I think this is generally true in western Ontario, the men who may desire to enlist for home defence are spending not only their business time but every spare moment of time in recruiting for overseas forces, going from town to town all over the district, holding meetings, urging the younger men fit for fighting service to come in and join the colours. Thus where I live the usefulness of the peace battalions has practically ceased. Officers fit for service who were in command have practically left their commands and gone into the fighting forces. So that the regimental units have been practically wiped out of existence, and practically all the men who are fit for service have gone or are going overseas to fight. The condition of which my hon. friend speaks is therefore a natural condition, and I am surprised to learn that the conditions are not the same in the West as they are with us.

As to abandoning the support of the cadet movement in favour of a movement such as the hon. gentleman has foreshadowed, or advocated, that it seems to me would be a great mistake, because the only home force to-day in western Ontario that is organized, that is available, is the cadet force, which is officered by regular officers attached to the schools of which the corps form a component part. They are composed of youths from 14 to 16 or 17 years of age. If there is any force that should be equipped for home defence, a force of energy, activity and intelligence, it is the cadet force. The hon. gentleman suggests that we substitute for them a non-existent section of the community.

Hundreds and thousands of these cadets have enrolled in the overseas forces and gone to the front not only with training but with intelligence and efficiency. Anything that would detract from, or cause deterioration in, the cadet forces would be the next thing to a national crime. I hope the committee will take the remarks I have made in the spirit in which they are offered. Whatever may be the conditions in other places, I would oppose any suggestion that would detract from the efficiency which is now being developed through the cadet movement, and which is reflected in the fighting forces of this country. I think it is the best movement that has taken place in the history of Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: I agree very largely with the remarks of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) in regard to the Home Guard. In one of the towns in my constituency, when the war first started, a Home Guard was formed and a lot of our young men joined it. In the early part of last summer I was in that town attending a meeting for the purpose of helping recruiting, and they reorganized their Home Guard. Out of the first hundred members who joined the Home Guard when the war broke out 80 had joined the regular forces and were either across the water serving at the front with the First Contingent or had been drafted into various battalions that were being organized. They reorganized the Home Guard and some 150 more men joined it. Their complaint was that they could not get any help as to officers for drilling or rifles from the Militia Department. They particularly asked for rifles. There were some old Ross rifles that were not supposed to be first-class that had been sent out for the Border Horse. The Home Guard applied for these rifles. I had some correspondence over it with the Militia Department, and I asked them to communicate directly with the parties out there; therefore I am not prepared to say whether they eventually got any help or not from the Militia Department. I know there has been a shortage of rifles. Possibly the acting minister could say how many Canada can produce in the arsenal at Quebec. Are we producing a large number?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know that it would be very prudent for me to give statistics in regard to that. I may, however, say that according to my information the Ross rifle factory has produced more rifles since the commencement of this war than any other establishment on this continent up to the present time. I am pretty sure, although not absolutely positive, that it is producing more to-day than any other establishment on this continent. I do not believe that will always continue, because very great preparations have been made in some of the establishments on the other side of the line; but I think I am quite within the limit when I make the statement to which I have just given ut-

terance. Might I say that while that is true, we really have not had any such supply of rifles as would enable us to meet the suggestion which the hon. member for Edmonton has thrown out. There is a certain amount of difficulty in providing uniforms and other articles of equipment for the men as fast as they are enlisted. The greatest difficulty of all is with the rifles. It is not a question of money, as my hon. friend from Edmonton seems to suggest, but it is a question of rifles. If he will tell us where we can get rifles, there is money enough on hand to purchase them; but we do not know where they can be secured except in the factory that we have at Quebec, and that has done fairly well. I appreciate very thoroughly the spirit of the men who enlisted in the home guards in the early months of the war. I had the privilege of reviewing a great many regiments of home guards in different parts of the country. There were men of all ages, old and young—young men, men in the prime of life, men getting on in years, fifty or sixty years of age and perhaps more. They were all drilling away, endeavouring so to train themselves as to do good service in case there were any call for it. As has been observed by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), a great many of the younger of these men have since enlisted for overseas service in all parts of the country. The movement became so pronounced in various parts of the country that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes) concluded that the better course for him would be to organize the reserve militia, which the Governor General had power to do, if I remember the provisions of the Militia Act correctly. An Order in Council was passed for that purpose. A good many units of the reserve militia have been organized in different parts of Canada. It is suggested that the Government give these no consideration. The Government give them all the consideration that is possible consistently with providing for the needs of the men who have enlisted for overseas service, and I feel sure that all will agree that that is the need which must first be provided for; so we have provided for that first. In some cases a few rifles have been procured for training of the battalions of the reserve militia, not very many, I am sorry to say, because they were urgently needed for other purposes which were regarded as of prior importance. Subject to those considerations, I am informed by the deputy minister that the department has been disposed to give, and does give, to these units of reserve militia all the consideration that is possible.

Mr. TURRIFF: I quite agree with the Prime Minister that if rifles are short the men who are overseas naturally have to be attended to before the home guards, cadets or anybody else; but I understand that the Department of Militia, or the Government, sold a large number of old Lee-Enfield rifles prior to the breaking out of the war.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the officers of the department that no rifles have been sold since the outbreak of the war. Some time before the war a small number of old rifles were sold through the British Government to the New Zealand Government.

Mr. TURRIFF: Of course, I am aware that those rifles were sold before August, 1914; but even before the war broke out rifle associations had a good deal of trouble in getting rifles. With regard to the Lee-Enfields, my information is that 15,000 of them were sold to the New Zealand Government at $1 apiece, and that the New Zealand troops in Flanders and France and other war zones are now using those very rifles.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Where did my hon. friend get that information?

Mr. TURRIFF: I could give my right hon. friend my authority for it. If my information is not correct, the officers of the department who are here to-night can set me right. I know these rifles were sold to the New Zealand Government, because they are mentioned in the Auditor General's Report, and the New Zealand Government put a certain amount to the credit of the Canadian Government in London in payment for them. I had a letter from one of our soldiers in the trenches not long ago, and he said that the Ross rifle, with which they were armed, was not considered as good a rifle as the Lee-Enfield, and that whenever our soldiers had the opportunity of picking up a Lee-Enfield, they threw the Ross rifle away. If that is true we have the anomaly of the Canadian soldier throwing away a rifle which costs $17 or $18, or $27 or $28—I am not sure which, but it is a considerable sum anyway—and picking up a rifle which our own Government sold to the New Zealand

9 p.m.

Government for $1. I know exactly where this letter came from, and can depend on the writer when he says our soldiers are throwing away the Ross and picking up the Lee-Enfield.

Mr. MORPHY: Are the New Zealand forces armed with the Lee-Enfields that my hon. friend has just referred to?

Mr. TURRIFF: That is my information.

Mr. MORPHY: On what date were those rifles sold by the Canadian Government?

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not know whether it was in 1912 or 1913, but they were sold by this Government some time before the war began. I could not prove that these rifles the Government sold are now being used by the New Zealand soldiers at the front, but the Auditor General's report shows that they were sold to the New Zealand Government at all events.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have heard stories of our men picking up the Lee-Enfield rifle, and I have also heard stories of British soldiers picking up the Ross rifle in preference to their own. I have been told it is not an uncommon thing for a soldier, when a rifle of a different type is available, to think for the time being it is better than his own, and to favour the idea of making the change. As far as the sale of rifles is concerned, I should like my hon. friend to bear in mind that the Ross rifle was adopted by the late Administration, instead of the Lee-Enfield, as the rifle our soldiers were to be armed with. It was a model weapon that was adopted. It is perfectly true that the contract made by the late Administration with the Ross Rifle Company provided that the Government might from time to time require the production of rifles of a different model, if it saw fit, provided it would pay the cost of the neo ssary machinery, gauges and other alterations of a complex character that the change would necessitate. The Lee-Enfield rifles, and some of the Lee-Metfords, I think, were disposed of, as they were not required while that policy was being carried on. The policy with regard to the Ross rifle was not changed when the present Administration came into power. I deprecate the idea of endeavouring to convey the impression, either to the House or to the country, but especially to our own troops, that the rifle with which they are armed is not a suitable weapon. Any idea of that kind, I think, would be most unfortunate, and do a great deal of harm. If we had any choice as to the rifle to be used there might be some object in it, but inasmuch as, under present conditions, we have to use the Ross rifle or nothing, I for one can see no good reason why any hon. gentleman in this House should seek to cast discredit on the rifle with which our troops are armed. There was a good deal of discussion about the Ross rifle some years ago, and there has been some discussion since the war broke out. To avoid a particular difficulty that occurred at the front a change has been made in the Ross rifle. A difficulty occurred at the front, not only with the Ross rifle, but with the Lee-Enfield as well, and a change corresponding to that made in the Ross rifle has also been made, I am informed, in the Lee-Enfield, and with good results in both cases.

Mr. HUGHES: The ammunition caused the guns to jam, I think.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The change that was made was an enlargement of the chamber. The chamber of the Ross rifle, I understand, was slightly smaller than that of the Lee-Enfield. The Lee-Enfield chamber was slightly enlarged, and the chamber of the Ross rifle enlarged to a still greater extent, and I believe that the enlarged chamber of the Ross rifle is now somewhat larger than the enlarged chamber of the Lee-Enfield. It is said, however, by those who are in a better position to judge of these matters than I am, that the jamming to which allusion has been made was occasioned by the character of a certain quality of amunition which at one time was being served out, but which I think has since been withdrawn. I am informed that neither with the Ross nor the Lee-Enfield has any great difficulty been experienced when other ammunition was used. As a matter of fact, when our own ammunition, manufactured in this country, was used in the Ross rifle no considerable difficulty in jamming occured.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: I saw it stated in the newspapers quite recently in regard to the heavy fighting that took place within the last two weeks at St. Eloi and other places that some jamming occurred. Whether it was the fault of the ammunition or whether those things occur under the best conditions or not I do not know, but I saw criticisms of that kind in the Montreal Gazette and other leading Canadian newspapers.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am a little inclined to doubt the accuracy of the information of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) in regard to the old Lee-Enfield rifles sold to New Zealand being used by the soldiers at the front. I have a very distinct recollection, when the Liberal Government was in power, of that Government handing around hundreds of those rifles throughout the country wherever any number of young men formed a rifle association. The Government would provide them with the rifles free of cost, and also with all the old ammunition which the Government were discarding and which those young men saw fit to use. I belong to one of those associations, and my recollection of that rifle is that when you fire it off it will pretty nearly kick you into the next county. While I think the Government did a proper thing in discarding those old rifles and giving out the old ammunition, thereby encouraging rifle associations, I cannot think that those rifles would be used in actual warfare, although for a person who had his shoulder well padded they might do all right to use in firing at a target.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why would the New Zealand Government buy such a large quantity as 15,000?

Mr. EDWARDS: They might use those rifles for drilling purposes or for target practice. If a person had a bag filled with sawdust up against his shoulder, and if he placed his feet very firmly on the ground, he might remain in the county in which he was when he fired off his rifle. I do not think, however, from all I can hear, that troops like those supplied by New Zealand would use a rifle that was not up to date, and I do not think the New Zealand Government would place in the hands of their men a rifle that was purchased at a dollar apiece. I think the hon. member is drawing largely on a very excellent and active imagination when he supposes anything of that kind.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: The discussion has rather switched from what we had in mind when this item was first called, and, if I might be permitted, I would like to take this opportunity of threshing out this question of policy in regard to arming and equipping and recognizing local forces throughout the Dominion. That question is an important one and one that is entirely pertinent to the subject under discussion. When we find it desirable to train and measurably equip boys for the sake of the service that they may render in years to come, and that is all very proper, we should not ignore the present need of men who can render service now, who are willing to render that service, but whom we are not willing to equip so as to enable them to render that service. There is, in parts of the Northwest, at any rate in Alberta, an organization called the Legion of Frontiersmen, formed for the purpose of military drill. That legion was organized long before the war and had exactly the same purposes, if I understand the matter correctly, as the cadet corps, only it was composed of mature men, and possibly to some degree of elderly men, and not of boys. That legion has organizations at various points throughout the province of Alberta for the purpose of securing military efficiency in order to be able to render to the country a service which, while it was only in prospect when the war broke out, may at any moment become an imperative necessity now that war conditions exist. There is no question about the good faith of those men, nor about their loyalty of purpose, nor about the efforts that they have made in the sacrifice of time and energy in fitting themselves for military service by military drill; but military drill is only an empty thing unless it has the support of actual weapons. I know that this organization has applied repeatedly to the Department of Militia for arms and for such recognition as is granted to the cadets, but I am informed that such recognition has been not only constantly refused, but refused with some abruptness that was perhaps not necessary under the circumstances. My contention is this, that when the country is at war, and when no man can forecast what contingency may arise, so long as we are dependent upon voluntaryism for our military service, it is the part of wisdom for the Government to encourage military organization under every possible circumstance that will measurably tend to efficiency and to good results, and that when the Government absolutely ignores the offer of service on the part of those men who form this Legion of Frontiersmen, they discriminate against men who are able to render service to-day in favour of boys who can be expected to render service only some years hence. I do not think that is good policy; I do not think it is what the necessities of the country require at the present time. I have already spoken of the active militia being organized, but not provided with weapons or with uni-

forms, being without pay or recognition, and only permitted to enroll themselves under the orders of the Government, and yet they may be called to any part of the Dominion at any time that the occasion may arise. The idea that is in the minds of those who are not prepared at the moment to enlist for overseas service, but who desire to render themselves efficient in a military sense by means of drill and organization, is that the men who enlist for overseas service will be sent overseas and leave the country depleted of an active military force. It may not be the intention of the Government to send overseas the men who have enlisted for that service; their intention may be to keep in Canada a large proportion of those men.

If that is their intention I can only say that I do not think they keep faith with the men who enlist. The man who gives up his business, gives up his prospects, believing that the country demands that sacrifice from him, will certainly not think that the country is doing fairly by him if, instead of giving him the opportunity to render the service that he has sacrificed in order to render, it keeps him doing drill and sentry-go in Canada around his own home. That is not his intention or desire, and if that is the intention of the Government in securing his enlistment, it is certainly not in conformity with the views and wishes of the men who enlist. The idea is that men who enlist for overseas service shall be sent overseas, and that there shall be a local military organization sufficiently large and efficient, and well enough equipped, to protect the interests of the country at home. While that is the idea of the people, I take the liberty of criticising what appears to be the policy of the Militia Department, which, judging by their action, is to ignore everything except the enlistment for overseas service. The men who enlisted for overseas service being held in Canada for a longer time than they believe they ought to be held, are dissatisfied and do not recognize that they are being dealt with fairly by the Government. I say that in time of war, under a voluntary system such as we have and must depend upon, the policy should be to encourage military drill and military efficiency in every section of the population that is willing to take up that drill and secure that efficiency.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know that it will be of any use for me to repeat again what I have already said in terms as distinct as I can make them. We have not enough rifles to train the men who are going overseas. We regard the necessity in that respect as above the necessity for the reserve militia referred to. The hon. gentleman says we ignore them because we do not give them rifles. I tell him again we have not the rifles to give them; all the rifles we have are required for the forces training for overseas. I cannot make the matter any plainer. If the hon. gentleman would like a statement of the exact number of rifles available and the exact number of men under training, I should be very glad to give it to him for his own information, and perhaps he would then understand the situation better then than he seems to do now. So far as the defence of Canada is concerned, I think it was stated a year ago last autumn, or last December, that under the policy which the Government proposed there would probably be at all times in Canada not less than 50,000 men under training, who would be available for the defence of the country in case of attack. There are certainly more than twice that number in training in Canada at present, and as regiments go forward new regiments are formed. The total enlistments up to the present time run to about 320,000. The enlistments from the first of January to the first of May—I have not the exact figures before me—were between 112,000 and 115,000, or at the rate of nearly a thousand a day. The troops have been going overseas just as fast as the conditions permitted: first, the adequacy of there training here, so that they can complete that training in Great Britain; second, the arrangements made by the British Government for their reception in the British Islands while that further training is being carried on; and, third, the provision of transports to take them across the Atlantic. By all these conditions we have been limited. Perhaps there might be mentioned a fourth, which is the provision of equipment and rifles—though we have not always waited for rifles, but have sometimes sent them across without rifles which followed them safely afterwards.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): I desire first to express my appreciation of the splendid manner in which the Government is handling this stupendous problem of equipping men, training them, and sending them overseas. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the complete answer to the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite, this

evening and at other times, is to be found in the fact that the records made by our troops who have gone overseas prove conclusively that the method used by the Government, the system under which these men are enrolled and trained, is a sound and good one. I do not think we could have a stronger testimony to the efficiency of the Government and of the Department of Militia than the record of our troops at the front.

There are one or two things I wish to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister. It has been brought to my attention that in the Motherland it is often very difficult to distinguish a Canadian soldier, because so many of them wear no distinct badge. On the contrary, New Zealanders and Australians wore badges that were quite distinct. I understand that the badge we use is a composition and that not all our soldiers wear a brass badge. The suggestion is made that we should have a common badge for all battalions which every Canadian soldier should wear, so that our men can be distinguished. That suggestion comes to me from a very prominent commander of a battalion at the front. Another point is this: of the men offering themselves for enlistment, probably from twenty to thirty per cent are rejected for some minor physical defect. A man may be an inch or two short in chest measurement, or he may have some defect in his teeth—though I understand that teeth defects are being remedied at the expense of the Government. Many of these minor defects for which men are rejected could be remedied by a brief course of physical training. It has been suggested to me, and I think the suggestion is worthy of consideration, that special instructors should be used to take men who are capable of being developed into suitable subjects for enlistment and give them a few weeks of special training. It is easy to see that if you can save five per cent of the men offering for enlistment it would add very materially to the forces going to the front. I know that there are men in different parts of Canada, well trained for this work and who could give special physical instruction to these recruits, and probably a few weeks would bring many of them up to efficiency.

Then, in giving commissions to officers taking troops overseas, I believe the policy should be followed at all times of bringing back from the front men who have seen service. We sent overseas in the first contingent a large number of bright, educated, clever men, highly capable of commanding men or directing their activities in civil life, and who have proven themselves to be very efficient at the front. I think that from now on the policy should be adopted as a definite and final one that all commissions shall be given to those men who have served at the front. I understand that the Government have already adopted the policy to a very large extent, and that many men are being brought back from the front who have seen active service. The whole question of commissions has become a very serious one in this country. Many men feel that they ought to have commissions, but while this is a proper and laudable ambition, it would be infinitely better if a man were compelled to have from three to six months' active service at the front before being allowed to take command of a body of men. Exception, of course, might be made in the case of those who have been in military life for many years and have undergone extensive training. I feel very strongly on the question of commissions and the type of men who should receive them. I wish to cast no reflection on men who hold commissions in Canada to-day, or in the training camps of England, but it appears to me that no one could criticise the policy of bringing non-commissioned officers and others recommended by their senior officers back from the front for that purpose. This applies particularly to commanding officers. I think it would be very desirable to bring back, say, majors or captains from the front and give them command of battalions in Canada. Knowing the entirely new and strange conditions under which the men now have to operate, they could impart very much better training than men who had not seen service at the front. I throw out these few suggestions for the consideration of the Government without wishing to add unnecessarily to their burdens, at the same time expressing my appreciation of the splendid manner in which this department has handled the gigantic task resting upon it. I can scarcely understand how the Prime Minister can carry the burden which is resting upon him, not only the responsibility of the Prime Minister's office, but also that of the Department of Militia. I think the committee should give to the Prime Minister every possible consideration in the matter of carrying out these very onerous duties.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Every Canadian who goes overseas has a badge

on his shoulder, the word "Canada," and he has, as I understand, a regimental badge on his collar. The type of cap used is practically uniform with that used in the British Army. It is not so distinctive as that used by the Australians and New Zealanders, who are more readily distinguished in that way. With regard to bringing back men from the front for the training of those in Canada, that has been done to a considerable extent. A great many of the units which have been organized during the past six months have been so organized by men who were brought back from the front. So far as commissions are concerned, I am informed by the deputy minister that the practice at the front is this: if, for example, a lieutenant is invalided, the next senior non-commissioned officer is promoted, and if the lieutenant does not return within thirty days to duty the position taken by the non-commissioned officer is made permanent. Promotions are made from the ranks to make good his place and that of the corporal and other non-commissioned officers; so that the department has been endeavouring to carry out that principal, giving preferment to men who have served at the front for a certain time.

Mr. STEVENS: The badge is a composition badge, I understand. The information I have from a very reliable source is that it does not wear well, and the suggestion is that it should be a brass badge.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A brass badge can be seen at a considerable distance and is very conspicuous. It is all very well in the streets of London, but not so appropriate at the front; and for that reason the composition badge is used instead.

Mr. MACDONALD: The idea which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) puts forth is a very laudable one. I agree with the Prime Minister as to the difficulty of obtaining the necessary rifles for the equipping of the home forces along the lines suggested. The problem of obtaining sufficient arms to equip the troops is one that I am sure is very serious. I understand that the difficulty of obtaining arms on this side of the water is taxing the capacity of every factory; especially do we realize this when we consider that the Allied nations have come to the United States for the purpose of obtaining arms. As we have a factory in Canada making our own rifles, I think it is time that this captious criticism with regard to the Ross rifle should come to an end. It has come from hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House and from newspapers throughout the country. Formerly hon. gentlemen on the other side had the exclusive right to the criticism of the Ross rifle, but the criticism has probably come from all quarters regardless of politics. One thing I think we all agree about is that we have in Canada a rifle factory where we manufacture an arm which is all right, which enables our people to go out and take part in this conflict and which in time of war it is important we should have in Canada. So far as the equipping of troops is concerned, I do not know where we should have been if it had not been for the fact that we had the Ross rifle factory. I am quite sure that we should not have been able to equip 50,000 men, much less 300,0000, if we had been dependent on outside rifle supply. The demand has been so great, not only in the Mother Country, but in every one of the Allied nations, that if we had not had this factory we should have been absolutely unable to equip any considerable number of men in Canada since the outbreak of war. Reasonable criticism was necessary and desirable, but I think that we should agree now to give up all further discussion of the matter. The problem of maintaining forces at home is a very serious one, and I apprehend the difficulties suggested by the Prime Minister as existing in this regard while we are engaged in preparing and sending over as fast as possible these men for overseas service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In the course of a few months there will be in the province of Nova Scotia a provincial election. The term of the present legislature will expire shortly. There are, I am sure, over 5,000 soldiers under enlistment scattered throughout the province of Nova Scotia at the present moment. It is rumoured that all the regiments now recruited and recruiting will be sent to Aldershot for training during the summer months and until they go to the front. The question therefore naturally arises as to whether any provision can be made in a fair manner for the voting of these citizen soldiers at the forthcoming election in the province. It does not interest one party more than another, so I should think that both parties would desire to devise some means whereby such of the enlisted men as have votes might have the opportunity of voting. It is possible to arrange this in a small prov-

ince like Nova Scotia. Has the Prime Minister, who is now Acting Minister of Militia, considered this matter, and can he work out some plan whereby these soldiers may have the privilege of casting their votes at the impending election? I do not know that this burden should be cast upon him, but probably the gentlemen representing both political parties from Nova Scotia might get together and appear before him and jointly work out some plan. There are two methods by which the soldiers might be enabled to vote, one by giving leave for one or more days to the men in the training camps, so that they might go to their homes and vote. That could only be done with the permission of the Department of Militia, and, of course, if this permission were granted it would have to be granted without discrimination. The other plan would be for the Provincial Legislature to provide for a system of registration and voting prior to the polling day of the election, after the manner of the Act passed by this Parliament the session before last. Of course, such action by the Legislature of Nova Scotia would not be effective without the hearty co-operation of the Department of Militia.

Mr. EDWARDS: What about those who have gone overseas?

Mr. MACLEAN: I would eliminate them altogether. My suggestion is that we should make provision only for those who are within the province.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course, I would not undertake to propose any method of voting. But it is perfectly obvious that the fact that a man has enlisted for the purpose of defending and fighting for the interests of the Dominion, of the whole Empire, and indeed of the world, ought not to be allowed to debar him from exercising his franchise. The fact that he has enlisted is an additional reason why he should have the opportunity of polling his vote, if it is possible to do so by any reasonable means. I understand that the subject is under consideration in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, and that a committee of that Legislature to-day considered two proposals.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think that is correct.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I may be misinformed. All I can say at the moment is that, so far as we can co-operate in any reasonable way to assist in arriving at some arrangement to enable the soldiers to poll their votes, we shall be prepared to do so. If the Legislature of Nova Scotia is formulating any method it would be inadvisable for us to take any action until that method has been placed before us in the regular way.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What does the Prime Minister think of the idea of giving a sufficient leave to the enrolled men to permit them to vote?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would be inadvisable for me to express any opinion with regard to that without first consulting the Chief of the General Staff, the Adjutant General, and the other officers of the department, who would know much better than I would whether or not that would be feasible. I shall be very glad to place the observations of my hon. friend before them and ask them for a report on the subject. I do not know whether the proposals which I understood were under consideration would involve any question as to the men from the province who are already overseas. Some of them are in Great Britain and some, doubtless, in France. In some of the provinces where provincial elections are impending arrangements have been proposed by which men who have already gone overseas might be enabled to vote. However, my hon. friend has not raised that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think it would be inadvisable to do that.

Mr. TURRIFF: It seems to me that the only feasible plan in connection with provincial elections would be the granting of sufficient leave for those who wished to vote to get away and cast their votes, providing everybody gets leave. All the soldiers would not want to go home to cast their votes. We all know that in any election 25 per cent of those on the voters' list do not come out and take advantage of their franchise. Among the soldiers many, if they were at home, would not vote, and while we should all like to see all the soldiers vote who wished to vote, it seems to me that for a province to adopt the very unreasonable legislation that we adopted for soldiers to vote abroad, would be a mistake. I think they ought to be given leave so that they may go and vote if they so desire.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Might I ask the Prime Minister if to-morrow afternoon he will put himself in a position to say whether or not it would be possible, in the judgment of the officers of the department,

to grant leave to enable soldiers to vote, so that it would be known? The Legislature of Nova Scotia will not be in session very long, and if anything is to be done in the way of legislation it will have to be done very promptly.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Legislation here?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, or there. There will not likely be any necessity for legislation here.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I should not think that legislation will be necessary here. It would seem to be a question for the Legislature of Nova Scotia to take into consideration in the first instance. I am afraid that I shall have a pretty busy morning before me.

Mr. MACLEAN: Monday?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall make an effort to get the information at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MACDONALD: There are two ways in which the votes of soldiers in Nova Scotia, a comparatively small province, and accessible for voting purposes at all points, might be polled, and that would be either by allowing the men to go home, or by enabling the men to cast their votes while in camp. One can see a great many difficulties that would attach to three or four battalions, representative of the whole province and many different counties, casting their ballots in camp. The difficulty of working that out on election day would tax the patience and ingenuity of the officers in charge. I assume that in regard to this question any attitude that would be adopted by the federal authorities who have control over these men, would not be in any way partisan or inconsistent with the idea that it would be important if possible for these men to exercise the franchise. I understand that in the western provinces a large number of men have been permitted to go and work at the crops. There is no reason why leave should not be given to those who desire to go and cast their votes. Of course, a large number of young men whose names are not on the list, and men whose names are not on the list for some other reason would not need to go home. But those who have votes and who desire to go should be given that opportunity. It would only mean three days' leave, and being in camp it is not as if they were located in a desultory way throughout the country. All the ordinary details of the camp would be carried on in their absence. I do not profess to be a military expert, but I have been in camps several times, and for a matter of three days the disjointing of things would not be serious because there would be enough men left for ordinary purposes. It seems to me that in our province that would be the most feasible method of working it out.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Give them leave?

Mr. MACDONALD: Give them leave.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And provide transportation?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, if that is thought desirable.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Would not we be subject to the penalties of the Election Act?

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not think that my hon. friend need have any fear on that score. I am sure that the Prime Minister approves of the desire of the men to have the opportunity of casting their votes, and I also feel confident that a scheme can be worked out with the least inconvenience to the men and the least difficulty to all concerned. It is impossible to tell anything of the political complexion of the men who are there, but it would be an anomaly if the 3,000 or 4,000 men who are in camp should not be permitted to go home for the purpose of casting their votes. I hope the Prime Minister will be able to work it out.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Of course, any question as to the political opinions of the men would not be taken into account at all. The only object to be arrived at would be to give the utmost possible freedom to exercise their franchise without any undue influence of any kind, and to provide every facility for that purpose so far as reasonably consistent with military considerations.

Mr. TURRIFF The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) rather gave the idea that we on this side of the House were unduly criticising, and not giving credit to, the Government for the manner in which the raising of the army had been carried out. I do not think anybody on this side of the House has any such idea in his mind. But I do not see that there is any such fulsome praise due to the Government, or the department, in connection with the sending across of an army to the Old Country. You only have to look to Australia with half of our popula-

tion and half our resources to see what she has done; Australia has sent more men to the front than we have. I would like to ask if there is any rule or system under which men are sent forward. I know of regiments that have been kept 18 months in Canada while other regiments that have not been in training half as long have been sent to the front.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What regiment has been here for 18 months?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: There was a regiment in Regina. It may have been one of the regiments that passed through here the other day, but they started organizing 17 or 18 months ago.

Mr. EDWARDS: Have there been no drafts from any of these regiments? In some cases there have been drafts of 150 or 200 men.

Mr. TURRIFF: In some cases perhaps drafts have gone over but in other cases there have been regiments ready for over a year and they do not seem to be chosen to go while other regiments which have not been organized nearly as long have been sent to the front. Is there any rule or system under which the different regiments are sent over.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed by the deputy minister that there was greater delay than usual in the case of some mounted regiments organized in the West. There was no occasion for the use of mounted men on account of the kind of warfare that has been carried on during the past year or fifteen months. After a good deal of correspondence an arrangement was reached by which they could be sent forward as infantry; but for that purpose, I understand, it was necessary that they should go through a different kind of training. Further than that, the deputy minister informs me that a regiment at Regina, which is possibly the one that the hon. gentleman has in mind, has sent forward drafts of about 500 men. When these drafts were sent forward, it was necessary to enlist new men and train them, and a good deal of time was occupied in that way. However, the regiment is about to go forward, as I understand.

Mr. TURRIFF: One went forward last week from here.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has either gone forward or is about to go forward. In the end it will go forward as one of the finest regiments in all the Canadian Expeditionary Forces.

Mr. OLIVER: Following the remarks of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), I appreciate quite as much as he does the very great burden that is carried by the Prime Minister, especially since he has assumed the duties of Acting Minister of Militia, and I certainly would not wish to add to his burden in any way. But we are here in a very responsible position, dealing with a matter that is of greater and graver import than any that has yet come before any Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, and I consider that we should be doing very much less than our duty if we did not bring into this council of Parliament the best we have, both as to constructive and, if you like, destructive criticism. We wish to secure the highest degree of efficiency in the military administration and service of this Dominion, both for our credit and for the welfare of the Empire, and I hope that neither the Prime Minister nor any other member of the Government will think that in anything said by myself or any other member on this side of the House we have any other desire than to secure the best that can be had in the interests of the country and of the Empire. We must necessarily criticise from time to time; and in opposition to the very broad statement of commendation that my hon. friend has made, I would be compelled to make an equally broad statement of condemnation, based upon the information that has been given to the House by the Prime Minister to-night, as to the condition of the country in the matter of rifle armament.

We have been in a condition of war ever since August, 1914. When war was declared we were supposed to have armament for a force, I think, of some 75,000 or 100,000 men. We had a contract, I believe, with a rifle factory in Canada for the purpose of providing a sufficient output to equip our forces. Now, if it is a fact that at the end of eighteen months or more of war we are not in a position to equip efficiently even the forces we have sent overseas—and we have not sent our forces overseas nearly as rapidly as the understanding on which the men were enlisted would require—I cannot find in that condition of affairs anything for commendation of the Government, either of its activity or of its success. I am not prepared to urge culpabil-

ity against the Government for not having met the exigency more fully.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the hon. gentleman suggest where and from whom the Government can secure rifles?

Mr. OLIVER: That is not a fair question addressed to a private member. The Government of the country is responsible for the direction of its affairs; it is upon the shoulders of the Government that that responsibility rests, and it is not for any private member of Parliament to be held responsible for the direction of the country's affairs. When we faced the condition of war that we did face in the summer of 1914 we must have contemplated at that time an enormous increase in our military forces and equipment, and we surely should have taken stock then with a view to meeting the requirements as they arose.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: At what date?

Mr. OLIVER: At the beginning of the war.

Mr. STEVENS: No one dreamed of the developments that have arisen.

Mr. OLIVER: I am at a loss to conceive how any person could think this war was going to be any other than it has been. With all Europe under arms, with millions of men on both sides ready to take the field, with the training and preparation of two generations, I am at a loss to conceive how anybody could expect that this war would end in a very short time, or would not become the most tremendous conflagration the world had ever seen. My hon. friend has asked what my suggestion is. My suggestion is that the Government was remiss in not making preparation for equipping our forces on a larger scale than they did. We have a rifle factory in Quebec. I know of no reason why we should not have had a rifle factory in Toronto and another in Montreal. We have established shell factories all over Canada; we have established fuse factories in different parts of Canada; and I know of no reason why we should not have increased our output of rifles to any amount that was desired, in the interval that has taken place since the beginning of the war. There may be reasons that I am not aware of that limit the action of the Government, but that is my answer to my hon. friend's question.

10 p.m.

Mr. STEVENS: It is a very poor one.

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. OLIVER: I think it is an absolute answer. The weapon that wins the war is the rifle; efficiency in the use of that weapon is the chief factor in winning the war. Any country that presumes to accept a condition of warfare, and does not make adequate preparation for equipping its troops with rifles, and give them an opportunity for acquiring efficiency in the use of that weapon, is not considering the matter seriously.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. gentleman claim that the Government was remiss in not supplying these rifles previous to 1914? Or is he referring to the interval since that date?

Mr. OLIVER: Since that date. Remiss in not recognizing that a state of war had occurred in which it might be expected that Canada would have to put forth her military strength to a degree that was never contemplated in time of peace; remiss in not recognizing that the exercise of that strength would necessarily involve the equipping of an enormous number of men with efficient rifles, above everything else. Yet under those conditions of world war, we depended upon exactly the same institution as supplied us with rifles, possibly a sufficient number, in times of peace. That was not a reasonable proposition on the face of it, and it has not worked out well.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What does the hon. gentleman say we should have done?

Mr. OLIVER: I have already said that the Government when it saw the condition of war that had occurred, and it was quite evident that Canada would require to put forth military strength far beyond what she had ever dreamed of in times of peace, was remiss in continuing to depend upon the same mechanical organization—the factory at Quebec—to supply the needs of the country in time of war that had been adequate to supply its needs in time of peace.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Who told the hon. gentleman that we had to depend upon the same organization?

Mr. OLIVER: I understand that we had only one factory when the war began and that we have only one factory yet. We could have multiplied our means for the manufacture of rifles just as we have multiplied our means for the manufacture of shells, fuses, or any other article that was required for military purposes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would like to tell my hon. friend something that will convince him perhaps that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. We could have done one or two things. We could have gone, as some other governments did, to the United States and placed orders for rifles there. I am not going to give information here that might be of value to the enemy, although in some quarters there is less consideration of that aspect than one might have anticipated. I would ask my hon. friend to get in touch with Mr. Moir, the representative of the British Government in New York, and ascertain how many rifles out of the millions ordered have been produced in the United States although they were ordered more than a year ago. The other course that we might pursue and that we did pursue was to endeavour to increase the output of our own rifles in this country; and I may tell my hon. friend that we are producing to-day in Canada an output fifteen times greater than the normal output in time of peace. The fact that we have been able up to the present time to equip all our troops sent overseas with the latest type of Ross rifle, with the exception of two or three regiments—and in the case of those regiments the rifles followed them very shortly afterwards—is of itself a sufficient confutation of the statement of my hon. friend that this Government has been remiss in that respect. It is very easy to criticise and to look back now and say that everyone must have known in August, 1914, precisely how this war was going to develop. All I have to say to my hon. friend is that if he knew that, he knew a great deal more than men who have devoted nearly all their lives to the study of military conditions. I have known men whose life study has been of military affairs and who did not entertain the opinion that my hon. friend says he entertained in August, 1914. I do not believe that any great percentage of the men who have given this subject their attention and study had any such conception in August, 1914. It is very simple at this date to look back nearly two years and say: "Why, any one might have known in August, 1914, that this war would eventuate precisely as it has eventuated." Will my hon. friend cast his prophetic gaze forward and tell us what the events of the next eighteen months will be? If he will do that with the same confidence and assurance with which he is able to point to the events of the past eighteen or twenty months, he will be rendering a great service to the Empire and to the world.

Mr. BURNHAM: I am to a certain extent cognizant of public opinion in Canada, at any rate in the district from which I come, and I am well aware of this fact, that the discouragement by the Liberal party in this House of the military spirit in Canada prior to the declaration of war is the cause of our lack of preparedness. Hon. gentlemen opposite suddenly find, subsequent to the 4th of August, 1914, that the war is not only not going to be a short one but going to be a very long one. In July, 1914, they thought it was not going to take place at all; they kept telling us, as they had been doing for months: "War! why, it is a preposterous thing; it could not take place." Now they tell us that it could not have been avoided. Before the war broke out they told us that it was madness for us to indulge in all that preparation. It was that sort of talk that placed Canada in the position she was in, and it is a wonder we did not encounter a danger which we were unable to meet.

Mr. OLIVER: It does not matter what occurred before July, 1914; what we are interested in is what is occurring now and what will occur in the immediate future. What the Prime Minister has said as to the increase in the output of rifles is very good so far as it goes; the only trouble is that it does not go far enough. If it was possible to increase the output of rifles fifteen-fold, it was just as possible to increase that output twenty-fold, that is to say, to have secured sufficient rifles to arm and equip our soldiers as they should be armed and equipped under the conditions as we find them to-day. Let me remind the House that exactly the same sort of talk was put up in the United Kingdom in the winter of 1914-15 as to the supply of munitions there for use in the war. The people of Great Britain and the Empire were told that everything was being done that could be done; but it turned out that everything that could be done was not being done, and under the stress of criticism, exertions were put forward that had not been put forward before, and the supply of munitions was increased and still increased until we believe that to-day they have an adequate supply. If, however, the Government and the people of the United Kingdom had rested, in the winter of 1914-15 as easily as this Government are resting now in regard

to the supply of rifles for the soldiers of Canada, the war would never have been won by the Allies; it would have been lost. This is no time for recrimination; it is no time for blaming this one or that one or the other one; this is the time to recognize the conditions that we have to face and to meet those conditions adequately, and the first thing we need in order to take our proper part in this war is a sufficient supply of efficient rifles in the hands of proficient men. Unless and until we have that, we are not taking that part that we all desire to take in the task of winning this war. I did not know the condition was as the Prime Minister has said it is; I regret that it has had to be stated that we are short of rifles; but I would be doing far less than my duty as a member of this House if I did not use this opportunity of impressing, so far as I can impress, upon the Government, the House and the country, the fact that we must have an adequate supply of efficient rifles, or else we are not doing our part in the winning of the war.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would not like my hon. friend to imagine that anything he says impresses that consideration upon the mind of the Government any more than it has been impressed ever since the outbreak of the war. I cannot make that too plain to him. There is nothing that he has said here to-night that we do not know. There is no admonition that he has addressed to us that we did not have in mind fifteen months ago, and, if it had been otherwise, we would not have been able to produce in Canada to-day an output of rifles fifteen times as great as the output immediately before the war. If we had not taken that precaution the conditions would not have been as satisfactory as they are to-day. For I consider it a remarkable thing that, in the stress of this war and under the difficulties experienced in getting the complicated machines, too numerous for me to name, which are necessary for the purpose of establishing now units in a rifle factory, and with the growing demand all over the United States for that machinery on account of the orders for rifles that were coming from all the Allies to the United States—I say, I consider the results obtained in Canada are wonderful results. Not only had the machines to be provided, but it was necessary to procure all the material, material of a very precise type and difficult to procure—the seasoned wood, the special description of steel, and all the articles which go into these rifles. These articles had to be procured in quantities fifteen or twenty times as great as any provision had been made for before the war. And, as I have said, all this had to be done in competition with the great industrial concerns in the United States that had orders for millions of rifles from all the governments in Europe. The matter for astonishment is not that more was not done, but that so much was done, and that Canada, up to the present time, has been substantially able to arm every soldier with an efficient rifle before he crossed the Atlantic, the exceptions being, as I am informed by the deputy minister, two or three regiments whose rifles were not taken with them, but followed them very shortly afterwards. I repudiate any suggestion of remissness on the part of the Government, and I say that the results that have been obtained are a credit to Canada.

Mr. OLIVER: This is the most important question connected with the war and with Canada's participation in that war, and the Prime Minister will pardon me if I pursue the argument a little further. I have discussed the question of the supply of rifles for the active militia and for what may be called the auxiliary militia, the home guard. We are now aware that the reason these people are not equipped with weapons is that it was not possible to supply them. But we are assured that our troops as they go overseas are supplied with efficient rifles, and the Prime Minister tells us in detail of the difficulties of supplying rifles more rapidly than they have been supplied. I quite appreciate that there are difficulties. But let me turn the other side of the question. We are sending men overseas—our men—to meet on the field of battle the most highly-trained and best equipped troops the world ever saw. We are not doing justice to our troops unless, when we send them into the field, they have the best equipment that we can furnish them and unless they are as efficient and as proficient in the handling of that equipment as it is possible for them to be. Now I am to be corrected here and now if what I state is not right. According to the best information I have, our troops, enlisted in Canada and kept in training in Canada for periods of from six months to fifteen months, have gone over to England or the Continent, as the case may be, without

ever having had efficient target practice. Not to speak too generally, my information is that at the Sarcee camp near Calgary last summer there were 8,000 men in brigade camp, and that these 8,000 men had something over sixty-odd service rifles with which to carry on target practice. The only target practice they received was with these sixty-odd rifles for a period of four or five months in the summer camp. I saw some of these regiments going through here the other day. And I say that if the facts are as I have stated them—and I am here to be corrected if they are not—this country did not do its duty—

Mr. EDWARDS: Are you sure of the facts?

Mr. OLIVER: I am, but if I am wrong let me be corrected now. These men have gone to face the enemy on the battlefields of Europe, and, according to my information, they have not had fair opportunity to become proficient in the use of that weapon which is the decisive factor in modern battle, either in attack or defence. The Deputy Minister of Militia is at the elbow of the Prime Minister, and he can say whether that is right or not.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And he says absolutely it is not right. I will tell the hon. gentleman why it is not right. In the first place, so far as regiments in Canada are concerned, the best provision of rifle available has been given to them for target practice, not usually Mark III Ross rifle, but Mark II Ross rifle when the other was not available. I do not say they have always had the full equipment for a battalion, but I am assured by the deputy minister that they have had a sufficient number of rifles to enable target practice to be carried on efficiently at every camp. But my hon. friend goes further and says that they have not only gone overseas to Great Britain without instruction but they have gone from Great Britain to France without instruction.

Mr. OLIVER: So far as we know.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: But the hon. gentleman should not without warrant make statements which disquiet public opinion in this country and which are without foundation. I say that when these men go overseas they go through a course of musketry instruction at one of the English schools. I myself, when in England last summer, saw regiment after regiment going out for instruction at the great musketry school at Hythe. I say from my knowledge,—and I think I know as much of this matter as does the hon. gentleman—that not one regiment from Canada has gone to the war without adequate instruction in musketry. If they have not got it on this side they have got it on the other side. And I deprecate strongly statements of that kind which will appear in the public press of Canada and which tend to disquiet the parents, relatives and friends of those who have gone overseas to fight for their country.

Mr. CURRIE: Perhaps a person who has been there and seen can speak with knowledge. The question has been raised as to the training of these men in the use of the rifle. A number of years ago the British Army changed its method of training. The men are now trained with dummy ammunition; they are not allowed to go on the rifle range and fire live ammunition until they have obtained a considerable degree of efficiency with dummy ammunition. The idea is that instead of going in for this long range target practice the men must be able to put twenty-five or thirty shots a minute in an 18-inch ring at 400 yards. The men are practised constantly in this aiming and rapid firing with dummy ammunition. Even at the front every man is on his honour bound to devote a certain amount of time to this practice, and each day he goes through these motions for at least ten minutes in order to acquire proficiency in rapid aiming and firing. I was at Sarcee Camp, and I know that the training there was of that kind. When the training is of that kind it is not necessary to have a great number of rifles; a few rifles will suffice. A man who fires five rounds on the rifle range after he has completed his practice in this way, is far more efficient than if he had been working for two or three weeks under the old system and costing the Government a large sum of money for cartridges. Soldiers of the old school appreciate the fact that the men are not firing away hundreds of dollars worth of ammunition at the targets every day. I know that the units that have gone to England get thorough training in this modern school of musketry, which, after all, is the school that stood the British Army in such good stead in the retreat from Mons, and that has made the Canadians such an efficient fighting force at the front. When I left England last summer, the number of men without rifles in the new army regiments,

when I saw them on the march, was far greater than the number without them in Sarcee camp. They had not made any provision for the war, but they were making rifles as fast as they could. The units that went to the Dardanelles got their rifles at Malta; these rifles were sent over from India for them.

The great dearth of rifles has been one of the drawbacks of this war. I suppose that possibly one-third of Kitchener's army is not yet supplied with rifles in England. Fully one-half of the men were drilling in civilian clothes and had been doing so all winter—or in old uniforms of the blue and red type which is now obsolete. I think, therefore, that we have made fairly good progress in this respect. When I came over and found the regiments all equipped with uniforms I was very much surprised, because in England fully three-quarters of the men did not have uniforms. As to the rifle practice, if the men are given rifle practice according to the new school, they do not need any rifle at all except a rifle in form that has two sights on it. It is like the old deer shooting idea, that men must be able to raise a rifle rapidly and drop the enemy. Some of the English soldiers who are very proficient fire as many as thirty-five rounds a minute. In that kind of training it is not necessary to spend thousands of dollars on the ranges. They were indulging in the new practice at Sarcee when I inspected them last fall, and they had made fair progress in it, and were doing very well. They did not have rifles for every one there, but I do not think that is necessary; if the men get new rifles after they are trained and go to the field, it is possibly the best way. I think we are doing very well so far as that is concerned. Of course, not 5 per cent of the people of Great Britain or the colonies and dependencies believed what Lord Kitchener said when the war broke out, that it would last two and possibly three years. The men who could get articles in the magazines and those who could hold public meetings and be listened to were the ones who would tell the whole world that the war was going to end in two months; that Germany would be starved by that time. In some places the same idea still prevails, but I do not think many members of this House, if I asked them when the war was going to end, would say that it will be over in two or three months. I stated in the House once before this session that the war would last more than another year, and in that I was very seriously brought to task by some of my associates, in the House and outside, who said that I was dreaming; that the war would be over in two or three months. I fail to see that. I think we are on the crest of the war at the present time; the situation at Verdun to-day shows the first sign that the Allies are going to win. If they make the best of progress it will take them another year or year and a half—but there is no doubt as to what the end will be.

Mr. OLIVER: There was a question of fact as between the Premier and myself in regard to the armament of the men at the Sarcee camp at Calgary. What the hon. member for North Simcoe has said substantiates my statement that the men at the Sarcee camp were not armed with the Mark III rifle; that they did not have adequate target practice with the Mark III rifle.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN I did not say that they were armed with the Mark III rifle.

Mr. OLIVER: I made an assertion as to the equipment of the troops there, and I understood the Prime Minister to say that I did not know what I was talking about.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend said that members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces who went to the front to fight in the trenches had not adequate musketry training. I said that this, according to the information given to me by the deputy minister, was absolutely incorrect, and according to the information it is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that as to musketry training in England, or as to musketry training in Canada?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In Canada and in Great Britain. It does not make any difference where they get it as long as they get it before they reach the front.

Mr. OLIVER: I was stating a condition as I believe it exists in Canada, and I want to know whether I stated what is correct or not.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman has perhaps misconstrued what I said. For instance one company in each battalion would be armed with rifles, either Mark II or Mark III. That is the condition that obtained all over the country. The time table of training is divided up into various things —squad drill, company drill, physical train-

ing, marching; one company would be constantly exercised in the use of arms and arm drill and musketry, whilst others would be employed in something else. I think it would be impossible for the United States, for instance, with all its power, to arm the soldiers of Canada in as short a time as would be required to arm them all as they are enlisted.

Mr. OLIVER: The question is not as to what could or could not be done; the question is what was done. I repeat that what I said has been established, that the Canadian troops did not get adequate target practice with the service rifle in Canada, that they were not supplied with service rifles with which they could engage in target practice, and that they went from Canada without having had sufficient or efficient target practice. The hon. member for North Simcoe says that they have some system for practice with dummy ammunition that is better than the practice with the efficient rifle. That may be; I do not know whether that is true or not, but my information is that in order that a man may be efficient in the use of the rifle, he must know the rifle. He must have had the opportunity of practicing with his own rifle, so that he understands whatever peculiarity there may be in the rifle, or else he will not be efficient. It is said that the only use of rifle shooting in the field is at short range and quick-firing; but I will draw the attention of the House to this fact, that our casualty lists show a larger proportion of injuries from snipers than they do from any other cause except when an occasional great battle occurs.

Mr. CURRIE: There are more German casualties from the sniping of our fellows.

Mr. OLIVER: I certainly hope so, but the point is that the man that can hit the mark at long range is on the showing of the facts the most useful member of the military force, both for offence and defence, and he cannot get that expert ability except by actual practice.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would like to tell my hon. friend that I had the authority of the General Officer Commanding the Canadian Expeditionary Force at the front for the statement that the Canadian divisions at the front have been more successful in keeping down snipers, and more efficient in the use of rifles in the respect that my hon. friend alluded to, than any other part of the British forces that he was aware of.

Mr. OLIVER: I am very glad to hear that, but again I must insist that they are not given all the opportunities that should be given them under the circumstances surrounding their training at the hands of the Militia Department.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I may say furthere that I have had a letter from General Williams within the past two weeks, since our troops have been moved from one portion of the line that they formerly held to take up another portion of the line, and I have his statement that they were moved there because of their efficiency in that way, and that since they have arrived there they have been most successful in accomplishing the purpose for which they were sent.

Mr. OLIVER: We are very glad to know that they have acquired efficiency; but our business was to send them over efficient, and we did not do it because we did not supply them with the rifles that would enable them to become efficient on their home training grounds.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: All I have to say is that General Alderson's and General Williams' statements are absolutely inconsistent with that which my hon. friend has just made.

Mr. LOGGIE: After this little tussle between my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the right hon. Acting Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Robert Borden) I think perhaps we ought to go on in a little different strain. I endorse the suggestion made by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), that under certain circumstances it is very advisable to recall efficient non-commissioned officers, give them commissions and employ them in this country in the training of men who have joined the ranks in the battalions which are now being recruited. I think that is a wise proposition. Young men have been advanced within their own ranks. I know some that have been advanced, but they have not been given commissions. Perhaps it would not be out of place for me to say here that I congratulate the Government on the good work they have done in this dreadful struggle. Not only do I congratulate the Government, but I congratulate the whole citizenship of Canada on coming to the rescue as well as they have done. I was very much pleased when the Prime Minister intimated that

his goal was that we should have 500,000 men from Canada on the fighting line. I was glad to hear him announce that there had been recruited from the first of January until the 15th April about 101,000 men—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No, nearly 103,000.

Mr. LOGGIE: I was glad to hear that. You may consider me rather pessimistic, but I regret that recruiting has not been so active since that time.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. LOGGIE: If there is anything the Government can do to make it more active it behooves them to do it, and I am sure that in that they will have the hearty support of the people of Canada as a whole. I think I should also congratulate the Government upon the splendid help of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who has come so boldly to the front and given his heartfelt support to the Government on this occasion.

Mr. MORPHY: And his followers?

Mr. LOGGIE: His followers too. It was my privilege to state in this House, during a session before this, that the Government must expect criticism in connection with their administration and the expenditure of the moneys entrusted to them; but that does not mean that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House do not support them in their undertaking in defence of home and country, and of this great Empire. The Acting Minister of Militia said to my hon. friend from Edmonton that he would like him to make a prophecy as to the extent of the war. Let me just read one line from a letter I received this morning from the front, almost from the trenches, from a soldier who was wounded last October, but who is now back fighting as a private in the First Brigade Machine Gun Company, First Canadian Division.

Mr. MICHAUD: Would my hon. friend give us the name of that soldier?

Mr. LOGGIE: This is a matter that is private. I could give it to my hon. friend if he wants to know, but it would be considered rather personal if I were to name him. But what is in the letter is this: "I do not see how anything but the wastage of men will end the war." That does not indicate that the end of the war is near at hand. It means that it will not end in the near future, and it devolves upon us to find a way of reaching the goal that the Prime Minister mentioned, and that is that before the New Year we should have the full total of half a million men enrolled from Canada. I do not know how this is to be overtaken, but as one member of the House I should be very glad to give every support to the Government who have this great undertaking in hand. It is, I am sure, an undertaking whose extent we did not realize even when the war was declared. There is much to be said in support of the contention of my hon. friend from Edmonton, that there was every indication that the struggle would be a long one, and certainly the indications at the present time are that the struggle will not end in the near future, and it behooves us as a people to do everything in our power to reach the goal that the Prime Minister intimated, at the opening of this new year, it was his desire to reach. I congratulate the Government and the people of Canada, and I congratulate the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has given such splendid aid and support to the Government in their war measures.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Would the Prime Minister be good enough to tell us what position General Alderson occupies in regard to Canadian troops? It was stated in the press lately that he had ceased to occupy the position of command and that a Canadian had been appointed in his place.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have no official information on the subject.

Mr. OLIVER: Now that we have decided that we do not need rifles for target practice, I think we might take up the question of the efficiency of the rifle that we use, that is the Mark III Ross rifle. I have heard some reports with regard to this rifle that have been cited by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I would submit that, as the efficiency of this rifle is under suspicion at any rate, there might very well be a careful inquiry as to what its efficiency really is. The matter is too important to be passed over. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister resents the idea of these questions being discussed in this House of Parliament. We in this House of Parliament are charged with the responsibility, on behalf of the people of this country, of seeing that the best is done that can be done. and we are not relieved from that responsibility because of the gravity of the question that has to be considered. We have at the front a reporter, or a person who sends

reports of what occurs there. His reports, I understand, are supposed to be official. They are given in the newspapers under the heading: "The eyewitness reports" thus and so. I have here two reports of the eyewitness as to the recent fighting in the trenches in France or Flanders, and there are certain statements in these reports which I will take the responsibility of reading to the House, which I cannot read without grave disquiet. This is one of the eyewitnesses's reports. He speaks of certain events and he says:

> An insistent bombardment was continued by the enemy, and finally, about noon, all his remaining rifles being out of commission and his men exhausted, Captain Gwynne decided to retreat.

The eyewitness, reporting on another occasion, says:

> Waist-deep in mud, the few survivors of our garrison could offer little resistance. Hardly one of their rifles could be got to fire.

He says again:

> The lieutenant emptied his revolver at the Germans and seized a rifle, only to find that it jammed at the first shot. The rifles of his men, again and again reclaimed from the mud, only fired a shot or two before they also jammed.

These are reports of the fighting that has occurred within the last few days. I say that these words are very disquieting to me. I do not want to emphasize the point too strongly, but I say that, in view of statements such as these appearing in the reports of the eyewitness, coupled with information which I have received from soldiers who have served in the trenches, information that is corroborated by other members of the House, I desire to urge upon the attention of the Government the desirability of making such inquiry as to the efficiency of this rifle with which we have armed our soldiers as shall absolutely settle the question as to whether it is a suitable rifle for active service, or the most suitable rifle we can get for active service. There is no doubt about its qualities as a shooting rifle, but my information is that its mechanism is in some parts so delicate that it is more apt to get out of order than the Lee-Enfield. That is to say, owing to the difficult conditions of active warfare, where it cannot have that care and attention that it would have in an arsenal or under peace conditions, it is more apt to get out of order than is the Lee-Enfield rifle. If that is a fact, it is an unfortunate fact, and we should take steps to alter that condition. I appreciate the responsibility of the statement I make, but it is because it is of such tremendous importance that I dare to make it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: An inquiry was made into the Ross rifle last year, and I believe into the Lee-Enfield as well, after the jamming to which I have alluded first occurred. As a consequence of that inquiry, the chamber of the Lee-Enfield, as I am informed, and the chamber of the Ross rifle, were enlarged. I have already given the particulars of those changes. The Ross rifle is not used at the front now except with the enlarged chamber. I suppose it might be taken into consideration in connection with the Ross rifle, if my hon. friend desires to criticise it, that 100,000 of these rifles were ordered by the British Government in the early months of the war, and complaints have been made that they have not been delivered as fast as was expected and desired. I am not aware that there is any rifle in the world that might not jam or refuse to fire after it had been imbedded in mud or had fallen into deep mud in a trench. I should imagine, although I do not profess to be an expert in rifles, that there is nothing very extraordinary in that, nor do I imagine that the Lee-Enfield or any other rifle would be immune from difficulties of that kind. The Ross rifle may be superior in some respects—I believe it is—to the Lee-Enfield. It is quite possible that in some other respects it may not be as serviceable as that rifle. I am prepared neither to affirm not to deny as to these matters, because I do not know about them. Very likely if you got a number of experts to give you opinions about both rifles they would not entirely agree among themselves. It is probably true that of any two types of rifle that you select, one would have certain advantages, and the other rifle in comparison with it, certain other advantages. As my hon. friend says, the Ross rifle, for accurate long-distance shooting, is perhaps the best rifle in the world.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It may be equally true that the very qualities which gave it that pronounced advantage may be attended with a certain disadvantage under other conditions; I do not know, but one can readily see that that is possible. I believe it is true that the British soldiers who are very good shots and are employed for the purpose of long-distance shooting —sniping, as it is called—are very apt to

throw away their own rifle when they have a chance to pick up a Ross. On the other hand, I have heard, as no doubt my hon. friend has, that some of our own men sometimes throw away the Ross rifle when they can pick up a Lee-Enfield. An inquiry was made into the Ross rifle last year. The difficulty about the chamber was discovered. The jamming, as I understand it, was not entirely due to the chamber, but, to a certain extent, to the character of some ammunition that had been issued, and which I think is no longer being issued. With ammunition of a different character, and especially with that produced in Canada, I am informed that even before the chamber was enlarged there was not very much difficulty with jamming so far as the Ross rifle is concerned.

Mr. OLIVER: I would suggest that means be taken, not to hold a formal court, but to have the privates who come back to Canada from the front interviewed, not by an officer, but by some person to whom they would be willing to state the facts as they believed them to be. In that way the Government could satisfy itself as to the rifle. I do not think a Military Board is a good way of getting at what the soldier actually thinks of the rifle. He would not talk as freely when he was in the position of a witness or of a criminal in the dock as he would to some reliable person to whom he could give his opinion casually as to the rifle. In the multitude of expressions of opinion the Government would have a pretty fair basis to go upon as to the worth of the rifle. This is a terribly serious matter.

Mr. EDWARDS: How could the hon. gentleman depend upon the opinion of the soldier when, as he told us only a moment ago, the soldier does not know anything about the rifle? He was not trained to handle it, and did not even know one end from the other; that was his argument.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh, no.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. gentleman said that the soldier had not been properly trained in musketry, and did not understand anything about the rifle.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. EDWARDS: A man who does not know anything about the rifle is not the one whose opinion you should take, especially a man who does not know one end from the other. The hon. gentleman is absolutely inconsistent.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. gentleman has put words into my mouth that I never used, and ideas that I never expressed and have never held. I argued that the soldier had not a fair opportunity of becoming efficient in rifle shooting. I did not argue that he did not have every opportunity of becoming acquainted with the mechanism of the rifle. Surely the man who has been to the front knows what the rifle can do, and I am suggesting that his opinion be taken rather than that of some alleged expert. The man whose life has depended on the rifle is the man whose opinion I am willing to ask and depend upon.

Mr. TURRIFF: Perhaps the Acting Minister could give me some information, if not now the next time these Estimates are up, as to rentals of recruiting offices in the city of Ottawa. There are two recruiting offices, one on the corner of Sparks street and Elgin, and the other a little way down on Elgin street, within a stone's throw of each other. As only a few men join daily at each of these places I think one building would be enough. There is a third building used for the same purpose a little further down Sparks street. I should like to know what rental has been paid since the war started for all recruiting offices. Also how much it has cost the department to guard the canal at Cardinal, Iroquois and Morrisburg since the war started. In my opinion the cost has been unnecessarily heavy.

Mr. OLIVER: Would there be any objection to giving information as to the number of machine guns provided for each battalion in the field?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The establishment of machine guns has been greatly increased both in the British service and our own. To each brigade there is attached a certain number of lighter and a certain number of heavier machine guns. I could give my hon. friend the number privately. These guns are used for different purposes. I am rather more familiar with this question, for the reason that we had
11 p.m. to take into consideration recently a communication from the War Office with regard to the relative number of heavier and lighter guns in connection with our regiments and brigades?

Mr. OLIVER: Do the heavier guns use heavier ammunition than rifle ammunition?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is all the same ammunition, but the question depends upon the particular purpose for which the gun is used. One type of gun can be taken up and moved very quickly; the other is used in a different way and is usually placed where it will be in a permanent position for a certain period of time.

Mr. OLIVER: The Prime Minister, I see, does not desire to say how many guns are supplied to each battalion. I am going to ask the question: Have the battalions actually in the field been supplied with the full quota of machine guns, whatever that may be?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The deputy minister informs me, yes, absolutely so.

Mr. OLIVER: Have the battalions in training in Great Britain been supplied with their full quota of machine guns?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are supplied in Great Britain with a sufficient number for practice. Even if there should be the greatest abundance of machine guns, I am informed that they would not receive more than enough for practice while they are in training. They receive their full quota only when they go to the front.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the position of the battalions organized and in training in Canada in regard to the supply of machine guns?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The arrangement in Canada has been the same, that they are supplied with a sufficient number to enable training to be carried on.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the minister be good enough to say what number of machine guns for training were supplied to the 51st, the 63rd, and the 66th Battalions during the past winter?

Mr. CURRIE: I really think the hon. member should not ask that question, because the number of guns supplied to each army corps could be figured out.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think so. If the hon. gentleman will wait until I get the answer, I think he will find it has no bearing on that matter at all.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With regard to the battalions which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, they were all located where machine gun practice could not be carried on during the winter months.

Mr. OLIVER: The fact is that the three battalions were in Edmonton last winter, and when I saw them one of them had one machine gun and the other two had none. Therefore the machine gun sections of those battalions did not have a fair opportunity to become proficient in the use of the machine gun. Again I take the liberty of saying that I do not think that is a fair position to put our soldiers in.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Where were the battalions stationed?

Mr. OLIVER: The 51st Battalion was located in the drill hall, and the 63rd and the 66th were in the exhibition building at Edmonton.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed that machine-gun training would not be carried on under those conditions, but that the men, when they go into camp, will receive machine-gun training.

Mr. OLIVER: They were at the Sarcee camp last summer, and they did not have machine guns there to train with. The fact that one battalion at Edmonton should have a machine gun and the other two none rather breaks down the idea of machine-gun practice not being carried on in the winter.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Machine guns, like rifles, cannot be procured in a moment. Orders were given immediately after the war broke out, but you do not get delivery of machine guns within a few months after they are ordered, sometimes not for a year. The companies which have been manufacturing machine guns have been making pretty good deliveries. It might possibly be that during the period which my hon. friend mentioned there were not machine guns available.

Mr. OLIVER: There are at the present time five battalions being recruited. Some of them are up to strength and all of them are training. How many of those battaliens have machine guns to train with?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really could not say at the moment; I will get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: The battalions are the 138th, the 151st, the 202nd—the deputy minister will know the numbers. I just want to emphasize the point that I have urged to-night, that the men are not receiving the opportunity to become proficient that is an absolute necessity for their welfare and for ours.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not agree with that, if my hon. friend speaks of the period at which they go to the front. So far as I am informed, they do receive adequate training in machine gun practice before they go to the front. If they do not receive the whole of it in this country, they receive further training and instruction on the other side before they are sent to the front. I am quite confident that the system of inspection on the other side is sufficiently thorough to ensure efficiency before the men are sent to the trenches.

Mr. OLIVER: The 51st Battalion was recruited at Edmonton beginning in the fall of 1914. It was recruited to full strength some time in January or February of 1915. It went overseas in March of 1915. It was there for over a year, yet all the target practice that the battalion had is what I have stated at the Sarcee camp, and that battalion in the barracks at Edmonton was the fortunate possessor of the one machine gun that was at Edmonton for training purposes. I just wish to ask in regard to machine guns, if the Prime Minister does not object, as to the pattern of the machine gun that is used.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The two classes that are used are the Colt machine gun and the Lewis.

Mr. OLIVER: The Lewis machine gun, as I understand it, is the later and most approved pattern for military use. It is the one that is used, for instance, in aircraft. I would like to ask why the Colt is used instead of the Lewis.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They are used for different purposes. The one is a heavier gun that the other. I mentioned to my hon. friend a moment ago that we had a communication on the subject requiring a certain proportion of the heavier gun and a certain proportion of the lighter gun. I am not enough of a military expert to set forth an exposition of the particular reasons which have influenced this decision; it is enough for me that the military authorities, who are supposed to be competent, have fixed a certain proportion of each, and, unless we supply our men with that proportion, they will not be allowed to go to the front.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not very much of a military man myself, but this question of machine guns is very important, as is also the question of the efficiency of machine guns. My information is that the advantage of the Lewis machine gun is that it is air-cooled; the Maxim is water-cooled, and the Colt is not cooled at all. The advantage of the Lewis is that it can be fired continuously without becoming too hot. In the case of the Maxim, rapid firing heats the water and causes steam which exposes the position of the gun. The Lewis can be fired continuously without exposing the position. As the Prime Minister has said, it uses the same ammunition as the Colt, that is, the ordinary rifle ammunition. It is inconceivable to me, when there are two guns using the same ammunition, and one offering a tremendous advantage over the other, why the one having the least advantage is used at all. In the Colt gun, in order to overcome the heating, the gun is provided with one or two extra barrels and when one becomes heated it is unscrewed and taken off and the cool one put in its place, when the gun is ready again to fire. It appears to me that a gun that requires that exchange of barrels is tremendously handicapped in actual use as compared with one like the Lewis that will fire as long as the ammunition lasts. There does not appear to me any good reason for the use of the Colt gun in preference to the Lewis, unless it should be that a sufficient supply of the Lewis gun cannot be secured.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has the hon. gentleman any idea of how long it takes to change the barrel in the Colt gun?

Mr. OLIVER: It does not take very long, of course, but under battle conditions, the loss even of seconds may make a great difference in the result.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I can console my hon. friend as to the Colt gun in one respect, that is very creditable to the ingenuity of two of our Canadian officers at the front. The Colt gun has three barrels. When one becomes hot it is removed and another put in its place, which, in its turn, is replaced by the third, and by the time that is heated the first barrel is supposed to have cooled sufficiently to be used again. It used to take a minute and ten seconds under the old system, to make the change of barrels, and the change was made without protection to the man who made it. But two of our officers at Shorncliffe invented an improvement, which is very easily made, and with which, by means of what is called an interrupted screw, a principle applied in the big guns, the barrel can be changed in eight or ten seconds, and the man is pro-

tected while making it. After a review at Shorncliffe last year, these two officers asked Sir Archibald Murray, General Hughes and myself to look at the improvement they had made. Sir Archibald Murray, who understands these matters very well, said that the device was perfectly feasible and a great improvement. The Minister of Militia directed that all the guns should have this improvement made without delay. It was regarded as rather a quick piece of administration to arrange it in that way. One British officer who was present said it would take weeks, if not months, to accomplish that under the regular system in vogue in military affairs in most countries. The Colt gun is regarded as a suitable gun by the authorities of the War Office. It is used for brigade formation, while the Lewis gun is for company formation. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has observed the regiments that have passed through Ottawa. Recently I had the privilege of seeing one every day for six days. Each of these regiments has a machine gun section, made up, as I recollect it, of some sixteen to twenty-four men, who are thoroughly trained in the use of the gun. Besides, there is the brigade formation which is supplied, in respect of each brigade, with the Colt gun, a heavier gun than the other and used for more permanent positions. Whether that is right or wrong from a military standpoint I am not in a position to judge, but I do feel that I at least am not in a position to overrule the authorities of the War Office on that subject.

Mr. MACDONALD: I desire to ask the Prime Minister with regard to a case I mentioned the other night, of Private Chapman of the 106th Battalion, at Trenton, Nova Scotia. I received a letter from a sergeant, wounded and invalided home, who said that the treatment accorded this man was very bad. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman, if he has the papers, will show them to me.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) made some inquiry into a similar case. He asked me to postpone the discussion of it until he was here. There is no reason, however, why I should not give certain information in the meantime. The memorandum handed to me is as follows:

As I have already informed you, the Adjutant General has given direct instructions to stop this kind of punishment. Although there is nothing in our Canadian regulations dealing with the subject matter, the British regulations entitled "Manual of Military Law" page 721, deals with field punishment. Sub paragraph (d) of paragraph (a) reads: "When in irons a soldier may be attached for a period or periods not exceeding two hours of any one day to a fixed object, but he must not be so attached during more than three of any four consecutive days, nor during more than twenty-one days in all." Our officers commanding have applied this regulation notwithstanding the fact that it is no more applied in the British army. They have done it through ignorance and over zeal. The Adjutant General has given instructions that all kinds of field punishment, excepting detention, are not to be applied for the future. Therefore, I hope there will be no further recurrence of such cases.

There is in the memorandum some information with regard to particular cases, showing that there was very great insubordination. There are also reports of the medical officers which show that there was no physical injury.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would the Prime Minister place the papers on the Table so that I may look at them?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will do so. I agree entirely with the view expressed that punishment of that kind, which is not only unusual but might be regarded as cruel, should not be applied in our expeditionary force. I am sure the Ajutant General will see to it, as he has promised, that nothing of that kind shall occur in the future.

Mr. MACDONALD: I think that some attention should be paid to the officers who undertake to apply that kind of punishment.

Mr. CURRIE: As an officer I deprecate very much the discussion of matters of this kind in the House. It is subversive to discipline. In England, according to the King's regulations, there are two kinds of field punishment: Field punishment No. 1 and field punishment No. 2. Field punishment No. 1 is the form of punishment that has been administered to this man. When a soldier is insubordinate at the front he can be tied up; that is the practice in all wars; it was the practice in South Africa. In England they have withdrawn field punishment No. 1, because they have there what they call detention prisons, like that at Gosport. When a man is insubordinate they send him to Gosport for a period where he is put through a course of sprouts. When he goes back to his regiment he is very much subdued and a very good soldier. We have no detention prisons in Canada. Although 99 per cent of the men that come

into our regiments are the very best in the world, sometimes magistrates or friends of criminals get them released from prison and they enter our army.

Mr. HUGHES: Not in Canada?

Mr. CURRIE: Yes. Very often after a man has been before a commanding officer a number of times, having been in the habit of fiercely attacking his comrades, disobeying regulations and acting like a wild beast, it is discovered, perhaps, that he has parole papers in his possession, that he has been a very vicious criminal and that his record here or in the United States is such that they do not want him in the country. The fact that only two cases of the kind referred to have been mentioned as occurring in Canada, speaks very well of the Canadian officers and the discipline that they are enforcing, especially when you consider the number of soldiers who are in training. Evidently there is the feeling that any one of them can write to a member and claim that he was vilely used, and that sort of thing. I feel satisfied that if the facts in this case were gone into it would be found that the men got a great deal less than they would have got in a civil court, and for that reason I think that possibly the less said about those things the better. It is not so very many years since they used to have flogging in the Army. If it is at all possible to get along with a man without punishing him, I do not think that a single officer in the Canadian Militia would tie him up, but if he gets abusive and threatens to kill his comrades, being in a state of madness, perhaps, from drink, you must do something with him. You must tie him up in some way, and you are only allowed to tie him up to a fixed object. I have seen men break through irons four or five times in succession. I have seen men so powerfully built that they could break handcuffs as if they were made of paper. You must do something with these men. The General in command has power to deal with all these questions, and if complaint is made to the divisional officer I feel quite satisfied that if the officers have gone beyond their duty they will be cashiered or court-martialled, and there would not be necessity for bringing the matter before the House.

Mr. MACDONALD: The reason why I brought this matter to the attention of the committee was a desire to prevent injury to recruiting in the locality. The incident to which I refer occurred in a company which was guarding one of the munition works, where, rightly or wrongly, the men engaged in the work interfered with what they thought was excessive punishment. The reason why I mention the matter again is because I have received a letter to-day from a sergeant who had been at the front and who, after distinguishing himself there, had returned home and was engaged in work in a munition factory. This man considered the punishment as improper. While there is a good deal in what my hon. friend not captiously take up complaints of privates against their commanding officers, yet says, that members of the House should there is a phase of the question that he forgets, and it is this: nothing will stop recruiting among the men whom you want to get into the forces like a feeling in the community that the treatment of the men has been improper or unduly severe.

Mr. CURRIE: Was this man a soldier or a worker in the munition shops?

Mr. MACDONALD: He was a soldier.

Mr. CURRIE: He may have been smoking or something like that.

Mr. MACDONALD: All I want to do is to get the official report of the matter. I am not condemning the Government or the department in connection with the matter; the memorandum which the Prime Minister has read shows what the practices are in this regard. The incident, however, has created a good deal of excitement in the locality, and if the officer in charge committed any breach of authority, I think it would be wise to see that it is recognized by the department. I am instructed—this is an evidence of the local feeling that has arisen—that the soldiers are not permitted to go into the grocery store of a former mayor of the town, a man named J. B. Strickland, who was interested in the matter. I would like the department to inquire into that, because this is a rather summary course to take in respect to a citizen who, rightly or wrongly, was interested in what some people thought the improper punishment to which these men were subjected.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Has my hon. friend seen the statement which the soldier made?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, I saw that. I received that to-day from another source. As I have said, I received also a letter from Sergeant Grant, who has returned

from the front and who is working in the munition works, who complains about the severity of the punishment. I am aware that the claim is that the soldier had a bad record.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was not with regard to the character of the punishment. According to the Eastern Chronicle, an investigation was held at which the mayor of Trenton was present, as well as the mayor of New Glasgow, and representatives of local newspapers. The report says:

The soldier was questioned regarding the nature of the punishment given him and stood up against the wall showing the way in which he was fastened. He gave the following statement which he signed:

Statement No. 715631, Private W. P. Chapman, Composite Company, 106th Battalion.

I left the barracks at Trenton without leave at 6 a.m. on the 6th April, 1916. I did not return until 10 p.m., 17th April, 1916. At the time I went absent I was under open arrest (not allowed to leave quarters). On the morning of 18th April I came before Captain Williams on these charges: 1. Absent without leave from 6 a.m., 6th April until 10 p.m. 17th April; 2, breaking barracks while under open arrest. I was awarded twelve days' detention with No. 1 field punishment. At 11 a.m. I started my first hour's field punishment which consisted of having my wrists handcuffed to a plank five feet ten inches from the ground allowing some leeway in which to ease myself. My feet were firm on the ground. I was released in one hour. I received no bodily injury whatever, and, with the exception of the tired feeling in my arms felt none the worse for the punishment. I further state this to be my sixth offence against military discipline since coming to Trenton on the 14, 15th March, 1916. The punishment was remitted that afternoon, one hour's punishment being all that I did.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: The other day I referred to the fact that there were in Canada officers who were over military age, and who, under no circumstances, would be accepted for service at the front, who did not themselves expect to go, and whom nobody expected to go, and I said that some of such men were members of Parliament. Needless to say, my remarks did not refer in any way to members of Parliament or others who have gone to the front, who were of military age or otherwise qualified to go, or who expected to go. I referred only to the class of men to which I have already alluded, namely, those who did not expect to go and could not, by reason of age or any other cause. The acting minister, in referring to my remarks, said that such men might do useful work in Canada by recruiting or getting battalions together, and using their influence as members or as prominent citizens for military purposes. I think the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Graham) made some remarks of a somewhat similar character. My judgment is that the public man or prominent citizen who declines to do anything he can do in the way of recruiting or anything else to help the cause unless he is appointed an officer and put on the pay-roll, is not worthy of citizenship in Canada, and I do not think that the taxpayers of this country should be called upon to provide such men with military pay. I believe that the man who is not willing to make that sacrifice and to do anything he can along that line is the least qualified man for such purposes, not referring in any way to some men who happen to be members of Parliament and who have the qualifications to be officers. Such men should not be debarred from being officers, and they are entitled to their pay as officers and their indemnity as members. I think that 99 per cent of the people of this country will agree with the view I have expressed.

Militia and Defence—clothing, $800,000.

Mr. OLIVER: There are other matters in connection with the military service that should be discussed possibly at some length. Would the minister object to having some items stand?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If we allowed one item to stand there would be no objection to discussing any matter relating to the Militia on that one item, as we have been doing all evening. Then, of course, there are supplementaries. The explanation of this item is as follows: It is to provide the Militia, both permanent and non-permanent, with clothing and necessaries. No vote was taken for 1915-16, the current year, and consequently provision for 1916-17 is all the more necessary. The Estimate of the Quartermaster General, which I have under my hand, shows a possible total of over $1,000,000 required, but we are asking for only $800,000. Possibly some of this vote will be used for the reserve militia, to which my hon. friend from Edmonton has called attention this evening, and whom we would be very glad to furnish with uniforms if it should prove practicable to do so.

Mr. HUGHES: When the volunteers are provided with military clothing, what is done with their civilian clothing and their personal effects?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They remain in the ownership and at the disposition of the soldier

Royal Military College, $160,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES: A few days ago I referred to the fact that the advertisement calling for students for the military college at Kingston was not given to some papers that happened to be Liberal.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And some that happened to be Conservative too.

Mr. HUGHES: The acting minister gave as the reason, that there were some Conservative papers that were not allowed to publish it either. The inference I drew was that because all the Conservative papers did not get this advertisement, no Liberal paper would get it. The only paper in the province of Prince Edward Island that desired to have publication of this notice did not receive it, while several other papers on the Conservative side did publish it. It would appear to be an application of the party patronage system which the acting minister deprecates.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I gave the information as it was given to me, that the number of papers was limited and that several Conservative papers which desired to publish it were refused, and doubtless several Liberal newspapers.

Mr. HUGHES: Is the inference I draw correct, that because the Conservative papers are not publishing it the Liberal papers will not be allowed to publish it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suppose we can all draw any inference we see fit. My hon. friends' inference is so complex in its character that I hardly grasp it.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think it will be difficult to grasp.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir ROBERT BORDEN, the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m. Friday.

Saturday, May 6, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

ADVANCES BY SHELL COMMITTEE.

Mr. PARDEE:

Were any advances made by the Shell Committee to any persons or firms in Canada, to enable them to start manufacturing either shells or fuses? If so, what persons or firms?

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Government have no information with regard to the matter mentioned in this question.

DR. A. MACKENZIE FORBES.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What rank in the militia of Canada does Dr. A. Mackenzie Forbes, of Montreal, hold?
2. What are his duties and his remuneration?
3. What services did he perform overseas, if any?
4. What were the circumstances under which he returned to Canada, what representations were made to the Militia Department to that end, and by whom?
5. Is it the intention of the Department of Militia to again utilize his services overseas?
6. What allowance, if any, is being made to his family, wife and children, respectively?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. Lieut.-Colonel in the Canadian Army Medical Corps.

2. The officer is employed as medical officer in charge of troops, Montreal General Hospital, while he is in Canada, and is to be employed on special surgical duties, particularly in regard to orthopedic cases which may be inmates of convalescent homes. Regimental pay, $4; field pay, $1; subsistence allowance, $1.50.

3. The services of his office.

4. Returned for service in Canada.

5. The Militia Department will be only too glad, at any time, to utilize the services of this officer in the field.

6. Separation allowance, $50 per month to his wife.

WAR SUPPLIES—HORSES, HAY AND OATS.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Who were the men engaged under Lt.-Col. A. D. McRae to purchase horses, hay and oats for the Militia Department in the province of Alberta?
2. What remuneration did they receive?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. For horses:

Purchasers: Capt. J. J. Fry, Mr. L. S. Manzer, Mr. Bernard Michell, Mr. P. G. Pilkie, Mr. E. J. Legg, Mr. W. R. Lowes, Mr. R. F. Bevan.

Veterinary inspectors: Dr. J. C. Smith, Dr. Robt. Blyth, Dr. F. A. McEwan, Dr. E. G. Cunningham, Dr. P. K. Walters.

No appointment was made for the purchase of hay and oats in Alberta.

2. Each of the above gentlemen received $10 per diem and actual expenses.

FREIGHT EXPORTED THROUGH ST. JOHN.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many tons of freight were exported through the port of St. John during the calendar year 1915, to the British islands, the British possessions, and to foreign countries respectively?

2. What are the corresponding figures concerning the imports through said port?

Mr. REID:

No information is obtainable for the calendar year 1915. According to shipping returns to Customs, the figures for the fiscal year ended 31st March, 1916, are as follows:

	Tons Weight.	Tons Measurement.
Vessels arrived—		
Great Britain..	46,814	49,555
British possessions. ..	60,130	19,457
Other countries	98,622	10,725
Vessels departed—		
Great Britain..	368,391	185,451
British possessions. ..	25,161	35,677
Other countries	345,155	165,954

PROPOSED FOREST RESERVE IN SPIRIT RIVER DISTRICT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: The Minister of the Interior is not here, but I desire to ask for information, and no doubt the minister will be good enough to give it later. I have received a somewhat lengthy night lettergram from the secretary of the Spirit River Board of Trade protesting against the prospective setting apart of a forest reserve in that vicinity, and asserting on what is claimed to be good authority that at least 50 per cent of the land is clear, the soil good, good water available, and the balance of the land very light scrub. It is said that several whole sections can be ploughed without any previous preparation and that there is no muskeg. The land is in township 79-81, ranges 7-11 inclusive. I shall be glad if the hon. minister will say whether or not it is the intention to establish a forest reserve in that section of the country.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES BY VOLUNTEERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: During the consideration of the Orders in Council of the Department of the Interior that took place in the House some days ago, in discussing a certain order regarding homestead entry by volunteers, the Minister of the Interior spoke as follows:

With regard to the protection of the homesteading rights of those who have enlisted, I think the hon. gentleman has probably misinterpreted the Order in Council. He states that we are giving practically the same protection to the soldier who has made his homestead entry after enlistment as we are giving to the man who was the owner of a homestead prior to enlistment. But there is a difference in our treatment of these two men. The man who had a homestead prior to enlistment has not only protection in so far as not allowing cancellation proceedings to be instituted, but he is also allowed to count as time of residence on his homestead the time that he is serving his country at the front. In the case of the volunteer who makes a homestead entry after enlistment, he is not allowed to count his time but he is protected from cancellation.

I find in the Manitoba Free Press of May 3, under the heading "Homestead for Every Soldier," an article which copies an announcement said to have been made by the Department of Militia with regard to this particular matter. The Militia Department apparently holds an entirely different view from that held by the Minister of the Interior, and it is this difference of view that I desire to bring to the attention of the House with a view to having the two divergent views harmonized; otherwise there will be misunderstanding and unfortunate consequences. I shall not read the whole article, but the important part is as follows:

The scope of the Act in the foregoing particulars has been enlarged to embrace volunteers who may, subsequent to the date of enlistment, enter for a homestead of Dominion lands. By the operation of the new regulation the Minister of the Interior is empowered to consider the latter class of soldier settlers in the same way as the Act provides for the bona fide settler, who, on the outbreak of hostilities, enlisted for active service.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Who makes the statement?

Mr. OLIVER: The newspaper credits it to new regulations of the Militia Department. I will read what it says:

The new regulations affecting this matter are contained in Militia orders issued at Ottawa.

I think it is very desirable that the House should be informed as to the divergent views expressed, and, whatever is the intention, certainly it should be understood distinctly from the beginning.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not able to give my hon. friend any information at the moment, in the absence of the Minister of the Interior. It is my recollection that more than one Order in Council has been passed on the subject. Possibly the misunderstanding has arisen from an oversight

on the part of one or the other of these departments with regard to amendments which may have been made.

WAR LOAN—$250,000,000.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Acting Minister of Militia and Defence) moved the second reading of Bill No. 97, for granting to His Majesty aid for Military and Naval Defence.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT: (Laprairie-Napierville) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries, I wish once more to record a protest against this mad policy, which is bound to bring ruin to the country. True it is that I stand alone in this House in the position I am taking, but I count more sympathizers outside this House than within its precincts, and I shall name one of them especially: he is Baron Shaughnessy. At a meeting of the manufacturers of the Montreal district, held only a few months ago at the Montreal Board of Trade, speaking in the presence of General Sir Sam Hughes, the Baron stated that the Government ought, without delay, to put a stop to recruiting, because, he said, we already have 135,000 men under arms, and it will take twelve to fifteen months before those soldiers are sent overseas. He said, furthermore, that in discontinuing now such recruiting campaigns a monthly expenditure of five to six millions would be saved to Canada. He predicted that the economical situation would become more and more tense; that this country will soon have no more hands to till the land. In proof of his argument, he stated, in the presence of the Minister of Militia that the western farmers had called upon him to bring them, if possible, 10,000 men for sowing time.

During the last twenty-one months, Mr. Speaker, the Government has sent overseas —I mean to France and Belgium—65,000 soldiers. More than 70,000 are in training camps in England, while the rest are being trained in Canadian camps. If the Government continues the methods they have followed to this day for sending soldiers overseas, and if they insist on carrying through a levy of 500,000 troops, I find, by an easy computation, that it will take them over ten years to carry 500,000 men to the front.

I fail to see, taking the situation such as it is, why the Government should drag the people of this country into bankruptcy against its wish by persevering in a policy of unnecessary enlistment. So far as I am concerned, any discussion on this subject would be wasted time; to me the question is as clear as crystal. If it has been possible for France to hold more than 400 miles of trenches with her 39 millions of inhabitants, I wish to know how it is that England, with a greater interest than ours in this war, cannot take care of more than 40 miles of trenches, when her population is 49 millions.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) With my hon. friend's leave, I wish to state that the British army is now taking care, not of 35 to 40 miles of trenches, but of a good deal over 100 miles. My hon. friend is mistaken, because the British line now extends over 100 miles.

Mr. LANCTOT: (Translation.) The minister who has just interrupted me has his own source of information, which I feel not like questioning; but I have my own information, and I hope he will not question it either.

But I must say that only lately the British army extended over only 35 miles, and they have now taken care of five more miles. I do not care to name the gentleman who has given me this information, because he had no authority to do so. But granted that the British line had 100 miles of trenches to defend, if only one-tenth of the truth has been given out by newspapers since the beginning of this war, when they stated that Britain had from three to four millions of soldiers under arms, I fail to see where they have been sent. If little France, with its population of 39 millions, as I have stated, could take charge of 400 miles of trenches, Britain, with the help of its dominions, such as Australia, Canada and New Zealand, should at least be able to take care of her 100 miles of trenches, which is stated by the Postmaster General as the extent of her line, although I beg to differ with him on that score, as I claim it is at the utmost 40 miles. But in any case that is not the point I wish to make.

The other day, in this House, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) stated that we should not let our thoughts wander from the war. It seems as if his mind was filled with the idea and he will not speak of anything else. The hon. member might take a trip overseas and get a line on what is being done in England. He then could give good advice to our British friends, who have more dissensions to contend with than

we have, and he might show them how to carry on their business better than it is carried on to-day.

I wish to quote, as agreeing with what I have to say, the words of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) who spoke in this House in the afternoon of the 22nd of February last, while I spoke that same evening. He was congratulating the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and the Liberal party for refraining from any party politics in Canada, while he stated the practice was current in Britain. If the hon. member for Red Deer is horrified at what is taking place in this House, I should advise him, as he has been in Canada only a few years from the Old Country, to take a trip to Britain to find out what is going on and endeavour to suggest to the British Government some means of recruiting soldiers to fight in the trenches of France and Belgium.

Since the outbreak of the war we have been following in the footsteps of the old countries of Europe, of countries which have accumulated wealth for ages, while the truth is that we are mere beggars compared with European nations. Every dollar required to foot our war bill we have to borrow, while Britain has money loaned in all parts of the world. But we, the scions of Britain, in our need, we are going to borrow this year $300,000,000 to 400,000,000 to carry on the war and cover the deficit in our ordinary and special expenditures.

What is our daily war expenditure in Canada? Only a few weeks ago the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) enquired from the Minister of Finance what we were spending monthly for war purposes. The reply was that the expenses reached from ten to eleven millions, or $300,000 to $400,000 per day.

Now, referring to the Canada Gazette of the 15th of April last, I find that the expenditure for March totals more than twice the amount stated in this House by the Minister of Finance. For that one month it reached over $25,000,000. So that if we keep on spending as lavishly and recruiting day after day, as has been done since the opening of hostilities, of course we must expect the expenses to keep on the increase.

At that rate, according to my computation, the war expenses for the year will total $300,000,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, our obligations after the war are not confined to those figures. The Minister of Finance has stated that after the war we shall have to make adjustments for ammunition, supplies and clothing; well, what about our share of the cost? Will it be $100,000,000 or $200,000,000? I cannot tell. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to judge from the prices paid for shells and fuses, articles that come high both in Canada and in the United States, when this Government is the purchaser, it must be admitted that our share of the expenses will be large. Furthermore, the time will come when we shall have to provide for many other things in Canada, such as our railways for instance, for which even at this session we have been asked to provide.

I forgot to state that the expenditure for the country's management, only the ordinary and special accounts, will reach $217,000,000; the war account will total up to $300,000,000, or an aggregate expenditure of 517 millions for a population of 7½ millions of people and a revenue of $170,000,000. There will at that rate be a deficit in the expense account of $330,000,000 over revenue, or $65 to $70 per unit of population.

Yet the press will go on clamouring that our duty is to run to the rescue of the Empire. I am fully disposed, indeed, to save the Empire, I have no objection whatever to run to her rescue, but the Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) ought not to be taken at his word when he advised last year the people of Manitoba to drive the country into bankruptcy against the wish of its citizens; yet I think this Government has followed very closely the Solicitor General's advice. However, Mr. Speaker, when you see that the people are thus badly misinformed, when public opinion is perverted by the public press here as well as in England and all over, the day is coming when a reaction will set in, and the same people who have been shamefully deceived by the politicians of 1915, 1916 and 1917, will wreak a terrible vengeance on its deceivers.

As a member of this House, I want to keep my electors posted on what is going on here and in that connection I must say that over in England there is a man I admire more than all other public men of Britain or of any country in the world. I mean Lloyd-George who again and again in the British Commons, has disclosed what Great Britain has done and what she has failed to do. I admit in passing that the British navy has done a great deal; but, as stated by Lloyd-George, it must be conceded that Great Britain has scarcely done anything on land. In a notable speech in the

House of Commons, the British minister inquired of his colleagues what part the British had taken in the struggle? France, said he, has been fighting for the past 18 months against one half of the German host. Russia with practically no arms and no munitions has held her own against the other half of the German enemy, against the whole Austrian army, the Bulgarians and the Turks. And what have we done? Nothing. Such are his very words.

Those are the words of a statesman. A statesman should always tell his people the truth. Why, in this country should we not tell the people that the policy which has been adopted by this Parliament will be disastrous, and can be carried out only by increased taxation on revenue and property. What good purpose is served by the newspapers spreading the hope of better times after the war? Who can claim that now, when we know that after the war our purchasing power will be cut down by a million and a half per day so as to keep our soldiers in the cities, what doing? I would rather not speak of it in this House. I am really shocked when I see what is going on here and in Montreal. A large number of these young men go from one saloon to another and get drunk. It is perfectly well known that the training the soldiers get here is of no value whatever to them, that when they get to England, they have to go through their training all over again. If such be the case, why keep on recruiting? Why should these young men from the country be kept in the cities and get the habit of drink and immorality. I say it is high time to put a stop to that. If in six or twelve months, the soldiers that have already enlisted must be sent overseas; if it is hoped that by shipping to the front the few thousand soldiers which are being trained, the Empire will be saved, so much the better; it ought to be done and I shall not object. But there is as yet no evidence that your idea is the Empire's safety. Why do you not acknowledge, as men should do who speak their minds, that your purpose in recruiting is to promote jingoism pure and simple.

In my constituency, I tell you that not five per cent of the people approve of your present policy. Then go into the rural districts throughout the country and you will realize that your system of enlistment is not in the least favoured by the nation at large. I must state to the House that I am now speaking for myself only, and that when anybody rises to speak on this question on behalf of the Liberal party, he does not express my opinion. My position in this matter is my own.

I do not wish to delay the House. As I have stated, the Government will have to take over the railways. The Canadian Northern has an indebtedness of $420,000,000, besides loans in practically all the banks of the country. We must also operate the National Transcontinental, which will increase our burden by $700,000,000. The public debt, in round numbers, is to-day $920,000,000, and with the expected deficit of $300,000,000 by the 31st of March, 1917, it will reach $2,000,000,000. And to what purpose? What have we to show for that inordinate expenditure, over which the people have no control? Absolutely nothing. We have sent our soldiers into the trenches to have them butchered, while at the beginning of the war we could not provide them with rifles and ammunition. Why keep to that policy? Within the current year we shall have to pay $100,000,000 in interest. Furthermore, we shall have to provide pensions for the invalids, the widows and the orphans, likely amounting to $30,000,000 or $40,000,000. We shall also have to provide for the different commissions which this Government is creating every day out of a revenue which will decrease after the war by several millions on account of the lowering of the country's purchasing power, as I explained a while ago.

I say, then, that conditions after the war will not be as rosy in this country as editors would have us believe.

I stated already that, in so far as I was concerned, I want to put these facts and the true situation, as I understand it, before the people of this country, and more especially of my county. My purpose is not to court popularity; I do it from a sense of duty, prompted by my conscience, because the people have been misinformed, and because the politicians who owe their election to their stand against all military expenditure, against the naval proposals, and against all contributions to Imperial defence, ought to have joined me in my protest in this House when I say to the Government: If you want to go into such follies first get the people's assent to them.

Mr. Speaker, as I have alluded to the navy and to dreadnoughts, I will say that I have often listened to the right hon. Prime Minister as he spoke to us of dreadnoughts and of the Senate's refusal—the naughty Senate—to vote for the famous

Bill to contribute three dreadnoughts to the Imperial defence. Much was said of the German menace. But the Prime Minister went to Great Britain; why, then, did he not warn the British Government of how imminent was the German menace and not urge them to increased preparedness?

If Great Britain was not ready when the war broke out, why should Canada have been in greater readiness? One must use his common sense.

I congratulate the Senate for having saved to the country the cost at least of the three dreadnoughts. Since the English fleet is keeping the German fleet bottled up, of what advantage would it be for Great Britain to have three more dreadnoughts in the North sea, or elsewhere?

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up the time of the House any further. I have already discussed the question, and I shall do so every time it comes before the House in the same spirit as I speak of it at home. I intend objecting as strongly as I know how against that disastrous policy, and if anyone saw fit to bring in an amendment to reduce that amount by 100 millions I should vote for it.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 6—charged to Consolidated Revenue Fund:

Mr. TURRIFF: Is it open to discuss war matters at this stage?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Certainly, my hon. friend can discuss anything he thinks desirable.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is one point I would like to bring up. The country is spending a lot of money on training young officers, and I saw it stated the other day by a colonel in charge of a regiment in the West, I think, that there were enough young officers now training, to whom the Government had not been able to give positions, to man at least two battalions. That would mean 2,000 men who had qualified for commissions, but to whom there were no commissions to give. The acting minister stated last night, I think, that, as far as possible, it was the intention, and I think rightly, in granting commissions in future to give them to men who had served at the front and in the ranks. It would seem to me that something ought to be done either to stop the expenditure in training young officers, when we have so many that we cannot use, or to see that the services of those young officers are utilized. The Government have expended a considerable amount of money on training officers, and if it be true that there are at least 2,000 of them who cannot be used, something should be done. If they cannot be used as officers, why can they not go to the front as privates or as non-commissioned officers? I know numbers of them have been qualified for over a year, and have been waiting to go to the front, but they have not gone, and apparently are not going. It looks to me as if many of those officers did not want to go as privates, and so the country is going to lose their services altogether. I do not suppose that it is altogether their fault. It is quite natural that a young man should want to go as an officer if he can secure a position, but if there are no positions to give, something ought to be done, either to shut off the expense of training more officers, or to see that those who have qualified give their services to the country in some capacity.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think that the spirit which my hon. friend seems to have found is one that prevails to any extent. On the contrary, it has been the experience of the Department of Militia and Defence that men have been willing to waive their rank and go to the front in a lower rank.

Mr. TURRIFF: In some cases, yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: More than that, there have been many cases where men holding commissions and rank in the Militia have put them to one side and gone to the front as privates; so that any such aspersion as my hon. friend seems to be inclined to pass upon the young men of the country is altogether unfounded and unwarranted. The experience of the department is that any young man who desires to take a course as an officer will certainly not be the worse for that if he does go to the front. Further than that, the regulations of the department are that in all the training schools throughout Canada the men who shall have precedence are the men who have first volunteered for service overseas. The Canadian force of 300,000 requires, I think, about 10,000 officers. These young men are being trained in schools which are kept up for that purpose, and up to the present we have not found any detrimental results from keeping these schools open. The deputy minister informs me that while the young men are training in these schools,

they receive only the remuneration of ordinary privates.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not think that the Prime Minister is justified in the tone of criticism which he has adopted towards me for bringing up this matter. I got the information from one of his own officers, and it was published broadcast throughout the country that there were over 2,000 of those men who could not be used as officers. I do not see any harm in pointing out a matter like that to the department. If this officer has not given proper information to the country, that is not my fault.

Mr. MARCIL: I have already had an opportunity during the present session of putting a question to the Prime Minister regarding recruiting. Canadians generally are very anxious to give to the Emipre all the assistance possible in this great war, but when the announcement was made by the Prime Minister that 500,000 men would be recruited, compulsory service had not been adopted in England. Now that the conditions in England have changed, I would ask whether he thinks it will be necessary to go to the full extent of recruiting 500,000 Canadians. We have been told by some very reliable authorities that this could only be done by seriously affecting the economic services of the country, and we can all realize, with our limited population, what 500,000 men leaving the country would mean. With the conditions now changed in England, and, in view of the new legislation adopted there, does the right hon. gentleman think it would be still necessary to recruit 500,000 Canadians?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What my hon. friend suggests, I understand, is that because Great Britain is proposing to do more, we ought to take into consideration the desirability of doing less than we at first proposed. We have not taken that into consideration, and we do not intend to depart from the announcement that was made on the first day of January.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Post Office—to pay railway mail clerks for extra services at the ports of Quebec and Halifax in checking incoming British mails, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $372.64.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: What does this comprise?

Mr. CASGRAIN: This item has been in the Estimates for some years past, and is to provide for the payment of amounts varying from $1.38 to $10, to about thirty post office employees for extra services in connection with the handling of the mails at Rimouski and Halifax. These men are out in all kinds of weather, and it is thought only fair to give them this extra small remuneration.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the summer, when the steamers arrive at Rimouski, does the department still send the mails out by train concurrently both east and west?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I believe that is so, but I am not quite sure. I will let my hon. friend know on Monday.

Mr. MARCIL: My attention has been called to the possibility of a change being made by the department in the design of the three-cent stamp. It is very difficult for any one, especially a short-sighted person, to distinguish between the two and the three-cent stamp. The three-cent stamp looks just the same as the two except for a mark on it increasing the value of the stamp by one cent. The bank teller where I do my little business, tells me that the majority of his customers put a three-cent stamp on a cheque when, of course, only a two-cent stamp is required; which shows that it is not easy to distinguish between the two. Has the minister considered the advisability of having the three-cent stamp of a different colour?

Mr. CASGRAIN: This matter has received the attention of the department, and we have instructed the contractor to make the stamp of another colour.

Post Office—to provide for the payment of one year's salary to the widow of John Linahen, railway mail clerk, Montreal district, who died on the 22nd March, 1914, from pneumonia, which he contracted while on duty, $800.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the explanation of this?

Mr. CASGRAIN: On the 23rd of February, 1914, John Linahen was asked to go out on a special postal car with a large quantity of mail matter that had been left over at Bonaventure station, Montreal, on account of a storm. The door of this car would not close on account of the ice, and Linahen protested against the state of the car, but finally consented to go. He caught

a chill while on the car and contracted pneumonia, of which he died a short time afterwards. As he had contracted this while on duty the department thought it only right to grant a compassionate allowance to his widow.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not object to his widow receiving a compassionate allowance, but I think my hon. friend, who is a good lawyer, will agree with me that an action could be brought against the company. The railway company provides the mail cars, and has to keep them heated and in a proper condition. As a lawyer, who was in practice some years ago, I would venture the opinion very modestly that the widow has a claim against the company, but not against the department.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Strictly speaking, that may be so. A case similar to this occurred last year. This is what the officers of the department say on Linahen's case:

> There was no heat in this car. The doors could not be closed on account of ice on the floor. The steam coils were inoperative on account of the cold, and it was three or four hours after the train started before it was possible to get the door closed.

It may be true that technically the widow has a claim against the railway company, but I doubt very much whether she would be able to recover, or whether it would pay the Government to take action against the company. There was no fault on the man's part, and I think we are only doing what is right in granting his widow this allowance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no objection at all to the allowance being granted, for the case seems to be a deserving one. But I see in these Estimates half a dozen, if not a full dozen, cases of a similar nature. All these may be meritorious, but I never saw the Estimates so loaded up as they are this year with items of this character. Is there any rule followed by the Government as to granting gratuities? The country is, of course, disposed to deal generously with public servants who lose their health or their life in the service, but there ought to be some rule in cases of this kind, and I would particularly call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to this matter, because he was very severe on this point in times gone by.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My right hon. friend will remember that many of these items are items which we thought it only proper to include in the Estimates by reason of some of our public servants having lost their lives in the fire at the Parliament buildings. The Government gave very careful consideration to these cases, and on the whole we thought that the slight measure of assistance to their families which we proposed would commend itself not only to the members of the House, but to the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The circumstances to which my right hon. friend has alluded, of the death of certain officers of the House in the unfortunate fire which took place at the Parliament buildings, only emphasizes the need of a universal rule in cases of this kind. These men lost their lives under very dramatic circumstances, and, so far as it goes, nobody objects to the provision which has been made for granting their families some compensation. But other gratuities are provided in the Estimates, and these cases, though not so dramatic, may be just as deserving. In the new Supplementary Estimates, which we have not yet considered, and which were laid on the Table only a few days ago, I see the following:

3 p.m.

> Gratuity to the widow of the late J. J. Brennan accidentally killed by the elevator at Postal Station "H" Montreal, $1,000; Gratuity to the widow of the late H. Bélanger who was killed while at work at Lake Timiskaming dam, $1,000: Gratuity to John Sloan who was seriously injured while at work at Lake Timiskaming dam, $1,000; Gratuity to Onésime Chayer who was seriously injured while at work at Lake Timiskaming dam, $500; Gratuity to the widow of the late William Dunmore, engineer, Vancouver examining warehouse, accidentally killed by the passenger elevator, September 3, 1915, $1,000; Gratuity to the widow of the late J. E. Bussières, accidentally killed by the elevator at the Custom House, Quebec, $4,000.

I do not criticise this item. The gratuities may be well deserved as the servants may have lost their lives or been injured under circumstances which entitled them to the bounty of the Crown. I would like to know, however, if there is a system, or if each case is dealt with arbitrarily.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN. The very considerations which my right hon. friend has urged—and the force of which I do not deny—were considered by the Government, and the Minister of Justice was asked some weeks ago to investigate the Compensation Acts in the different provinces of Canada, to ascertain whether or not by the application of those Acts in the various pro-

vinces, some principle might be arrived at upon which the Government could work. I quite agree that we should act, not arbitrarily, but upon some principle, and I understand the Minister of Justice will make a report as to what may be gathered from the various provincial Compensation Acts, which would be of assistance to us in that way. The difficulty I think has been that those Compensation Acts differ rather widely from each other in their provisions, and it has not been the easiest task to arrive at a working principle which could be made applicable in all cases. For example, if we adopt the scale fixed in one province, we might find that somewhat in excess of or very much less than the scale adopted in another province. The question has been whether we should apply in each province the provisions of the Compensation Act of that province, should there be such an Act, or whether we should work out from all the Acts some fair scale which could be applied in all cases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Perhaps the Minister of Justice has something to say upon the subject.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that I can say much more than has been said by the Prime Minister. I first approached the question rather with the idea of applying in each province to our employees the Compensation Act of that province; but as the Prime Minister has pointed out, we found that that would produce the result that, as our employees are scattered throughout the Dominion and as the accidents that might happen to them resulting in death or in injury, would happen under very similar circumstances, if a man happened to be in one province, we would be paying him less than if he happened to be in another province. What calls for some consideration is whether we should select the system used in some one province and make it for our purposes generally applicable, or whether we should make something of a compromise of the different rules laid down in the various provinces and make that apply generally to our employees who may suffer injury or death in the performance of their duties, so that they will find themselves in the same position towards the Government as that in which an ordinary employee finds himself towards his employer under a General Compensation Act. I think the proper course would be for us to adopt a system of our own, selecting the most commendable features of the different Acts, and then we would be in a position to treat all our employees in all parts of the Dominion upon the same basis.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I repeat that the matter should be dealt with systematically, and the system ought to be that any servant of the Government who meets injury or death in the performance of his duty is entitled to compensation. The rate of compensation should be according to his salary. That is the rule adopted generally, and, I think, if adopted by the Government, it would meet the requirements of the case. We must have a system of our own, and the Minister of Justice, by comparing the different systems, can come to some decision. Instead of these different payments being placed in the Supplementary Estimates, if they are to be made at all, they ought to be made under a well understood system.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have something to say about other gratuities, but I shall wait until we reach the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is true that the different provinces have Compensation Acts by which they allot to those who are injured varying amounts according to degree of injury. Inasmuch as this is a matter within the control of the provinces, I think the proper course would be to deal with each case under the Compensation Act of the province in which the accident occurred. It is true that you have the anomaly that a man who suffered injury or death would secure more for himself in case of injury and for his wife and children in case of death if he happened to be in one province than in another, but such things are bound to occur. The railways operate in the different provinces and they settle the claims that arise in each province according to the rules laid down by the legislature of that province, and I do not think any one considers that to be an anomaly or that that system should be done away with. Inasmuch as the matter is one of provincial concern, and a matter in which the province settles the quantum in respect of all the circumstances in the province in which the injured party lives, it may be right that the system should be a varying one. Perhaps in British Columbia a larger sum might be an equitable and just settlement that in one of the eastern provinces where living is much cheaper. I do not

think he blanket rate would be the best one. The Minister of Trade and Commerce can bear me out that some months ago I presented this view to him in a friendly way, in the same way as I am making these remarks now, and he has been good enough to give the matter consideration, although no decision has yet been arrived at. The matter concerned the employees in our government grain elevators, in which men in my own town have been injured; and one at least killed. If they are working for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or the Ogilvie Elevator Company, or any of the other elevator companies, they get compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Surely, none of us who are voting the public money would wish our employees to be treated less generously than the employees of those companies, and it seems that the most simple and just way would be to extend the Exchequer Court Act to give the judge of that court power to deal with the matter, and if he thinks fit, to take cognizance of the Workmen's Compensation Act of the province in which the matter arises. Whether or not the Exchequer Court Act would have to be amended would be for the Minister of Justice to decide. If a province has not a Compensation Act, that is its own business, because it has its provincial rights and is supreme in that sphere. Just as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is a business concern and conducts its business throughout the various provinces, complying with the legislation in the respective provinces as such legislation affects its business, so this Dominion Government should act, and I would be pleased if some such arrangement could be arrived at in the near future.

Militia and Defence—Dominion arsenal, $100,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) made inquiry as to punishment administered to certain privates of the 128th overseas battalion. As the hon. member was not here yesterday, I might repeat what I said with regard to the administration of field punishment No. 1:

Although there is nothing in our Canadian regulations dealing with the subject matter, the British regulations entitled "Manual of Military Law" page 721, deals with field punishment. Sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph (a) reads: "When in irons a soldier may be attached for a period or periods not exceeding two hours of any one day to a fixed object, but he must not be so attached during more than three of any four consecutive days, nor during more than twenty-one days in all."

The memorandum which I have before me continues:

Our officers commanding have applied this regulation notwithstanding the fact that it is no more applied in the British army. They have done it through ignorance and over zeal. The Adjutant General has given instructions that all kinds of field punishment, excepting detention, are not to be applied for the future.

It is therefore hoped that there will be no further recurrence of incidents of this kind. So far as the particular case is concerned, the report that we have, after investigation by the Provost-Marshal, is as follows. It comes from the District Officer commanding military district No. 1:

Reference Adjutant-General's wire 27th instant and further reference my reply same date are field punishment being administered by O.C. 128th Overseas Battalion. Case has been investigated by Provost-Marshall who reports that Privates Anderson and Graham whilst undergoing detention were given field punishment No. 1 for a period of approximate]y fifty minutes at the expiration of which time medical officer reported no bad effects. The Provost-Marshall's investigation also brought out the fact that Lieut.-Colonel Hawlett has administered on different occasions field punishment in a mild form. Full explanation was however made to him with reference to this form of punishment and instructions given him that it was to be discontinued at once and that in future he was to award detention instead. From the Provost-Marshall's investigation it would seem that aggravated cases only were dealt with in this manner. Please advise me if you wish any further action in this connection.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am very thankful to the Prime Minister for having had this matter looked into. I am quite sure he would be even more opposed to cruelty to any soldier than I would. We have had the matter cleared up so that there will be no shadow over the regiment on this account, and this form of punishment will be stopped. Therefore the purpose of the inquiry has been attained. The Prime Minister spoke of only two soldiers, but the names of three were given. I suppose that is not worth bothering very much about.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Only two are mentioned, but as other cases are alluded to I imagine that all have been considered.

Mr. KNOWLES: I assume so. I should like to know where these boys are now. I am told that pending this investigation two of them were taken out of Moosejaw and put into the Regina 68th, then on the eve of departure, and that they are now across the ocean. If that is correct, of course their evidence could not have been taken.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really have no information on that point, but I will make inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLES: I do not ask for that. I trust the regiment in Moosejaw will be even more successful than it has been and that the bringing of this matter before Parliament in this way will have a good effect. I understand that these are the only cases in Canada in which an officer has administered this punishment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No. I explained that there was a case in Trenton, N.S., where the same punishment was administered. An investigation was held, and the same direction was given to the commanding officer. Indeed, the directions have been made general to all commanding officers in Canada, that this form of punishment shall not be administered in the future. I entirely agree with the Adjutant General that these instructions should be issued. It will be the duty of the proper officer of the Militia Department to see that these instructions are carried out.

Mr. KNOWLES: In this field punishment No. 1, are the arms suspended above the head?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is expressed in general terms in what I read a moment ago:

> When in irons a soldier may be attached for a period or periods not exceeding two hours of any one day to a fixed object, but he must not be so attached during more than three of any four consecutive days, nor during more than twenty-one days in all.

My hon. friend will find in Hansard of yesterday an account of the punishment administered to a soldier in Trenton. His feet rested on the ground but his hands were attached to an object above his head. He remained in that position for an hour. There were no ill physical effects except that, as he stated himself, his arms felt quite tired. There is no particular description in the report of the officer commanding military district No. 10, but only the general reference to field punishment which I have read.

Mr. KNOWLES: The rumour which I reported to the Prime Minister to the effect that the man had fainted is neither confirmed nor denied?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That rumour would hardly be consistent with the report of the officer, to the effect that these soldiers were given this punishment for a period of approximately fifty minutes, at the end of which time the medical officer reported no bad effects.

Mr. MARCIL: Are any other punishments provided for offences on the part of Canadian soldiers?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The order given out is that they shall be punished by detention, but not in any other way.

I desire to make answer to a question asked of me by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. W. M. Martin) with reference to the case of Private Darrach of the 68th overseas battalion, who was in the hospital and who died, and the members of whose family were not present in time to see him before his death. The report which I have from the Adjutant-General, which is addressed to the deputy minister, is as follows:

> With reference to your minute of the 2nd instant, attached herewith, it is pointed out that a report was called for some time ago regarding this matter.
>
> On April 4, the Officer Commanding Military District No. 10 forwarded a copy of a letter from the Grey Nuns' Hospital, Regina, which states in part:
>
> "I must admit that there was a complaint from the parents of Private Darrach. But when the patient arrived at the hospital his condition was that of an ordinary influenza case, his temperature being 101 degrees raising to 104 degrees, and again coming down to the same point, with no other complications. The next morning his condition changed for the worse, shortly before his death, hardly giving us time to notify the doctor and the family, these taking a whole hour before reaching the hospital. In this case we understand that the parents must have felt very much grieved, and this excited them to lay the said complaint; but any one who saw the patient and ourselves were just as astonished at the sudden turn, which could not have been prevented."
>
> The description of this man's illness and death as taken from the official medical board, held on January 29 last, at Regina, substantiates the report from the hospital as to the fact that this man's death was very sudden, and that up to the hour before his death he was not considered to be seriously ill. The report is as follows:
>
> "That he was taken sick on January 24, 1916, and was given usual treatment for La Grippe.
>
> That condition did not improve and he was admitted to barracks hospital at 4 p.m. Tuesday, January 25, 1916, and was seen by Captain Morrison about 6.30 p.m., when he was detained in hospital and treatment continued.
>
> That on January 26, 1916, at the hour of 9.30 he was examined by Captain Coles and treatment continued; temperature, a.m., 101-5.
>
> Temperature p.m., 102-6. As his condition remained unimproved on this evening he was removed to Grey Nuns' Hospital at 7 p.m. After being placed in bed it was found that his temperature was 101-4.

That he was examined by Doctor Wallace at 11 a.m., January 27, 1916, when it was found that influenza was present, but gradually becoming worse. Temperature, 7 a.m., 104-2; pulse, 100; respiration, 24.

The disease pursued the usual course until 11 a.m., January 28, 1916, when heart failed. He became cyanosed. Pulse became imperceptible and he died at 12 a.m. same date in spite of temperature 100-4, pulse 90, respiration 30."

(Sgd.) W. E. Hodgins,
Major-General,
Adjutant-General.

Mr. TURRIFF: It seems to me that when his temperature was ranging up to 104 there was great carelessness on the part of the Militia authorities or of the doctors in charge that this man's people were not notified. I wonder what degree of temperature would be necessary before they would notify the relatives? The report that the temperature went up to 104 degrees carries condemnation on its face. Any one who knows anything about fevers or about temperatures knows that his relatives should have been notified when he was in that condition.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The temperature does seem to have been very high.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is absolutely no excuse for a thing like that.

Mr. OLIVER: In reference to the punishments inflicted, no doubt the committee highly approves the decision of the Government not to permit such punishment in future. May I ask whether any consideration has been given to the officers who inflicted these punishments?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have not consulted the Adjutant General with regard to that; there has not been an opportunity of doing so. The punishments were authorized under the British War Office regulations, which are applicable to our force. It is not usual to administer such punishments in Great Britain, and they will not be administered here in the future. The punishments do not seem to have been attended with any ill effects to the physique of the young men, and I do not know under the circumstances whether the Adjutant General would recommend any disciplining of the officers or not. I shall, however, consult him as to that.

Mr. OLIVER: I take the opportunity of expressing the opinion that while the officers had the authority of the regulations enabling them to inflict this punishment, the fact that the regulation had become obsolete in Great Britain was evidence of a change in conditions and opinions that an officer properly appreciating his position and responsibilities would surely have taken notice of. In Canada, where conditions are so far removed from those that prevail in military circles in England, an officer who would exercise the authority given by the regulations to that extent would seem to have shown that he was not the man for the position; that there was error in judgment in placing him in that position, or that, at any rate, after his having committed that error in judgment it would be a mistake to continue him in the position. It is not possible to lay down rules and regulations for the conduct of officers, especially commanding officers under all circumstances. If an officer does not show that he has judgment over and above what is laid down in the regulations, it seems to me that he demonstrates that he is not the man for the position. The Government would be well advised to take that into consideration.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is stated in the report which has been made, and which I read to-day as well as yesterday, that these incidents doubtless occurred through ignorance of the officer that the particular form of punishment administered was no longer used in Great Britain. It appeared in the regulations, and on the strength of the regulations they felt entitled to administer that punishment. Further than that, so far as the present case is concerned, and also, apparently, so far as the cases in the West are concerned, there had been very grave breaches of discipline. I do not know as to the particulars of the western cases.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is not very clear that there were any grave breaches of discipline in the western cases.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am merely referring to the report, which says that the breach of discipline was flagrant, or something of that kind. From the Provost Marshall's investigation it seemed that aggravated cases only were dealt with in this way. In the Nova Scotia case, a man while under detention escaped, remained away from his regiment for about two weeks and then returned. He had been guilty of six distinct offences within a period of four weeks previous to that. It was, therefore, regarded as a very aggravated case, and the commanding officer administered this punishment.

Mr. TURRIFF: In the case of an investigation of this kind, is it the officer complained of who investigates and makes the report?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Provost Marshal made the investigation, not the officer in command. The investigation is made under the direction of the officer commanding the military district.

Mr. OLIVER: The Prime Minister has not so far been good enough to say whether the Government has any intention of going into this question of the fitness of these officers for their positions or the propriety of administering some form of punishment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps my hon. friend did not understand what I said with regard to that. I stated that I would consult the proper officer of the department, who in this case is the Adjutant General. I would ask the opinion also of the Chief of the General Staff, General Gwatkin, who is an officer of long experience and sound judgment, as is, indeed, the Adjutant General himself.

Mr. OLIVER: The matter is very far reaching. In our present condition, when we are attempting to enlist the active service and therefore the sympathy of most of our people in military affairs, such circumstances as these, which are very foreign to our ideas of right and justice, and so very foreign to custom, have a very prejudicial effect. Their tendency would be to prejudice the public mind very greatly against military service. Cases having occurred, it would seem to me that something should be done to demonstrate to the public that such conduct is absolutely contrary to the policy of the country, in military as well as in civil affairs.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have not yet the full report of this investigation, but only a summary by wire. It is possible that some recommendations may be made by the officer who is charged with the duty of investigation. My hon. friends will remember what was said by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) last night, that while 99 per cent, or 999 out of 1,000, may be the very best men you can find, you do occasionally find in a regiment a man who habitually offends against discipline and whose example to the other men in the regiment is very detrimental indeed. Notwithstanding that, instructions have been given that this particular form of punishment, which at one time prevailed, but which has now become obsolete in Great Britain, shall not be administered in the future in Canada. I really cannot say anything more about the officers than what I have stated. A consultation will be had with the proper officers of the department, and their view of the conduct of those who are responsible for the administration of punishment on these occasions will be ascertained. Considering that we have enlisted 320,000 men, who have been trained in Canada during the past eighteen or twenty months, there have been very few instances of anything like this. At the moment I cannot recall anything other than the few cases in the West and a case in Nova Scotia. So in that respect I think, perhaps, we are entitled to congratulate ourselves that so few incidents of a regrettable character have occurred.

Mr. KNOWLES: While it is true that there may be 99 per cent of the men good and 1 per cent bad, it is also possible that there may be a certain percentage of our officers who are not the highest type of officers. As to this punishment being set out in the field regulations, I do not think there are many officers who would hide behind that. I have no doubt that the same field regulations say that if a man deserts he should be shot. If you are going to say that you should go by the letter of the bond, it would be as much a justification for shooting boys who desert—and some of them, nice boys, do desert—and it would be preposterous to say that the field regulations were in force to that extent, I should think that the very word "field" regulations would be enough to convince any man that, in a city like Moosejaw, it is not necessary to adopt such regulations as you would at the salient at Ypres. I should think that the field regulations were made for the firing line. No mention is made in the report, of the young man named O'Brien. I know that the Prime Minister has only a telegraphic report at present and it may be that this case may have been overlooked in the telegram. I see by the press that a meeting of the battalion, or something of that kind, was held, and a vote was taken to the effect that they would stay by the Colonel, which to my mind is not a good sign. You will always get men who will vote for their colonel, especially that kind of a colonel. There are not many who would desire to have a taste of the cast-iron wheel to which the men were

tied, and naturally they would think that, all things considered, they had better vote for the colonel as long as he was colonel. The commanding officer, whose name I have never mentioned, may be an honourable officer. He said in a public address in the city of Moosejaw that he has been stabbed from behind. I am not going to enter into any controversy with him, but I will say that I am more convinced now than I was when I first mentioned it that I was discharging my duty when I brought this matter to the attention of the House, and I have no reason to doubt that the address he is reported to have made in Moosejaw last Sunday night referred to my remarks. It was not an utterance an officer should have made. I have my duty to perform, and he has his. So far as I have had any personal relations with him, they have been of unalloyed friendship. I know him very slightly, because he is a stranger in our city. When will the full report likely be received in Ottawa?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We expect it some time in the early part of next week.

Mr. OLIVER: Last night the Prime Minister referred to an investigation in regard to the Ross rifle. Is that report available?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think the report could not be brought down; it is of a confidential character.

Mr. OLIVER: Was it a British or a Canadian investigation?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was under the direction of General Alderson himself, and was made by officers appointed by him for the purpose.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: On April 26 some questions were answered with reference to the employment of Mr. J. A. Spidal as recruiting officer in the county of Kings. The answer was that he had been in the employ of the department from November 9, 1915, until January 4, 1916. My information is that he is at present at Berwick in command of a detachment of the 219th Battalion, and it is said that he is still in the employ of the Government and is receiving military pay. I am also informed that he has been wearing his uniform and, having been nominated as the Conservative candidate for the legislature, he has recently been attending Conservative meetings in his uniform. It would appear that perhaps there is a misapprehension somewhere. I desire to know if the statement is correct that he has not been in the employ of this Government since January 4, 1916, and if he has been disporting himself in a military uniform while not in discharge of any duties as an officer?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have no personal knowledge of the matter. The answer given was communicated in the usual way by the officers of the department. The deputy minister will take a note of the question and give the information later. So far as concerns the question of engaging in political activities, I do not understand the rule of the department or of the War Office to debar a man from becoming a can- a candidate.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: I did not say that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The other day I had an application from the Premier of Quebec asking for leave of absence for an officer who is on active service. The request was that he should receive leave of absence for 30 days in order that he might attend to his duties as a candidate in the general elections pending in the province of Quebec. We at once gave him leave of absence for that purpose, and he was relieved of his military duties in order that he might attend to matters requiring his attention as a candidate. The same rule will be observed in regard to all persons on active service, whatever their political affiliations may be.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: No objection is taken to his being a candidate, or to his taking a part in politics. He has a perfect right to do so if he so desires. The reason I mentioned the matter was because of an answer to a question on 26th April, to be found on page 3219 of Hansard. The question was: "Is it the intention of the Government to continue to employ Mr. Spiddel in such service?" The answer was, "No." A previous question was: "When was he appointed?" The answer was: "November 9, 1915." Another question was: "What rank does he hold, and what pay does he receive?" The answer was: "No militia rank. $3 per diem from November 9, 1915, to January 4, 1916." The inference is that on January 4, 1916, he ceased to hold his position as recruiting officer. In respect to his rank, I am told that he has taken a lieutenant's course at the Royal School of Infantry at Halifax, and that that answer is not correct. It may well be that the other answers were incorrectly given, not intentionally, of course, but through

some misapprehension. It is alleged that this man is now in Berwick in command of a detachment of the 209th Battalion. It is also stated that he still continues in the capacity of recruiting officer, and is drawing pay as such. In support of that statement, the evidence is that he has been going through the country in his uniform, and that he attended a meeting at Kentville and was chairman on that occasion. That, however, is only mentioned in passing. I shall be very glad if the minister would get this information, and furnish it as soon as convenient.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will have inquiry made, and give the information to my hon. friend when the Bill is in committee.

Mr. TURRIFF: I noticed that the acting minister stated that it was not his intention, and that it had not been the intention of the Minister of Militia, to allow political influence to be used in connection with the department. We all know perfectly well that there has been politics in the Militia Department, and in connection with the army, from the beginning of the war until the present moment; we see it manifested all over the country. I do not say that it would be possible for the Government to do away with it altogether, but there is no use in shutting our eyes to the fact that politics cut a very large figure in connection with the running of the Militia Department.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In what respect?

Mr. TURRIFF: Let me give my right hon. friend an instance. A battalion is being organized in Prince Albert, and an hon. member of this House is the lieutenant-colonel, while his son-in-law is second in command, having been put over the head of a man who had had military experience. If that is not politics, I do not know what it is. But what I got up to bring to the attention of the acting minister was this: A man named Frank Carew, whose father is a member of the local Legislature, is the paymaster for some soldiers located in Lindsay, Ont. He has clerks to do his work, and, while dressed in military uniform, runs his father's office. He is paid by the Militia Department. That seems to me to look as if political influence was at work. I have information of another case. A man named Roenik, a German, draws pay as bandmaster, though he is not the bandmaster; he is too old to attend to his duties or to go overseas, and another man named Heffernan is in reality the leader of the band and bandmaster. In other words, the man who does not do the work draws the pay for it. It strikes me that that savours a little of political influence, and I do not think that that sort of think should be allowed. In my own constituency one man applied for a position as an officer; he is an officer now. He has had a long experience, having been in the Mounted Police force during the greater part of his life, but he told me that another man had been placed over his head—a very good man, a lawyer, and a good supporter of the Government, but with no military experience whatever, while the other man had put in 20 years in the Mounted Police, and was an officer in a local corps long before the war started; yet he was passed over. Cases like these are numerous throughout the country, and I think it would be well if my right hon. friend, the acting minister, would, as far as possible, do away with that sort of thing and not have experienced military men turned down. I am not speaking now so much of political influence, but of men with some military experience being turned down for men who have had no experience. I do not think that that is in the interest of the Militia Department, or in the interest of our army when it goes across the water. Certainly it requires some experience to enable a man to be a good officer when he goes to the firing line. These are just a few cases that have been brought to my attention. I have heard of many more, but I cannot mention them because I do not know more about them. You hear every day of this man or that man being passed over for some one else with political pull but without any military qualifications.

Mr. BURNHAM: I think that in justice to the people of the country the statement of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) should not go unchallenged. Take for example the battalion which I know very well: discipline prevents me from mentioning the number. The colonel is a Liberal; the majority of the officers were Conservatives, and there were three applicants for the position. Two of them were Conservatives, but everybody pulled for the Liberal. When I say "pulled" I do not mean that there was any improper pulling done. They wanted to see the Liberal get the position for the sake of the service. There is no use in sending broadcast

through this country the idea that the Conservative party is honeycombed with vice of that description, because it is not so.

Mr. STEVENS: I quite agree with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), that this statement should not be allowed to go unchallenged. From Vancouver we have sent three battalions to the front. The commanding officers of these battalions are all prominent Liberals, prominent citizens, and excellent officers. One of them, who is now at the front—the Prime Minister knows him very well; I will not mention his name—has earned the D.S.O. and other distinctions. With regard to the case my hon. friend has spoken of, it is quite correct that the commanding officer had for his second-in-command his brother-in-law; but this was not a case of political influence. He appointed his brother-in-law, not because he was a Liberal, but because he had a liking for him; it was just a little bit of human nature; and the man is discharging his duties in an excellent manner. No one can complain of that; I would not think of suggesting political influence, or that the officer was appointed because he was a Liberal. The brigade commander is also a prominent Liberal and an excellent officer. I have no objection to him whatever. As long as a man can do his duty to the country I do not care a scrap what his politics are, and as far as the district I represent is concerned, I resent the suggestion that politics count one scrap in appointments to the army. I challenge any member to cite one single instance in which I have ever suggested politics in the appointment of officers or in the purchase of supplies in any shape or form. From the day the war broke out I have taken most emphatically the stand that politics should not enter into this war as regards military appointments. It is unwise and unfair to be continually throwing out to the country that our magnificent army is a matter of political patronage; it is not fair, it is not right, and I resent it.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman may resent it; I suppose he has a right to. But let me tell him on my responsibility as a member of this House that military affairs in the province I come from are, if I may use his expression, honeycombed with politics from start to finish, it being purely a matter of political patronage, and I challenge the hon. member or any one else to prove to the contrary. In the county from which I come we have Mr. Douglas, who is president of the Conservative Association for the province of Nova Scotia. He is also one of the local members for the county, and has just as firm a grip on every move in every battalion in Cape Breton as he has in what may be regarded as matters of legitimate patronage.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Did my hon. friend say that Mr. Douglas was president of the Conservative Association in Nova Scotia?

Mr. McKENZIE: I understood that he was.

Mr. DAVIDSON: He is not.

Mr. McKENZIE: If not, a change must have been made in the last few months. He was president last year.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Mr. A. B. Crosby has been president since last fall.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Douglas was the president, at all events, and he is now either vice-president or honorary president. The hon. member for Annapolis knows well the standing that Mr. Douglas has in the Conservative party. I am making no misstatement at all about his position, and if the Prime Minister, either as Prime Minister or as Acting Minister of Militia, will take the trouble of getting some independent information as to how matters are managed in the county of Cape Breton, he will find that they are absolutely honeycombed, to again use my hon. friend's expression, with political influence. We are not looking for anything else; we do not expect anything else; we never get anything else. I say to the hon. member for Vancouver and to the Prime Minister that not one man east of Halifax has received any military prominence since the war broke out, unless he was a supporter of the Conservative party and identified with the cause. We have one gentleman in Halifax of whom I am very proud. He bears the name of the Prime Minister, and is a well-recognized Liberal. His ability prominence and personality have brought him forward; they could not keep him back; but he is the only Liberal in Nova Scotia who has received any prominence whatever since the war broke out. I challenge any one to name any other man who has come to the front in any way whatsoever in the province of Nova Scotia, unless he was well recognized to be in harmony with the Government of the day.

We are told that there is no political influence in the matter of supplies for the troops. I asked some questions a few days

ago as to supplies for the 94th at Sydney Mines and North Sydney, and I got the answer that the officers went around and got bids from different parties for the supplies. I have the names of those who furnished the supplies, and I should be glad to show them to the Prime Minister; he knows some of them. There is not a man on the list but got his name down through political influence, either directly or indirectly; there is not a prominent Liberal on the list at all, and the men who supplied the goods got their money direct from the department without there being any competition. We are not complaining of that; we are not looking for anything else. The acting minister—perhaps not he, for he has not said very much about it, but the Minister of Militia—used to say boastfully that there was no such thing. If he had kept quiet about it we would say nothing, but we cannot listen to such boastful declarations when the truth is absolutely to the contrary. We do not expect any patronage to come to us in Nova Scotia in public works or railway matters, or anything of that kind, so long as we are in opposition; and that is precisely the policy that has been followed in Nova Scotia in regard to military matters as well. It is the absolute truth that only by some unavoidable accident has anything fallen to the lot of a Liberal. On the other hand, the Liberals have joined the ranks and are doing their part just as well as the others; men and women, Liberal and Conservative, are connected with every patriotic society, doing what they can; but when it comes to preferment or an appointment to a military position the line is strictly drawn; there is no communication between the Jews and Samaritans in things of that kind. We do not complain, but we want hon. gentlemen to keep quiet, and not make vain and improper and unsupported boasts about these things.

Mr. STEVENS: Does my hon. friend say my remarks were improper?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am referring to no province but my own. Whatever my sins may be, I keep to facts within my own knowledge. But if I were to judge by general politics, I should say that Vancouver is about as corrupt as they make them.

Mr. STEVENS: I challenge my hon. friend to prove that.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. McKENZIE: On general grounds, I prefer to take the declaration of so distinguished a Conservative as Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, who says that
4 p.m. the Conservative party in that province is steeped to the lips in corruption. I leave the issue between that distinguished member of the Conservative party and my hon. friend. I do not wish to find fault, especially as the Prime Minister is head of the department for the present, and is perhaps not so familiar with the details as the real head might be. I was in the province of Nova Scotia a few days ago when some complaints were brought to my notice and I wish, in the kindliest way, to bring them to the notice of the Prime Minister. I have reference to the 185th Battalion, which is now in camp at Broughton, a small place in a remote part of the county of Cape Breton. I do not quite understand why they were sent there. It is not a convenient place for a railway; there is no proper sewerage; there is no water system at the place, and it is practically in the woods where the land is not even cleared and the tents, I am told, are in amongst stumps and stones and uncultivated land. The men are complaining that they are not properly looked after and that they are not well fed. I was also told by my Roman Catholic friends that although the soldiers are there for several weeks, over several Sundays, no provision at all has been made for any Roman Catholic services. As they are complaining about these things, I bring them to the notice of the minister in the best manner that I can and with as little publicity as possible, and I trust that these men shall be properly taken care of and housed and well fed, and that their spiritual wants will be looked after as they ought to be.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Just a word or two with regard to what some of my hon. friends have said. There seems to have been an impression that the Minister of Militia spends his time making appointments amongst the force of almost 140,000 now under training in Canada. The appointments as I understand, are recommended by the Officer Commanding, and the Minister of Militia very often does not even know the names of the officers who are recommended. He takes the view of the officer on the spot as to those whom he should recommend, and he does not concern himself more about the matter, because it would be impossible for him to make personal inquiry into the officers who are selected by the commanding officers

of the different battalions to fill the various positions.

Mr. MARCIL: Who authorizes each battalion and selects the commanding officer?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is done from headquarters.

Mr. MARCIL: By the Minister of Militia?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I presume the minister acts upon his own judgment and takes the report of the proper officers of his department as to the competency of the selection which is presented for his approval. My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has referred to some matters in the province of Nova Scotia. I do not know very much about the details, but I am informed that the son of the hon. member for Pictou has been appointed as the adjutant of one of the battalions there. I am also informed that Mr. Rolston, who was the opponent, I think, of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) at the last election, has been very rapidly promoted, and that Col. Parsons, who was appointed to be second in command of the 185th Battalion, is a very strong Liberal. The remarks of the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria are rather surprising in view of the fact that not long since a resolution was passed, I think, at a Liberal convention in Nova Scotia, giving the credit for the organization of the Highland Brigade in Nova Scotia to the Hon. Mr. Murray, premier of that province. If Mr. Murray has imbued himself with the political aspect of the situation to the extent which my hon. friend suggests, I admit that my hon. friend's remarks which must be taken as an animadversion upon him, are well founded, but I do not believe that Mr. Murray's connection with such matters has had anything more to do with politics than the connection of the Minister of Militia. It is a fact as reported to me that great credit is taken by the Liberal party in Nova Scotia for the organization of the Highland Brigade. Yet my hon. friend stands on the floor of this Parliament and says that the whole thing is honeycombed with politics. If you put those two observations together, you have a result which is not flattering to the patriotic attitude of hon. gentlemen on the other side.

The battalion at Broughton is under the command of an officer whom I do not personally know except that I saw him in Nova Scotia last autumn, but I have the best possible report as to Col. Day. He is, I am told, a very able man, a very patriotic man and a man who, I believe, would be inspired by no other consideration or feeling than the desire to do his duty. I have not the slightest idea as to what his politics are, nor have I ever inquired. I would like to say that if the province of Nova Scotia has been honeycombed, as my hon. friend suggests, by partisan considerations, in connection with military affairs, it is different, I believe, from every other province in Canada, because I know that in other provinces gentlemen who are associated with the Liberal party have been promoted to the very highest commands. That is true in the province of Ontario, and many illustrations could be given. As a matter of fact, I venture to think that for every complaint made with regard to some gentleman having been passed over because he happened to be a Liberal, I could give two complaints from Conservatives who thought they were passed over in order that Liberals might be appointed in their stead. In the province of New Brunswick we appointed a member of this House, Col. McLean, to a very important command. He was at Valcartier last autumn, and he has been rendering very good service. In the province of Ontario the highest commands are in many instances given to gentlemen who have a very high standing in the ranks of the Liberal party, and I desire to affirm to this committee my most sincere belief that from the first of this war up to the present time, the Minister of Militia and Defence has never in a single instance been actuated by any political consideration in any appointment that he has made. That is my sincere belief, from what I have seen and known of his conduct during this war. With regard to the appointment of a Catholic chaplain to the 185th Battalion, I understand that Father Gillis has been appointed.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Prime Minister says that there are no politics in the department, and that the minister is guided in his appointments by the recommendations of the officer in charge. I would like to call to the attention of the Prime Minister that Toryism gets in its work in making the recommendations to the officer in charge. The Tory politician in my county is supreme so far as military matters are concerned, and he says to the officers: If you do not do my bidding, off goes your head. I will point out to the Prime Minister—and he can look up the record—three

men who were rather independent. Col. McRae, of the 94th Battalion, would not play second fiddle to John C. Douglas. Off went his head; he was discharged. Major Gillis, an independent officer and a good Scotchman, would see John C. Douglas in Jericho before he would be pulled around by the nose by him, and off went his head. Major McLean, who was in charge of the 94th Battalion at North Sydney, was known to be a Liberal. He would not be dictated to by John C. Douglas and his minions, and off went his head.

Mr. MARCIL: Who is John C. Douglas?

Mr. McKENZIE: He is the Tory manager in the county of Cape Breton. The men who are in charge and who are human enough to think that it is nice to stay in office, do precisely what John C. Douglas tells them to do, and through the medium of those men the Tory appointments come to the minister, and he can flap his holy wings and say: I know nothing about the matter; it is done absolutely without any bias at all. But he knows that nothing can come to him but what is absolutely lined with Toryism.

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot allow the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) to go unchallenged. It has been whispered and insinuated many times regarding British Columbia. The leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) laughed with considerable glee when the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) made the remark. But I challenge the right hon. gentleman and the hon. member for North Cape Breton to cite a single sentence falling from the lips of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper in which he cast any reflection whatever upon a single act of the Administration at Ottawa or upon a single act of mine as the representative of Vancouver in this House.

Mr. McKENZIE: I shall be glad to do so if he will give me the time.

Mr. STEVENS: Do so. I will take my seat to give the hon. gentleman his opportunity.

Mr McKENZIE: I have not the papers before me, but on Monday—

Mr. STEVENS: Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper did consider it his duty to take the platform against the Provincial Government. With that I have nothing to do, and this House has nothing to do; the people of British Columbia will judge of that. But by not one single word has Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper cast any aspersion, direct or indirect, upon this Government or upon any administrative act of this Government. And I want to say something further for the consolation of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for North Cape Breton, and that is that the only corruption that has come to light in the last election is the wholesale plugging on behalf of Mr. M. A. Macdonald, the Liberal hero in Vancouver. They brought men by the score from Seattle, self-confessed pluggers, and voted them for Mr. Macdonald, the Grit candidate. That is the only corruption that has been shown in the city of Vancouver in connection with the recent election.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the hon. gentleman inform the House what this House has to do with that?

Mr. STEVENS: An aspersion has been cast upon the province of British Columbia by the hon. member for North Cape Breton, and even at the risk of being out of order I would resent it on the floor of this House; and I think I have a right to do so when these statements are made here. For months and months the papers of eastern Canada have been circulating false and slanderous stories regarding British Columbia, and it is about time some one said a word to the people of the East in regard to my province. If time permitted, I could convince any reasonable member of this House that conditions in British Columbia, politically and otherwise, are a credit to the province and to Canada as a whole. Unless an hon. member is prepared to bring some specific charge or statement before the House, he should respect the representatives of the people from that province.

Mr. LOGGIE: I had the pleasure of visiting Halifax last fall, and while there I called upon several of the prominent mercantile establishments. I was told by a reputable firm that when ships of the imperial navy came into port at Halifax, tenders were publicly asked for supplies for the ships, but when supplies were needed for a Canadian ship, a few people were selected to tender. In my opinion, this way of buying supplies should cease; in this matter, we ought to attain as high a standard as the Imperial authorities. The firm that gave me this information is a reputable firm, and I think its testimony is conclusive evidence that, to some extent at any rate, there is a disposition to carry

on the abominable practice of petty politics and party patronage in the purchase of war supplies.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That relates to the Department of the Naval Service, and so I cannot pretend to be familiar with the matter; but I should be surprised to learn that the statement of my hon. friend has any foundation whatever. If the supplies for British ships are purchased through the Department of the Naval Service it is inconceivable that they should have one system for British ships and another system for Canadian ships. To what Canadian ships does the hon. member refer?

Mr. LOGGIE: I refer to ships under the authority of the Canadian Naval Department, but the ships to which I refer as publicly asking for tenders are under the authority of the Imperial Government. They are, as I understand it, patrolling out of New York and defending the route to the British Islands. Their supplies are purchased in a different way from those required by ships under control of the Canadian Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as transports are concerned—and I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has reference to transports or not—everything is managed by a gentleman who was formerly associated with the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. A. H. Harris, who has been acting as overseas director of transport. And, if I am not very much mistaken, the firm employed as ships' agent for the transports, is a strong Liberal firm. As to the small patrol ships, I do not know how they are supplied, but the Minister of the Naval Service will know and I will direct his attention to the observations of my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: I have never troubled the House very much with mention of politics in the administration of public affairs, and shall not do so now; but, as the question has been raised concerning influence in military appointments, I may take the opportunity to read from the Edmonton Journal, a Conservative newspaper, something which may throw some light on the matter. This is from the Journal of the 6th of March, 1916:

Major Allan Elliott Declines Offer to Command Guard—Will Remain with the 51st Battallion Which is Soon to be Moved to the Front.

As predicted by the Journal on Saturday, the appointment as officer commanding the 218th Irish Guards was tendered Major Allan Elliott of the 51st Battalion, by a deputation consisting of A. F. Ewing, M.L.A., Alderman R. N. Frith, and Percy Abbott. The Advisory Committee of representative Irish citizens which is working in unison with Lt.-Colonel McKenery in furthering the interests of the Irish Guards had unanimously decided upon Major Elliott as a fitting soldier to take over this command.

You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that the Irish citizens had decided that Major Elliott was a suitable person to be colonel of a regiment, but that it was a committee consisting of Mr. Ewing, the Conservative M.L.A., Alderman R. N. Frith, ex-president of the Conservative Association, and Mr. Percy Abbott, who is very prominent in Conservative circles—I do not know what particular office he holds at the present time—these three gentlemen who, as stated by this newspaper supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, went to Major Elliott and absolutely tendered to him the command, and it was to them he refused to accept it. I think it is only fair, in view of the discussions that have taken place, to lay the facts before the House.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Where a regiment is proposed to be raised from a particular nationality, I think it is very often desired to obtain the views of those who are very likely to be members of the battalion, and to learn whether or not they have confidence in the particular officer who is proposed to be selected. Something of that kind was done in this case; some representative gentlemen were asked to consult Mr. Elliott on the subject, as he was connected with another battalion, and to ascertain whether or not, if the appointment were offered to him, he would accept it.

Mr. McKENZIE: The member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) challenged me to produce proof of certain statements which I made. To take up the challenge of my hon. friend would not, perhaps, be exactly in line with the resolution before us; but I do not want to be charged with making observations that are not backed up by the facts. What I am about to read has reference particularly to Mr. Bowser, and brings in Sir Richard McBride. If I know anything about the politics of British Columbia, that has been the whole push for the last eighteen years—Bowser and McBride, McBride and Bowser. I venture to say the hon. member for Vancouver could never have got the nomination for Vancouver if it had not been for the sup-

port of Bowser and McBride and McBride and Bowser.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is making a very grave mistake.

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend may say so, now that Mr. McBride is out of the country, but I venture to say that when he was in his palmy days no one from British Columbia could say or do anything except by his authority.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman has, I think, sufficiently verified his assertion of a moment ago, and I do not know that any useful purpose can be served by this discussion. I submit to the committee that the Chairman is placed in a somewhat helpless position from day to day inasmuch as ministers announce that the widest possible discussion may be had upon a given resolution, notwithstanding the fact that the rules state explicitly that the discussion must be strictly relevant to the item under consideration. Of course, there is nothing for the Chairman to do but submit to the wishes of the committee in that respect, but the committee could assist the Chairman by keeping within such wide bounds as are laid down for discussion in committee. I sincerely hope that the hon. member will not pursue the subject any further.

Mr. McKENZIE: If I may be allowed to finish what I want to say, I will not add anything to my remarks. The hon. member for Vancouver put me in the position that I was making statements for which I had no authority; I am simply going to read my authority.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will see that this will involve a reply from the hon. member for Vancouver and so on, ad infinitum.

Mr. McKENZIE: Permit me to say this: I have the telegram of Sir Charles Tupper in my hand which denounces in the worst terms the Tory party—and you will not permit me to read it.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will have ample opportunity before the session is over. I think he himself will agree with me that it will be far wiser not to pursue the subject any further.

Mr. OLIVER: Something has been said to-day about a surplus of officers in Canada and something was said on a previous occasion about a surplus of officers in England. What is the position in England with regard to what may be called supernumerary officers? The statement was made here that as battalions have gone overseas, for one reason or another officers have ceased to be attached to them and are maintained on pay in England without rendering service. If that occurs to any large degree it is an evil that should not be permitted. It burdens the country and is a discrimination in favour of men who do not merit it. I certainly think the committee is entitled to understand from the head of the department what that situation is.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is a supply of officers in Great Britain, above what is called the establishment. A communication was sent within the past two weeks to General Carson for information on the subject and the reply was to the effect that every one of the officers was attached to some unit and that every one of them was being employed. A fuller statement will come by letter. Pending the receipt of this reply a further inquiry was addressed to General Carson, to which a reply has not yet been received, so far as I am aware.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister a certain instance that I have already discussed in part with the Minister of the Interior, who advised me that I should take the matter up with the Department of Militia. It relates to a battalion which was raised at Edmonton, and which was listed at Valcartier as the 9th Battalion. When war broke out there was in Edmonton a volunteer battalion known as the 101st. It was at full strength and was under the command of one Colonel Osborne. When war was declared this battalion offered its services as a body to the Government for service overseas; at least that is my information. It was not accepted, but authority was given for the raising of an overseas battalion, with the result that a battalion was raised immediately for overseas service under Colonel Osborne, and that battalion was amongst the first, if not the first, to reach Valcartier, although it came from Edmonton, further away than almost any other battalion that came to Valcartier. It came to Valcartier over strength; I think there were some 1,300 men in the battalion. Some little time after it had been at Valcartier I am informed that as Colonel Osborne sat in his tent one morning another gentleman, Colonel Maynard Rogers, entered the tent and said to Colonel Osborne:

"I am in command of the 9th Battalion." Colonel Maynard Rogers is a former resident of Ottawa. He removed to Edmonton and was finally appointed the superintendent of Jasper Park. Having had military experience, when war broke out he volunteered his services, and they were accepted. He left his employment at Jasper Park, came to Valcartier, and was given command of the 9th Battalion, over the head of the man who had raised it and had brought it down there, and with just the amount of ceremony, so I am informed, that I have related to the committee. Colonel Osborne accepted the situation and continued with the battalion as second in command. The battalion went overseas in due course, reached England, and while it was in England—I do not know all of what occurred, but in the end Colonel Osborne was retired altogether from the battalion, and, though retaining his rank, I suppose, was returned to Canada without military employment. My information is that it was found that Colonel Rogers was not competent for the position of colonel in the field; the fact was, at any rate, that the battalion was broken up and there was not any 9th Battalion from that time forward. The members of that battalion were distributed around among other battalions, and when I read the casualty lists issued in pamphlet or book form some time ago, I noticed that in the lists of casualties in the various battalions were men "formerly 9th Battalion." My information was that Colonel Rogers never went on active service in Europe, that he was one of the unattached officers in England until General Lessard was sent over to England; and then this Colonel Rogers was given a position as staff officer to him, and I suppose has been engaged in that service since. But from the time that the battalion went to England until he went to the front with General Lessard, so far as I am aware, he did no military service, and my opinion is that not only did he do no military service but, by reason of his lack of military ability, he did a serious dis-service in having been the cause of breaking up the 9th Battalion. At the same time, as the Minister of the Interior informs us, Colonel Rogers is drawing his salary as superintendent of Jasper park, $2,400 a year. He has been, of course, drawing his salary as Lieut.-Colonel during all this time. But not only is he not rendering the country or the Empire any service, but he rendered a serious dis-service by reason of his having been put in a position which he was not competent to fill. I do not know how many other cases there may be like that, but it appears to me that when there is such a startling case it should be made public, and I hope there are no other such cases. But the information that has come to me is that there are a very large number of them. The Minister of the Interior told us that Colonel Rogers drew his salary as superintendent of Jasper park, and was still drawing it. I say that is wrong. When it was found that this gentleman was not adapted for the command of a military battalion for active service, he should, in all common sense, have been returned to civil employment, for which I believe he was entirely fitted. Remember that I have no fault to find with Colonel Rogers personally or in his civil employment, but, having left his civil employment and undertaken military employment, and being found unfit for it, the results being as they were—and they were certainly very displeasing to men who are interested and to many of their friends —I cannot give the administration under which such a condition exists, that commendation that I should be very glad to give, and certainly such a state of affairs does not tend to efficiency or satisfaction.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am rather surprised at my hon. friend's animadversions on Colonel Rogers; unless he has good grounds for them. Colonel Rogers has had a long military experience in the militia of Canada, to my certain knowledge; and unless I am mistaken he also saw active service in the South African war.

Mr. OLIVER: He did.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand he is engaged in Great Britain in connection with the training of the troops there. I do not know all the particulars. So far as Colonel Osborne is concerned, I do not remember ever hearing of him or of the incident to which my hon. friend refers. That occurred a long time ago. If the Minister of Militia were here doubtless he could give some information. I shall have inquiry made. If my hon. friend has anything else as to which he would like information, I wish he would state it now so that we can take it up at the proper time.

Mr. TURRIFF: Who was the contractor for supplying clothing to the department last year, and who is the contractor at the present time?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really could not say. We will get the information and give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: There is another matter to which I wish to draw attention and it is in regard to recruiting. The Prime Minister said the other day that in the scheme of recruiting an effort was made to direct the exertions of those who were concerned to different localities where they would result in the least disturbance to the economic situation. I am compelled to take the view that that has not been the guiding policy of the department. My opinion is that they have been guided simply and solely by the possibility of securing recruits, and that wherever recruiting was good they took all the recruits they could without regard to the result to the community at large. I have no fault to find with the action of the department, but I do find fault with the assertion that discrimination has been used when there has been no such discrimination. If I may be permitted to give a statement of the recruiting that has taken place in Northern Alberta, of course with Edmonton as its headquarters, it will be seen just how much and how far consideration was paid to the circumstances which my right hon. friend has dealt with. On August 12, 1914, 120 men were recruited for the Princess Pats; on August 13, 116; and on Aug. 14, 65 men. On Aug. 22, the 101st sent 908 men. On August 26, the 19th Alberta Dragoons sent 206 men. On August 27, the 101st, that is the 9th Battalion, sent 350 men. That made 1,250 men in that 9th Battalion. On the 3rd of November a contingent of 100 men was sent to Quebec City, and in order to let the committee know the exact circumstances of that draft, I may say that a telegram was sent to Edmonton saying that 100 men were wanted. Those men threw down what they were engaged in and left the city, they did not take time to settle their affairs in any way. They simply took the next train for Quebec under the impression that the city had been attacked, or that there was some catastrophe that made such a call for men urgent. When they got to Quebec they found that all they were wanted for was to fill up a regiment that was somewhat short of its full number. On Nov. 16, 101 men went to Calgary to join the 31st Battalion there. On Nov. 17, another detachment went to Calgary to joint the 31st Battalion; on Nov. 25, 110 men went to Calgary to join the 31st Battalion; on Nov. 28, 40 men enlisted for the Lethbridge Artillery; on Dec. 12, 40 more men went to the 31st at Calgary. On Jan. 4, the Mounted Rifles, recruited under Colonel Kemmis, secured 164 men; on May 7, the first Universities Company sent a draft of 9 men; on May 8, a draft of 250 men was taken for the 51st Battalion, under Captain Higginson; on May 24, the second Universities Company sent 16 men; on May 29, the 49th Battalion, with base company, sailed for overseas, 1,300 strong. On June 1st, "C" Squad, 3rd C.M.R., Major Fane, recruited 164; on June 24, the 3rd Universities Company recruited 35 men; on August 13, another draft of the 51st Battalion, 270 men, went forward; on September 6, a draft of the 63rd Battalion, 252 men, went forward; on September 11, a draft of the 65th Battalion, 250 men, went forward; on October 4, the 4th Universities Company, 20 men, went forward; on November 17, a Pioneer Battalion, 75 men, went forward; on December 3, Serbian and Montenegrin reservists, to the number of 80, went forward; on December 5, the 5th Universities Company, 50 men, went forward; on December 19, the American Legion, 100 men, went forward; on December 20, 99 French-Canadians went east to join a regiment in St. Boniface.

Besides those who have gone forward, there was the 63rd Battalion, with a base company in the city numbering 1,132 men. It transferred to the Pioneers 35 men, and to the 50th Battalion 23 men. There was also the 66th Battalion with a base company, numbering 1,136, and it transferred to the Pioneers 50, and to the Artillery 10 men. In addition there was the 51st Battalion, with a base company, 1,263 men, and it transferred to the Pioneers 35 men and to the Artillery 10. There were also the 138th Battalion, 1,050 men; the 151st Battalion, 1,050 men; the 194th Highlanders (authorized) 1,050 men—this battalion is not up to strength yet—and a battalion to be raised by Lt. Col. Bowen, 1,050 men. There have been two other battalions authorized there since. I think this list will show that the only consideration in recruiting seems to have been to get men if they can be got. There has been no effort to distribute the quota throughout the country according to population; no rule at all other than to get the men if they can be got.

Mr. MORPHY: Did some of these men not come from long distances?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, from the northern part of the province.

Mr. MORPHY: So that the recruiting covered a very large territorial area?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes, the men came from all parts of northern Alberta, Edmonton, of course, being the recruiting centre. But even so, according to the Ottawa Journal, the province of Alberta has already recruited some 2,000 more men, according to population, than would be its fair proportion of the 500,000 called for by the Prime Minister last January, and still the recruiting is going on. I am not objecting to that; we are perfectly satisfied that that should be so. But when it is asserted that there has been discrimination used, I want to say that the facts do not bear that contention out.

A further remark which I desire to make is that at the present time there are six battalions recruiting from Northern Alberta with headquarters at Edmonton. I do not consider that it is in the interest of recruiting that there should be so many battalions recruiting at the same time. When two battalions are recruiting at the same time, there may possibly be an element of competition that is good, but when there is a larger number of battalions, all looking for men, it does not tend to secure the best results. I do not think that the department is well advised in having so many battalions recruiting at once. When an authorization is made, and two battalions are recruited up to full strength, let two more be authorized, if that is thought desirable, but to authorize four or five different battalions to recruit at the same time, in a small place and in a thinly populated country, makes the work of the officers who are attending to the recruiting very difficult, much more difficult than if they were permitted to recruit, say, only two battalions at a time. I see the acting minister is not in the House at the present moment, but I would like to hear from him.

The CHAIRMAN: We have sent for him.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The item can stand.

Civil Government—Department of Trade and Commerce—to provide for 16 clerkships in the third division, subdivision "B," Census and Statistics Branch, at $600 each, $9,600.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This item looks as if it involved a large addition to the service, but in reality there is no addition. It simply means that we are putting on the permanent list clerks who, since 1911, have been on the temporary list. These temporary clerks constitute quite a large proportion of the help in the Census and Statistics Department because of the change in character of the work. When compilation ceases these clerks are laid off, and when compilation is at its height the number of clerks is at its maximum. After compilation in connection with the last census ceased the term of service of these temporary clerks came to an end. Amongst them were sixteen of the very best clerks who had become adepts in the working of the different machines and in the peculiar kinds of compilation that are made and what we wish to do now is to put them on the permanent list, so that these experienced and really good hands may be kept in the Census Department for the regular work. Their services will become necessary soon, if not immediately, in connection with the compilation of the Northwest Census, which is to be taken in June. After that there will be sufficient work of a steady and permanent kind to employ them. We do not want to have them dispersed after they have been trained for three or four years, and, when we come to need assistance, be compelled to get fresh hands and train them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understand that these clerks are to be paid at $600 a year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They are put on at the salary which they are getting at the present time, which is $600, and they will go up to $900.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: By regular progression?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: By the regular gradation.

To provide for the development and extension of Canadian trade, $150,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the programme?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is an item which the committee is asked to vote in relation to the programme which I outlined in the House some two weeks ago. A portion of this amount will be used for the extension of trade commissionerships, as they may be required. There is a vote in the main Estimates which is insufficient to accomplish the work which will be neces-

sary during the year 1917, and a portion of this vote will be used for that purpose, but just what portion I do not know; it will depend upon what circumstances demand, and somewhat upon how the war progresses. I think I explained before that we are opening new trade commissionerships in Russia—one at Petrograd, and one at Omsk, in Siberia, with some sub-trade commissionerships in cities tributary to these two centres. These are not very important, however, as the salaries paid to the men are not large, they being correspondents and not regular trade commissioners. Then, we are preparing a trade commissioner for Italy, and in the course of the year he will be ready to take his place and engage in the work there. Then, two other sub-commissioners are being trained for work in other parts, as necessities may develop.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Whereabouts in Italy will the trade commissioner be stationed ?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Of that I am not certain. The trade commission of which I spoke the other day in the House, in the course of its investigations, is to make a short stay in Italy, and we shall be better able to discuss the question of headquarters after we have made some further inquiry, and, possibly, after their return. The trade commissioners will also visit France, Belgium, and the United Kingdom. The commission will consist of six members. It is an honorary commission, but of course their expenses will be paid. There are also to be attached to the commission, for working purposes, a number of representatives of large special interests. These representatives or experts accompany the commissioners in an honorary and unpaid capacity, the interests themselves providing the men. A certain amount of expenses will of course be incurred in connection with this commission, and they will be paid out of the $150,000.

I stated also that it was the intention to form a bureau of commercial information. That will have to be organized, and will take a certain amount of money. It is not the intention of the department to rush into a full-blown bureau of commercial information, but rather to proceed by judicious steps from a small beginning to a greater enlargement afterwards. But a considerable amount of expense will be necessary even to make a small beginning. I am not able to tell the committee just how much will be expended, nor the exact plans on which the work will proceed, although I have the plans fairly well mapped out. A little more consideration, and the advice of experienced men, together with a study of the mode of operating that is followed in other countries, will no doubt have an influence upon the establishment and methods to be pursued. Those who have followed the course of matters incidental to trade and commerce in Great Britain will know that the British Government made a very elaborate selection of articles of German and Austrian production, and collected a very large and representative exhibit. They have been showing that exhibit in the large cities of the United Kingdom for the last eight or nine months. I got into early communication with the Board of Trade in England and have been successful in getting their consent to having the exhibit put into the hands of the Department of Trade and Commerce for Canada. It will be brought out and exhibited in a number of our large cities, and at the Canadian National Exhibition in Toronto, which is held in the latter part of August and the early part of September. In order to exhibit that properly some expenditure will be necessary, and all the expenses in connection with it, from the time it leaves London until it returns there, will of course be borne by Canada, and disbursed by my own department. The object of the exhibit is to show manufacturers and producers in Great Britain and in Canada, as it will be exhibited here, the kind of articles, the quality of the articles, and the cost of the articles which were so largely supplied by German and Austrian producers to Great Britain, and largely also to Canada and all the other overseas Dominions. That exhibit, will come under this vote. The necessity for research work along various lines of production and industry is, I think, perfectly understood and appreciated in Canada. Whilst a good deal has been done in that respect, Canada has suffered as most other countries have, from not having had an eye out in that direction long ago and not having adapted means for linking together more closely than has been done hitherto the laboratory and the research chamber with the practical working out of industrial and productive operations. So it was that the Germans, having given great attention to that, having laid great stress upon it and having understood its necessity in the industrial trade competition, had arrogated

5 p.m.

and gathered to themselves in the years before the war a monopoly of many of the most important processes connected with industrial production. When the war broke out and the connection was changed, Great Britain herself, as almost every other nation, woke up to the fact that invaluable sources and necessities for supplies were monopolized by the country which was now her enemy, and the British manufacturers were left, so to speak, high and dry. The best exemplification of that is what happened in reference to dyestuffs and chemical products connected with textile work. The entire world outside of Germany was thrown into utter and absolute confusion because of the fact that, in the course of the preceding years, a monopoly of that kind of product had gradually been gained by Germany, and when the war broke out, it was almost a complete monopoly. Then again, everyone knows, if they look into and think about the matter, that we probably waste enough in Canada every year to make a very large contribution to the wealth of the country; we waste in many way things which are useful, simply throwing them into the waste heap. What we want is to get concentrated upon all those points the research power of the country, to get it organized, to have it, as it were, mobilized, and to get our attention fixed upon the utilization of waste products which are of inestimable value when chemical and scientific research finds out their qualities and their adaptations, and is able to put them within the power of productive enterprise, so that they become utilized by our manufacturers and confer great wealth and advantage upon the country. In all parts of this country there are more or less of these research resources. Our universities are in part equipped for them—some of them very well equipped; chemical societies and associations are doing their part of the work; individual chemists are at work, and I have in view the idea of linking up to a certain extent with the Bureau of Information these sources of research, having them co-ordinated so that they shall not be overlapping, having some directive power given to them so that when these questions come up, they may undergo the analysis of a competent directive body or committee that shall apportion these different items of research to the university or the laboratory which is best fitted for them. The universities are strongly disposed to enter into a co-operative effort in that respect. We have been in consultation for the last year more or less, and I think it is possible to work out a not very expensive plan by which research work in connection with the different universities of this country, the Chemical Association of Canada, and other laboratory or individual research sources, may be undertaken in such a way that it will enure very much to the benefit of Canada from an industrial point of view. Manufacturers' associations in this country are very much in favour of that co-operative work, and I hope to be able with a part of this vote to assist in that object. Those are the points with reference to which the vote will chiefly be used.

Mr. LOGGIE: I would like to add a word or two to what the minister has said, and I appreciate the points that he has raised. With regard to the dye question, if the minister could in any way hurry up the matter, I am sure it would be in the interest of the commercial life of Canada. I know that if to-day you endeavour to place an order in the textile trade, the trade will ask you, say on an order for cheap flannel, for ten cents per yard extra if it is to be died navy blue; the Dominion Textile Company will tell you that they cannot give you navy blue prints at all, so that it is very important in the interest of the future of Canada that we should be able to provide those dyes within this Empire, and in Canada if that be possible. It may be that the consumption in Canada is not sufficiently large for us to engage in the manufacture of those special dyes, but we may be able to receive them from the United Kingdom or from the United States. We should, however, encourage the manufacture in Canada of those chemical dyes that are required by our textile manufacturers, and I heartily congratulate the minister on the undertaking that he has brought before us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think my hon. friend has opened up a very wide field and one which will prove of very great advantage, but there is something which is as important, if not more important, in regard to everything he has stated just now, and that is technical education. What my hon. friend undertakes to do will certainly produce very good results, but he will find himself balked at almost every step by the want of technical knowledge amongst the population. The Germans have undoubtedly been ahead of every other nation in the application of chemistry to industry; that seems to have been their specialty; in that they have excelled even the Americans, who are supposed to be

the most inventive of all nations. I think the chemical manufacture of dyes was invented by a Frenchman, but it is now exclusively the property of the Germans, and they have applied it to industry in a manner which has not been approached, much less excelled, by any other nation. It has been largely due to their system of technical education. It seems to me that if my hon. friend would supplement what he has done by some scheme of technical education, he would do a great deal toward what he has in mind. I am afraid my hon. friend will have a long time to wait before we have these things in Canada. They are the result of the spread of knowledge, and in that respect we can learn a useful lesson from Germany.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the hon. minister anything to tell us as to the personnel of this commission?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not able to give the names to-day. I have selected the men, and their names, I suppose, are now before the Governor General, but it is not possible to give those names until the Order in Council has been passed. On Monday, however, I shall be able to give the names.

Compassionate allowance to the widow of the late James Barr, deputy grain inspector, who was killed while in the performance of his duties at Canadian Pacific elevator "D," Fort William, Ontario, $1,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This was a particularly hard case. Mr. Barr was for a long time in the employ of the Government as Deputy Grain Inspector. He lost his life by falling and being sucked into the elevator. He leaves a widow and three small children. The usual—or what seems to be the usual—gratuity of $1,000 is recommended here.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Minister of Trade and Commerce told us that on any item of his Estimates we might bring up any subject relating to his department. As this is the last item in these Supplementary Estimates, I desire to ask a question relating to the steamer service between the mainland and the Magdalen islands. A letter that I have received from an old friend in the Magdalen islands, the collector of customs, informs me that the Lady Sybil, a steamer built some years ago expressly for the route between Pictou, Prince Edward Island and Magdalen islands, had been sold. I do not know whether she has been sold to the Admiralty or to some private firm. She rendered excellent service on this route. The statement is made that she is to be replaced by the Amelia. This the people of the Magdalen Islands can hardly believe. Fifteen years ago the Amelia was on the route and was classed as a very inferior steamer. The steamer was partly wrecked, and a number of those on board perished, amongst them the owner himself, Mr. Leslie, formerly member of the local Legislature for the Magdalen Islands. The steamer was afterwards completely discarded; and now we are told that this old steamer is to replace the Lady Sybil which was certainly a credit to the department and to the service. I would urge upon the minister, before signing any contract—or, if the contract is signed before paying any subsidy—to have a proper inspection of the vessel. The route is a rough one, as the hon. minister, who comes from the Maritime Provinces, knows, and it will be dangerous for people to travel on that steamer unless repairs have been made which make her practically a new steamer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Lady Sybil was bought out from the service. I do not know who bought her or where she went. I imagine she commanded a good price and that her owner—and operator for a number of years—came to the conclusion that he could not have a better time than this to dispose of his property. Last year we only kept her by great persuasion as the owner wished to sell her then. But this year no persuasion could persuade, and she is gone. The difficulty was to get any vessel for the route, and for a time I thought we should have to borrow from the Marine and Fisheries the Princess—

Mr. LEMIEUX: She is a good steamer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: However, the Amelia, though out of sight, has not died. Or, at any rate, I believe she has made a complete and successful resurrection. She has been re-formed and re-fitted, and I am told that thus transformed she will be perfectly safe and a perfectly good vessel for the route. It was on these conditions that I entered into the contract for the service.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Under Captain McClure?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not remember the name of the captain.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it the same contractor as in the case of the Lady Sybil?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think not. They are Halifax people, who had the vessel and who have rebuilt her and have put her into what they say is excellent shape. She will be inspected, of course, and if she does not pass the inspection she will not go on. But this seemed the best we could get, and from the information we received I think she will perform the service all right.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That being the case, I have nothing more to say, but I would urge upon my hon. friend to have his eye upon that inspection, because it would be a very serious thing if any accident should happen. Mr. Leslie lost the contract with the Department of Trade and Commerce because he maintained the service with the Amelia, and Captain McClure from Pictou secured the Lady Sybil, which was specially built for that route. The Amelia was discarded and a new contract was entered upon. I hope that my hon. friend will see that the inspection is a good one.

Labour — Industrial Disputes Investigation Act—further amount required, $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend explain what became of his Bill amending the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act?

Mr. CROTHERS: I had a draft Bill prepared about a year ago. A large number of copies were struck off and sent to persons throughout the country who were thought to be specially interested in the proposed amendments. My hon. friend got a copy. I thought that we were suggesting some very practical amendments, which, in the interest of all concerned, should be enacted into law, but the Bill was not introduced this session owing to the fact that some of the suggested amendments were considered controversial and their consideration would take up a good deal of time. I think I asked my hon. friend and some others whether or not they would agree to let the Bill go through with certain amendments, striking out any that they had serious objection to. An arrangement of that kind, however, was not effected, and the Bill was allowed to stand in order not to take up time which it was thought should be devoted to other purposes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How does the question stand with regard to the fair wage clause in munition contracts? I see there has been quite an agitation in the country to extend the fair wage clause to the munition works.

Mr. CROTHERS: The provisions of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act have been extended to all industries in Canada manufacturing munitions of any kind. One reason why I am asking for an additional $5,000 is because I anticipate a larger number of boards of conciliation than there have been heretofore. The fair wage clause, I understand, is not being put in munition contracts. I took the matter up as soon as the war broke out, and I thought I had made an arrangement that such a clause should be inserted in every such contract. In fact, I was promised that that would be done. It was said, however, that a great many of these contracts were executed hurriedly in different parts of the country, sometimes by telegram, and it was not thought practicable to have such clauses put in the contracts. Wherever any dispute has arisen, however, as to wages, or hours, or any other labour conditions, we have inquired into them and effected an adjustment, I think, in every case. There is not that advantage that some seem to think there is in having this clause in the contracts. In the case of the construction of a public building a schedule is prepared by the department, and contractors tendering for the job are supplied with copies of this schedule, so that they know exactly the wages they will have to pay to the different craftsmen employed in erecting the building. But where it is not known where the contract is to be executed; where it is not known whether the tender accepted will be from Vancouver or from Halifax, a general clause is inserted simply requiring that the contractor, in executing the contract, shall pay the wages current in the district in which the contract is being executed. If any dispute arises in such cases we make investigation as to what the current rates are in the district. Although there is no such clause in the contracts for munitions, we take the same course; where any dispute arises we make an investigation as to the current rates of wages in the district where the contract is being carried out. So that we are taking the same course as if a clause of that kind were in the contract, and it works out just as advantageously to the workingman as if this clause had been inserted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can the minister tell me if Mr. Dubreuil, fair wage officer, has been replaced?

Mr. CROTHERS: A gentleman named Narcisse Arcand, of Montreal, was appointed a few weeks ago.

Mr. KNOWLES: Can the hon. minister give us any information as to the views of Mr. Lloyd George on the question of the insertion of the fair wage clause in munition contracts? Is it true that Mr. Lloyd George intimated his willingness that the fair wage clause should be inserted in these contracts?

Mr. CROTHERS: I had no correspondence with Mr. Lloyd George. I understood the Prime Minister to say in the House that Lloyd George was not in favour of having these clauses put in the contracts here in Canada.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the minister give the committee to understand that Mr. Lloyd George is opposed to having this clause inserted in the munition contracts?

Mr. CROTHERS: That is my recollection of what the Prime Minister said in the House here. I am not quite sure that I am right in that, but that is my recollection.

Mr. KNOWLES: My recollection is not the same. The minister follows these things closely; surely he is not depending for his information on what the Prime Minister or any one else says in the House.

Mr. CROTHERS: I know that the Imperial Munitions Board, after inquiring into the matter, and after having, as I understand, some correspondence with Mr. Lloyd George, decided not to put in these clauses. I have that direct from the board.

Mr. KNOWLES: In connection with people in works carried on by the Dominion Government employees, I think the minister was in the House when that matter was discussed. Perhaps the Minister of Labour would give an expression of his opinion on the question which I raised this afternoon of compensation to workmen employed on Government railways and in the Government elevators, workshops, etc., for injuries received in their employment.

Mr. CROTHERS: I quite agree with my hon. friend that those in the employ of this Government should be treated as generously as workmen are treated by private employers. As to the suggestion that they should be paid according to the Compensation Act in force in each particular province, you might find that in one province a man could not recover under the Compensation Act of that province. The Ontario Act has been freed from any objection of that kind but there might be trouble in some other provinces. I think that the basis should be the salary or wages that a man is getting. My hon. friend spoke of the cost of living being higher in the extreme western provinces than in the East, and suggested that that might be taken into account. No rule has been adopted; each case has been considered on its own merits. I do not know of any case where a man has been injured or killed in the exercise of his duty where compensation has not been made if the facts were made known to us.

Mr. KNOWLES: That may be true in the case of death, that a compassionate allowance is always voted; but I refer to cases of injury, such as the loss of fingers.

Mr. CROTHERS: I do not remember anything of that kind.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Workmen's Compensation Act would cover that, and my argument is that the workman should receive as generous treatment from the Government for injury as if he were working for some other person.

Mr. CROTHERS: I quite agree with my hon. friend.

Quebec Harbour—River St. Charles—improvements to navigation, $700,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the nature of the work you are doing in the St. Charles river?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $700,000 is required to carry on improvements, under contract with Messrs. Quinlan and Robertson. They comprise the construction of a concrete dam 1,600 feet long of an average height of 20 feet, and two locks, respectively 450 feet and 350 feet long, by 60 feet wide at the entrance walls, each lock having 15 feet of water on the sill at low water. The dam will have a super-structure of two lines of interlocked sheet piles, the whole back filled with dredged material from the bed of the river. A sluiceway will be placed in the dam with gates to control the water in a pool to be created by the dam. An Order in Council was passed on the 12th of March, 1913, authorizing the acceptance of the tender of Messrs. Quinlan and Robertson, of Montreal, for the construction of two

locks and dam in Quebec harbour, involving at the unit prices quoted therein an approximating expenditure of $1,873.80.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How far has the work advanced?

Mr. ROGERS: Just about one-third of the work has been done.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is the dam completed, or does everything go on together?

Mr. ROGERS: The dam goes rather ahead of the lock, and the dam is not quite completed yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is it expected to have it completed during this season?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. The dam will be completed, but I do not know that all of the work will be completed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This season?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And the whole work will be completed next season?

Mr. ROGERS: I am satisfied it will.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was told by a Quebecker—I do not vouch for the statement myself—that the effect of the dam and the locks would be to flood parts of the riverside, and that the city of Quebec, as a result, would have to change its sewerage system. Is there any correspondence between the department and the city of Quebec on that subject, and if a change has to be made in the sewerage system, will the cost fall upon the Government or upon the city? Perhaps that is a matter of detail with which my hon. friend is not familiar, but it was told to me by a gentleman who is not opposed to the project. He stated that the river St. Charles works were of such a character that the city would ultimately have to pay a very large sum of money to divert the present sewerage system from its present location.

Mr. ROGERS: I have some knowledge of the points the hon. member has mentioned. As a result of this work the question of the sewage of Quebec has been taken up by the engineer of Quebec, and the engineer of the Department of Public Works, and, while I am not clear as to the exact details, I understand that they have arrived at a solution of the matter, the cost, I think, being divided.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Between the city and the department?

Mr. ROGERS: Between the city and the department. I have not heard of any differences or conflicting views on the part of the engineers. I have not before me the exact arrangement, but I would be very glad to furnish it to my right hon. friend if he so desires.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has the department not had the same trouble at Winnipeg in consequence of the dam at St. Andrew's rapids?

Mr. ROGERS: We have had to a greater or less extent. We had to do a considerable amount of dredging by reason of the filling in at Red river, and in connection with the sewage, too, to some extent. We have had practically the same difficulty there; the Government did the dredging and relieved the conditions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would be interested to know what is the arrangement which has been arrived at by the engineer of the city of Quebec and the engineer of the department. To a layman like myself there seems to be no solution possible. The sewage cannot be diverted; it has to go into the St. Charles river because of the conformation of the land on which the city rests. The flow of the tide being obstructed, as it must be by the dam, as stated in the memorandum read by my hon. friend, a pool will be created which must collect all the sewage and all the mud that comes up from the river. I do not know how this can be overcome in any way.

Mr. ROGERS: I will be very glad to send the correspondence and everything we have in the department pertaining to the matter to my hon. friend.

Mr. TURRIFF: Where the Government undertakes such a work as this and interferes with the sewage of a large city like Quebec, on what grounds does it expect that city, or any other city in a similar position, to pay part of the extra cost caused by the action of the Government? It does not seem to me to be fair to the city.

Mr. ROGERS: Of course, the ultimate completion of the work will be a great improvement in the district. It is a work which is regarded as being of great advantage to the city of Quebec.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: There is an item of $1,200 in the Main Estimates for repairs to the wharf at Broad Cove Marsh.

I would like to know the nature of this work.

Mr. ROGERS: The amount of $1,200 is asked for by District Engineer Bernasconi to repair the wharf which was seriously damaged by a severe northwesterly storm. Assistant District Engineer McKean reported on October 9, 1915, as follows:

On October 2nd last I made an examination of the breakwater at Broad Cove Marsh, Inverness county, and found that it had been seriously damaged by a severe north-westerly storm and extra high tide which occurred previous to my visit. On August 20th last, I reported on this work as requiring $500 to place it in good condition. Now it will require $1,200 made up as follows: 320 cubic yards stone ballast, $192; 6,000 feet B.M. 3-inch covering, $150; 1,000 feet B.M. curb timber, $30; 3,000 fenders, $90; 400 lineal feet logs, $80; 50 piles, $200; 400 stringers, $80; 200 braces, $40; 500 pounds iron, $25; labour, $200; omissions and contingencies, $113; total, $1,200.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: Has any part of that amount been spent yet?

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing has been spent yet.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I would like the minister to see that this work is done in the proper season. It appears that all the repairs in the county of Inverness are attended to in the fall of the year. It is an eyesore to see men repairing public works of this kind in November, when the climatic conditions are so bad. They cannot do the work effectively, and the result is that the department does not get value for its money. Very often the men cannot work more than five or six hours a day, and sometimes they cannot even work one hour a day. This occurred last year and the year before; I speak from personal observation. I approve of these repairs. They are very necessary because the wharf is in very bad shape.

Mr. ROGERS: The deputy informs me that the work will go on as soon as possible.

Mr. CHISHOLM: There is an item for Inverness Harbour, $15,000. Is it the intention to spend this amount this year, and what is the nature of the work?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not expect that we shall find it necessary to go on with that this year.

Mr. TURRIFF: What does the minister propose to do in connection with Victoria harbour? There has been an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee, and from the evidence adduced it would appear that over-payments have been made to a considerable extent, and that claims are in from the contractors for still larger amounts. According to the evidence given by the officers of the department, the amount of rock taken out was many times greater than the amount of rock there was to be taken out. I would like to know what the minister proposes to do in connection with that work.

Mr. ROGERS: If my hon. friend has followed the evidence of the Public Accounts Committee he will have a knowledge of the facts. The engineer gave estimates for a greater quantity of rock to be taken out than had actually been taken out; at least that is the charge. So far as that is concerned, we are entirely protected. In the department we have ample funds in the shape of drawbacks and deposits to cover the loss. We have withheld a considerable sum of money and there will not be the loss of a dollar to the country in connection with the matter which has been before the Public Accounts Committee. When we first heard of the possibility of there being an over-estimate, Mr. Valiquette was sent out to British Columbia to investigate, and he did so. He reported that he did not think there had been any over-payment. There was still some doubt, and Mr. St. Laurent was sent out to make a further investigation. He went very carefully into all the circumstances, and his report went to show that there was a certain over-payment in connection with rock. But, whatever the over-payment, the department is amply protected, and will continue to be protected against over-payment on every classification.

Mr. TURRIFF: What amount of rock will be paid for?

Mr. ROGERS: We have turned the matter over to the Exchequer Court, to adjust the differences between the engineers.

Public Works—French River—extension of breakwater pier, $2,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: There are so many French rivers in Nova Scotia that I am wondering whether this is the one in my county.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, it is. This vote of $2,000 is required for the construction of a breakwater 100 feet long, and from 16 to 20 feet wide. The district engineer estimates the cost as follows: 16,200 feet of cribwork at 10 cents, $1,620.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is that to stand for this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the same remark apply to the wharf at Plaster Mines?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it proposed to go on with the boat harbour at Cape Dauphin this year?

Mr. ROGERS: We do not expect to go on with that this year.

Victoria harbour improvements, $1,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER: What is the proposed total expenditure at Victoria Harbour?

Mr. ROGERS: The contract with Sir John Jackson for the breakwater amounts to $1,797,000. The work has not been completed yet.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think it was originally proposed to spend a larger amount than that for the harbour improvements there.

Mr. ROGERS: Besides the contract with Sir John Jackson there is the contract with Grant, Smith and Company, Limited, and Macdonnell for $2,444,000, for the construction of wharves.

Progress reported.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I believe it is the desire of members on both sides of the House that we should not sit this evening.

Several hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden, the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Monday, May 8, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the deputy speaker in the Chair.

PRIVATE ADOLPHE GRENIER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: I wish to call the attention of the Prime Minister, who is also Acting Minister of Militia, to a case that has been placed before me by the Rev. J. O. Dubé, parish priest of St. Godefroy, in the county of Bonaventure, relating to Private Adolphe Grenier No. 416278, of the 24th, formerly 41st Overseas Battalion. This is rather an unusual case. This young man, 20 years of age, enlisted in Hull on February 18, 1915, and was reported on the 13th of March last as having been "killed in action March 3rd." On attestation the name and address of the next of kin were not stated. He was the adopted son of Pierre LeCourtois and his wife, Genevieve Roussy. These people took him when he was two months old, and brought him up until he was 20 years of age. Last year he happened to be in Hull working for a lumber firm, and he enlisted there and went to the front. He gave on enlistment the name of Adolphe Grenier, presuming that this was the name of his father, although he had been brought up by these two persons whom I have mentioned, who are very humble fishing folks. The question now arises who will succeed to whatever balance of pay has been left by him, and an insurance policy of $1,000 which he has referred to in two scraps of letters which I have in my hand. One of these is written in lead pencil and in it he says he is taking out an insurance policy on behalf of his adopted mother. There is a second letter, dated 12 August, 1915, in which he bids her a fond farewell on the eve of going into action, and hopes he will be able to get through all right, but if he does not he leaves everything to her. It is rather a pathetic letter, and looks as if he had a premonition of his fate. He refers to the sacrifice he is about to make for his Mother Country, England and Canada, and for all the citizens of this country. In addition to this, there is a letter, which I think worth reading, from the commanding officer of the corps to which this young man belonged:

Flanders, 19/3/16.

Dear Mr. Grenier:

Ere this letter reaches you, you will no doubt have heard from the department at Ottawa of the death of your son.

As his Commanding Officer I desire to place on record my appreciation of the faithful and efficient services which he has rendered and which has been an inspiration to all ranks.

I count it a great honour to have in my battalion quite a number of French Canadian soldiers, and they have all been looked upon by my officers and myself as the mainstay of the section to which they belong.

If at any time I can be of service to you, please write me, and if spared, I shall be only too glad to do anything I can to show my deep appreciation of the good work done by your son.

On behalf of my officers, N.C.O.'s and men, I extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Believe me,
Yours sincerely,

J. H. Gunn, Lt.-Col.

From this correspondence, which the reverend gentleman has sent to me, I see that the officer in charge of the estates of deceased soldiers says that it may take about four or five months before the department will be in a position to deal with the case. The reverend gentleman calls attention to the unusual circumstances that no kin are referred to in the attestation. He was the adopted son of these people; and by these letters, which evidently are a testament, whatever legal value they may have, he has left all that belonged to him to his adopted mother, Mrs. Pierre Le-Courtois.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is a matter that will, of course, come under the consideration of the branch of the Department of Militia and Defence which is charged with the duty of making any necessary arrangements with regard to the estates of deceased soldiers. I hope my hon. friend will get into communication with the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, whose attention I shall direct to his request. I am sure that we all join in the sympathy which is expressed by the commanding officer on behalf of himself and the non-commissioned officers and men of the regiment, and in the appreciation which they also express with regard to the gallantry of this young man.

PRICE OF CODFISH IN PORTUGAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LOGGIE: I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce a matter which I deem important. I have here a letter dated Oporto, 19th April, 1916. I need not read the whole letter. The concluding paragraph is as follows:

> Owing to the high prices to which food has risen in this country, due in great measure to the low exchange, the Government recently appointed Food Commissioners to study the question. Yesterday a law came into force fixing arbitrary maximum prices for codfish considerably below the prices at which we have been selling, these being already below what shippers require for their fish. The law mentions codfish but does not specify the origin. We are therefore in doubt as to whether it applies to imported fish or only to the Portuguese cure. In the meantime we have closed all our stores and have applied to the Civil Governor for a definition of the codfish coming within the decree. We have also made representations of our case to the British minister at Lisbon.

I shall hand this letter to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and ask him to take such action as he thinks in the interest of Canada.

PAYMENTS TO SOLDIERS' RELATIVES.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. PUGSLEY: May I ask the Acting Minister of Militia, who has special charge of the payment over of the portion of the pay of soldiers which may be assigned by them to their relatives? The reason I ask is that I have a very strong letter relating to the case of a young man—and the gentleman who wrote me thinks there are quite a number of similar instances—who arranged that a portion of his pay should go to his mother. The young man is now in England having been wounded; but the information which I have is that for five months no pay has been received by the mother. I cannot help thinking there is some explanation. I hesitate to read the letter to the House, and perhaps I had better send a copy to the Prime Minister.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Accountant Paymaster General in Ottawa would give to my hon. friend all information which would make it possible for him to communicate with those who have charge of the matter. There is an overseas paymaster, whose relation to the paymaster at headquarters here is that of district paymaster, I think. I shall endeavour to direct their attention to the matter, and if my hon. friend will send the information in his possession to the Accountant Paymaster General of the Department of Militia and Defence, it will receive attention here, or will be put in train to receive attention on the other side.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will send a copy of the letter to my right hon. friend.

ST. BERNARD—ST. MAXIME MAIL CONTRACT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I call the attention of the Postmaster General to a telegram I have received and regarding which I have been asked to place a question on the Order Paper; but, as I presume time is limited now, the Postmaster General might give me the information to-morrow. I wish to know the names of the tenderers and the terms of the contract for the carriage of the mails between St. Bernard and St. Maxime de Scotts in Dorchester county.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 96, for the relief of David Whimster Rhodes.—Mr. Boys.

SENATE AMENDMENTS.

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 31, to incorporate the Eastern Canadian Union Conference Corporation of the Seventh-Day Adventists—Mr. Smith—further considered.

Mr. SMITH: This Bill passed the House of Commons some days ago and was sent to the Senate, and then to their Private Bills Committee. A few amendments were suggested and adopted, and now the Bill has come back to this House. All the amendments were agreed to by those interested in the Bill.

Amendments concurred in.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 100, to incorporate the Manitoba-Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. J. E. Armstrong.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

BRITISH COLUMBIA COMPANIES ACT.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Has the Provincial Act, passed by the Legislature of British Columbia obliging Joint Stock Companies operating under letters patent granted by the Federal Government to register in British Columbia and pay a license fee to the Government of that province in order to do business there, been declared ultra vires by a judgment of the Privy Council?

2. If so, have the fees illegally collected by the Government of British Columbia been refunded to the companies who obeyed the provisions of the said Act?

3. If not, is it the intention of the Government to use its good offices to induce the Provincial Government of British Columbia to refund the moneys so collected, and thus save to the Joint Stock Companies interested the trouble and costs of litigation in connection with the matter?

1. This depends upon the interpretation of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the John Deere Plow Company vs. Wharton, 1915 Appeal Cases, 230. Their lordships held in terms that those provisions of the Companies Act of British Columbia which were relied on in that case as compelling the appellant company to obtain a provincial license of the kind about which the controversy had arisen, or to be registered in the province, as a condition of exercising its powers or of suing in the courts, are inoperative for these purposes.

2. The Government has no information.

3. If it be determined that the provincial Government is liable to refund these moneys it would presumably discharge its liability. There does not appear to be any case at present for the exercise of good offices.

AMHERST, SYDNEY, AND NEW GLASGOW POSTAL REVENUE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What was the postal revenue in the towns of Amherst, Sydney and New Glasgow for the year ending December 31, 1915?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Gross postal revenue—Amherst, $36,088.43; New Glasgow, $27,294.87; Sydney, $39,773.81.

JOLIETTE POST OFFICE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What has been the total cost of the improvements made in the Joliette post office?

2. Was the work done by contract?

3. Who were the tenderers, and what was the figure of each tender?

4. To whom was the contract awarded, and for what sum?

5. Were any changes made in the original contract, and were any extras paid for such changes? If so, what were the amounts of such extras and to whom were they paid?

6. Were the wages paid to the workmen by the contractor according to the scale of salaries established by law?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $36,959.75 paid to date.

2. Yes.

3. Jos. Archambault & Co., $29,945. Jos. Lalonde and C. B. Lafleur Fils, Ltd., $32,150. A. Durand, $38,777. D. A. Dostaler, $49,167.

4. Jos. Archambault & Co., $29,945.

5. Several changes were made in the contract and executed by the contractors, Messrs. Jos. Archambault & Co., as follows:

Changes to tower	$2,625
Steel beams and columns on first floor.	296
Repairs to top part of front wall, filling in around windows, alterations in janitor's quarters and basement	537
Removal of stone fence	12
New doorway in cellar	15
Alterations to heating apparatus	180
Ladders to clock tower	4
Door and frame, stairs to caretaker's quarters	18
Alterations to radiation on first floor and the graining of woodwork around main door and stairs	40
Additional electric lights, etc	16
Total	$3,743

Contract for fittings awarded to the lowest tenderers, Scnell & Co., 4,289 and $185 for additional work.

6. Yes, so far as the department is aware, as no complaints have been received to the contrary.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES IN JOLIETTE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. How much does the Government pay in rent in the town of Joliette for the excise offices, the customs, the Inspector of Weights and Measures, and of the Post Office Inspector?
2. To whom are such amounts paid, and what is the amount for each particular lease?
3. For what reason were the excise, customs and inspection of weights and measures offices, which had been in the old post office building at Joliette, transferred to outside buildings, which the Government leased after the post office had been enlarged at great cost?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. The Government did pay, up to 1st May, the following for temporary quarters while improvements and additions to building were being made:

For excise offices to J. C. Rivest, $24 per month. For customs offices to J. M. and J. A. Chaput, $50 per month. For post office inspectors offices to Amanda Dauphin, $22 per month; this lease will be extended temporarily as to the space alloted to the post office inspector is required by the Department of Customs. The Weights and Measures occupy premises rented from J. A. Preville estate on a lease from 22nd January, 1913, to 22nd January, 1914, at a rental of $264 per annum.

3. The building is not yet completed, but was sufficiently far advanced before the 1st of May to move from temporary quarters into the public building.

CARLSLAKE HOTEL PROPERTY.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What was the total award by the Exchequer Court for the Carslake Hotel property in Montreal?
2. What amount has been paid?
3. What were the dates of payment and the amounts on each date?
4. (a) Has any amount been paid since the case was appealed to the Supreme Court, and (b) is that appeal still pending?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $288,250 with interest on $68,750 from 15th October, 1914, and interest on $45,000 from 15th October to 3rd December, 1914.

2. $22,000.

3. 15th August, 1914, $175,000; 21st November, 1914, $45,000; total, $220,000.

4. (a) No; (b) yes.

[Mr. Rogers.]

SALE OF LEE-ENFIELD RIFLES.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many Lee-Enfield rifles have been sold by the Government since October 1, 1911?
2. To whom were they sold?
3. What price was received for the rifles sold?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. A number of rifles was sold to the Government of New Zealand between the 20th August and the 22nd of December, 1913, and a few to the Dominion Police.

2. They were sold, as I have said, to the Government of New Zealand the Commissioner of Dominion Police.

3. The total amount realized was $15,150.

D'ISRAELI GOVERNMENT WHARF.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Were any repairs made to the Government wharf at D'Israeli, Quebec, in the year 1915?
2. If so, was the work done by contract or day labour?
3. If by contract, who was the contractor, and how much money did he receive for the work?
4. If by day labour, who was the overseer, how many days was he employed, and what wage per day did he receive?
5. How much lumber was used, from whom was it purchased and at what price per thousand feet?
6. What was the total amount expended on said wharf during the year 1915?
7. Were any tenders invited for said repairs?
8. What are the names of the different tenderers and the amount of each tender?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2. Day labour.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Joseph Lemieux, 38½ days at $3 per day, 17th June-31st July, 1915.

5. J. H. Parent, D'Israeli. 13,435 feet plank, 10 x 12, at $18, $241.82; 28,721 feet, 12 x 12, at $19, $545.69; 5,031 feet, 12 x 12, at $23, $115.70; total, $903.21.

6. $2,174.41.

7 and 8. Answered by No. 2.

BROMPTONVILLE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Who is the mail carrier on the rural mail route known as Bromptonville No. 2?
2. What salary does he receive?
3. When was the contract awarded?
4. Were tenders called for?? If so, who were the different tenderers and the amount of their respective tenders?
5. Was the present carrier's first tender the lowest one received, or was it subsequently reduced?
6. Has any change been made in the said route since the contract was awarded?
7. If so, has the contract price been increased owing to said change?
8. Why was not the contract given to the lowest original tenderer?

9. Who recommended that the present carrier be allowed to present a second and lower tender?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Gedeon Hains.
2. $695.
3. April 7, 1915.
4. Yes. Honoré Liberge Bromptonville, $700; Oscar Bachand, Bromptonville, $750; Gédéon Hains, Bromptonville, $790; Gédéon Boisvert, Cote St. Joseph, $1,000; David Richards, Sherbrooke No. 3 $1,100.
5. Gédéon Hains' offer was the lowest received.

6 and 7. On the 25th November a rearrangement, involving an additional travel of three miles per trip was effected, the contractor being paid on a pro rata basis for the extra work, as provided in the contract.

8 and 9. After Gédéon Hains had sent in his tender, he offered, through Dr. John Hayes, to perform the contract for $695 per annum, which offer was accepted.

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. Turgeon.—For a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams relating to the dismissal of Augustin D. Lanteigne as postmaster of Island River, Gloucester county, N.B.

CANADIAN NORTHERN AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAYS.

PROPOSED LOANS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of the opportunity afforded by this motion to make a statement respecting the proposed loans of $8,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and $15,000,000 to the Canadian Northern Railway, which are contained in the Supplementary Estimates recently presented to the House, and also respecting the policy of the Government regarding the general railway situation of Canada. The loans in question are, in the view of the Government, necessitated from considerations of public interest by reason of the critical position of the financial affairs of these two companies. The House will recall that two years ago legislation was passed by Parliament under which, by a guarantee of securities, aid was afforded to the two companies for the purpose of the completion of their enterprises. It was the view at that time that the proceeds of the securities so guaranteed, amounting to $45,000,000 in the case of the Canadian Northern and $16,000,000 in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific would be sufficient for the purposes which were had in view. Within a few weeks after the legislation had been passed, and almost immediately after the completion and execution of the two trust deeds securing the issues of securities to which I have referred, war broke out. The immediate effect of the war, and its indirect result upon business and finance, was to close the London market, and indeed the markets of the world, to the issue of further securities except those of governments for the purpose of the prosecution of the war. In order that the intention of Parliament, as evidenced by the legislation to which I have referred, might be carried out, and the work upon these two Transcontinental railway systems continued, the Dominion Government made loans in Dominion notes upon a portion of the guaranteed securities. The amount advanced to the Canadian Northern Railway Company was $10,000,000, and the amount advanced to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was $6,000,000. In the case of the Canadian Northern loan of $10,000,000 security was taken to the amount of $12,500,000 of its guaranteed securities. and in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific, railway security was taken to the amount of $7,500,000 of its guaranteed securities. These loans were made and the transactions in question were subsequently ratified by Parliament. It was felt at the time that it was in the national interest that these two undertakings upon which so much public money had been expended, should be pushed to completion.

I may say that when war broke out it was the expectation of many that a few months would witness its termination, and it was hoped that the dislocation of business, and the derangement of world finance which ensued upon its outbreak, would consequently be of only temporary duration. These hopes and expectations have been disappointed, the war having increased in magnitude and intensity since its outbreak with no prospect, so far as one can see at the present time, of its early conclusion; indeed, all the indications seem to point rather to an indefinite prolongation of the great struggle in which we are engaged.

The war has affected the two great railway companies in question in two ways; in the first place they were both obliged to dispose of their securities, including the guaranteed securities which I have mentioned, at a lower price than they would have been able to realize had the war not broken out. There has been a material shrinkage in the case of guaranteed securities. It will

be recalled by the House that, in addition to the $45,000,000 of guaranteed securities, the Canadian Northern Railway Company had some $55,000,000 of further securities, which were to be marketed and the proceeds devoted to the completion of its enterprise. As market conditions have been, the Canadian Northern Railway Company has not been able to realize within $10,500,000 of the amount which it expected to realize under the prices which prevailed prior to the outbreak of the war. The first year of the war, by reason of the interruption to general business, saw a great falling off in the earnings of all the railway systems of Canada. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the premier railway system of the Dominion, there was a drop in gross earnings from $130,000,000 to $99,000,000, a reduction of about 25 per cent. In the case of the net earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, there was a drop of about the same percentage, from $42,000,000 to $33,000,000. On account of the abundant crop, particularly in the West, railway earnings during the past year have been considerably improved, but in this connection it is to be borne in mind that we had, particularly in the Western part of Canada, a winter of unusual severity, and the operating expenses of all railways have in consequence been greatly increased over the ordinary. As a result of these conditions the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have been unable to market their securities at the prices which they expected to realize at the time the legislation guaranteeing the issue of $45,000,000 and $16,000,000 respectively was passed. There was also, as I stated, a reduction in earnings for the first year after the outbreak of the war over what they might have hoped to obtain had peace conditions prevailed. In addition, by reason of the difficulties of finance brought about by the war, there was delay in completion of the work which the two railway companies had in view. In the case of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, the through service was linked up only last December, a delay of nearly a year over the period which that company had in view previous to the outbreak of the war.

In these conditions the affairs of these two railway companies, which have been so largely aided by the public credit, have given the Government considerable anxiety for many months past. With improving financial conditions and with better earnings in prospect, it was hoped that no material assistance would be required in addition to the aid which was given in 1914; but it is now clear, from the statements presented by the railway companies in question, which statements I have laid upon the table of the House, from the financial conditions which still prevail, and from the fact that the war is still raging, that relief is absolutely necessary if these two railway companies are to continue as solvent going concerns. It has been the policy of the Government since the outbreak of the war to maintain stability and to promote confidence in the financial and economic situation of Canada. We have, therefore, as I have stated, looked with growing concern upon the financial position of these two great transcontinental enterprises whose affairs have become so intimately connected with the public credit both of the Dominion and of the provinces of Canada. Securities to the amount of several hundred millions of dollars have been issued by both these companies and have found their way into the hands of investors in Great Britain, the United States, and Europe. Any financial crisis in their affairs could not but react seriously upon the general credit of the Dominion in the eyes of the outside world.

Without further elaborating these points, which are, I think, sufficiently within the knowledge of the House, I desire to refer briefly to the present financial position of these two railway companies. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is now completed from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert. That company has issued securities guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada to the amount, in round figures, of $78,000,000. In addition, loans have been made by the Dominion Government, under this and the preceding Administration, to an amount of $25,000,000, making a total of Dominion guarantees and Dominion loans of an amount exceeding $100,000,000. In addition, the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta have given their guarantees in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, which is a subsidiary of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to the amount of $13,000,000; so that, in round figures, the position, so far as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is concerned, is that it has outstanding securities guaranteed by the Dominion Government to the extent of $78,000,000; it has obtained loans from the Dominion Government to the amount of $25,000,000, and the Grand Trunk

Pacific Branch Lines Company has issued securities to the amount of $13,000,000, guaranteed by the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Therefore in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, the public credit of the Dominion and of the two provinces in question is involved to the extent of no less a sum than $115,000,000. In addition to the guarantees which have been given by the Dominion Government and by the Provincial Governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta upon the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and its subsidiary companies, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada has guaranteed additional securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to a total amount of $97,000,000.

The House is, no doubt, aware that it has been by the conjunction of the credit of the Dominion Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has been enabled to pursue its enterprise to completion. In addition to the $97,000,000 to which I have already referred as guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, that company has made advances to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company and to the Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company, the latter being also a subsidiary company of the Grand Trunk Pacific, an amount exceeding $25,000,000, for which it holds the notes of the companies in question, and a comparatively small amount, I think $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 of the securities of the Grand Trunk Branch Lines Company which, as I stated, are guaranteed by the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is, of course, a powerful corporation. But in common with all other companies, it has experienced and is still experiencing the adverse financial conditions produced by the war. It finds itself now, from considerations affecting its credit, unable to extend further aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company whose securities it has guaranteed to the amount I have stated and to which and its subsidiary companies it has made these advances exceeding $25,000,000. This is all the more the case because of the virtual closing of the London market to all new issues. In addition, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada finds itself confronted with the necessity of providing for betterments, improvements and terminal facilities involving the expenditure of large sums of money, upon its own system throughout Canada. I have stated that from considerations affecting its credit the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada finds itself unable to extend further aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or its subsidiaries; and in that connection I desire to read extracts from the letters of Mr. Alfred W. Smithers, chairman of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, which are published in the financial statements relating to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company which I laid upon the Table, and copies of which have been distributed to members of the House. Mr. Smithers says:

> Under present circumstances it is quite impossible for the Grand Trunk Railway Company to meet the extra liabilities arising from the Grand Trunk Pacific railway.

And further:

> We have done our utmost to meet the heavy financing which has been necessary, and the difficulty of which has been immensely increased by the disastrous war conditions. We are now "at the end of our tether" with regard to Grand Trunk Pacific financing.
>
> The first Grand Trunk Pacific payments for interest after the 1st January next will become due on the 1st March, and amount to just under $1,000,000, and there is no prospect of our being able to meet that payment.

And he goes on to say:

> The railway situation in Canada is a serious one, and any default on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company might lead to grave consequences as to the general financial position in Canada. The Board believe this danger will pass away if the Government accept their proposal, thus saving the general situation, and enabling the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as I have already explained, to fulfil its duty to the public.

From the figures I have given and the statements I have made it will be seen that the credit and standing of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada are vitally bound up with the condition confronting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway is now out of the construction stage. I desire to say a word concerning its financial position. Its fixed charges for the present year amount to $7,200,000, representing, of course, the interest upon its securities. To this must be added a deficit on operating account and for maintenance and exceptional repairs of $2,000,000, making a total exceeding $9,000,000 of a deficit expected upon the operations of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for

the coming year. In addition, I should state to the House that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada are in arrears of interest payments to the Dominion Government upon the loan of $25,000,000 made to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company by the Government. The amount of such arrears on the 1st of April last was $1,350,000. I have laid upon the table of the House a statement, signed by the Vice-President and Treasurer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, showing the details of the totals which I have mentioned. In a word, the position is this: Expected deficit upon operation and fixed charges for the coming year, $9,000,000; arrears of interest to the Dominion Government, $1,350,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Do these arrears take you to the end of the current year?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There are actual arrears of $1,350,000. I should point out here that, under the agreement of 1903 between the Dominion Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, the Dominion Government will be called upon this year to pay, without recourse, interest upon the bonds of the Mountain Division. The House will recollect that, under that agreement, for a period of seven years the Dominion Government is obligated without recourse to pay interest on the bonds issued in respect of the mountain section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. For the interest charges of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company the Dominion Government is responsible under its guarantees to the amount of $2,400,000 per annum. The interest charges for which the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada are responsible amount to about $4,000,000.

From the statement which I have made, it will be apparent that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is not only earning no portion of its fixed charges but that there is a large deficit on operating account.

Mr. GRAHAM: If in keeping with his argument, would my hon. friend divide the mountain and prairie sections in regard to operating expenses. In other words, does the prairie section pay its way, and is the deficit altogether on the mountain section?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think neither section pays its way. I have not the exact figures before me, but I can give them to my hon. friend when we are in the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The statement shows the net earnings of the prairie division to be $600,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not before me the operating expenses, and I am unable to say whether the earnings are sufficient to take care of the operating expenses and any portion of the fixed charges.

Mr. PUGSLEY: These are the net earnings after providing for operating expenses.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Then the position would be that the prairie section would earn $600,000 in excess of its operating expenses and would not be able to pay, except to the extent of $600,000, its fixed charges. But, as I have stated, taking the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in respect of that portion of the line from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert, not only is it earning no portion of its fixed charges, but there is a large deficit on operating account. The amount which would have to be provided in respect of such deficit, fixed charges and repairs, will aggregate, as I have stated, $9,000,000 per annum. In considering the future of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company it must be borne in mind that in addition to the deficit upon operating account and the amount which must be provided for fixed charges, there must be taken into consideration improvements, betterments and rolling stock which will be required for the carrying on of the enterprise. Those, I am advised by the Railway Department, would amount to three, four, possibly five million dollars, after a year or two.

3 p.m.

I come now to the position of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, the net earnings amounted to $6,000,000. For the present fiscal year, which ends June 30, 1916, the estimate is about $9,000,000. That estimate is based upon actual earnings and expenditure to the end of March, which is the latest date at which the figures are available. I pointed out to the House that the Canadian Northern Railway Company have failed to realise within $10,500,000 of the amount which they expected to realise upon the guaranteed and other securities which they had in 1914, when legislation was passed by Parliament granting the guarantee of $45,000,000. The fixed

charges upon the Canadian Northern Railway system aggregate about $15,000,000, in round figures. When I say the Canadian Northern Railway system, I am including the constituent and subsidiary companies. For the past two years, since the passing of the legislation in question, the net earnings of the Canadian Northern system have been applied to two purposes, namely, the payment of interest upon securities—that is to say, fixed charges—and payments on construction account. That is to say, they have been applied to the extent that they were available, because the fixed charges and the shortage upon construction account have exceeded the amount of net earnings which they had available to apply. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that under the legislation by which a guarantee of $35,000,000 was given in 1911 upon the securities of the Canadian Northern Ontario, and by the legislation under which a guarantee was given in 1914 upon $45,000,000 of securities of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, provision was made that the railway company might call upon the Dominion Government for a period of three years to pay the interest upon the securities and to add the amount so paid to the mortgage indebtedness. That legislation will be called into effect this year. So that from the end of the present fiscal year, that is to say, from July 1, forward, the Canadian Northern Railway Company will call upon the Dominion Government, and also upon the Government of the province of British Columbia—because there is similar legislation affecting the guarantee given by the province of British Columbia—to provide the sum of about $4,500,000 towards the payment of interest upon guaranteed securities, that is to say, the $35,000,000 of guaranteed securities, the $45,000,000 of guaranteed securities, and the securities guaranteed by the province of British Columbia under legislation of that province. Therefore, for the next fiscal year the fixed charges of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, in so far as they have a bearing upon the financing of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, will be reduced to about $11,000,000. The Canadian Northern Railway Company has a total outstanding funded debt of $383,000,000. Of this amount the Dominion Government has guaranteed $104,000,000 of securities.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is on the entire system?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The total Dominion guarantees in respect of the Canadian Northern Railway system aggregate $104,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I mean the outstanding indebtedness; that is for the whole system?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: For the whole system. There has in addition been guaranteed by the provinces of Canada no less an amount than $107,000,000 of securities of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Of this amount Ontario has guaranteed $8,000,000, Manitoba has guaranteed $25,500,000, Saskatchewan has guaranteed $15,000,000, Alberta has guaranteed $19,000,000, and British Columbia has guaranteed $40,000,000, making a total, as I have said, in round figures, of $107,000,000 of the securities of the Canadian Northern Railway system guaranteed by the provinces of Canada. Taking the two together, the Dominion and the provinces, the total guarantees aggregate $211,000,000. So that, Mr. Speaker, the position is that the public credit of the Dominion and of the provinces is now involved to the extent of $211,000,000 with the enterprise of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. In addition to the guaranteed securities which I have mentioned and which aggregate $211,000,000, unguaranteed securities are outstanding amounting to $147,000,000. In addition, there is income convertible debenture stock amounting to $25,000,000, making the total which I mentioned first, $383,000,000, as the total outstanding funded debt of the Canadian Northern Railway system. To this must be added the principal of equipment securities which have been issued, instalments of which mature from time to time. The total principal so outstanding amounts to $17,000,000. Although the securities which are pledged against them are contained in the total of outstanding securities which I have mentioned, there are temporary loans and obligations current amounting to $92,000,000. I have laid on the Table of the House a statement certified by the auditors of the company, Messrs. Webb, Read, Hegan, Callingham and Company, showing the details of the temporary loans and current obligations aggregating $92,000,000 as I have stated.

I may say to the House that the reason why there are so many temporary loans and current obligations is that since the outbreak of the war it has not been possible, at least until very recently, to sell long date securities, and the financing

which has had to be pursued by railway and other companies has consisted in pledging securities and issuing against them short date notes of one or two years' maturity. The Canadian Northern Railway Company officials assume that they will be able to renew the short date loans appearing in the statement, or to procure new loans to take their places; but if they do not receive assistance in respect of their current obligations they will not be able to carry through the year.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Would the minister explain item 2, on page 8, Dominion Government loan Canadian Northern railway 4 per cent debenture stock (Dominion guarantee).

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In the fall of 1914, when the markets of the world were closed, the Dominion Government made two loans in Dominion notes, one of $10,000,000 to the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and one of $6,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, upon the security respectively of $12,500,000 Canadian Northern securities, guaranteed by the Dominion Government, and $7,500,000 securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, guaranteed by the Dominion Government.

Mr. MACDONALD: What legislation?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There was no existing legislation, but at the next session of Parliament the transactions were ratified. The estimate is that the minimum assistance upon which the Canadian Northern Railway Company will be able to make arrangements to finance during the coming year is $15,000,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Would the minister please state just what that $15,000,000 will be used for?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend does not mind, I shall take that matter up when we are in committee. The general statement as to the purposes for which the $15,000,000 is to be used is this: For expenditures made or indebtedness incurred to meet interest payments maturing due upon securities in priority to the securities of $45,000,000 guaranteed by the Dominion Government under the legislation of 1914; to meet instalments of equipment bonds and on construction account. The minimum assistance with which they estimate they can continue to finance during the year is $15,000,000.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The minister said it would take $15,000,000 to pay the interest charges, that is $4,500,000 on the $45,000,000 and the $35,000,000. That would leave about $11,000,000. What does he estimate the net earnings of the system at June 30, 1916?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In the neighbourhood of $11,000,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Then there would be no deficit.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is the estimate.

Mr. BENNETT: Then why do you want $15,000,000 with these facts?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will observe from the statements of temporary loans and obligations that the Canadian Northern Railway is indebted for advances and upon loans which it has negotiated, to the extent of $92,000,000, of which I think some $16,000,000 or $18,000,000 is in respect of interest which has been met upon securities which have priority over the $45,000,000 of securities guaranteed by the Dominion Government, of instalments of principal of equipment securities and on construction account. The $15,000,000 is required if the Canadian Northern Railway is to continue as a solvent concern. It is the minimum amount with which it can continue to finance.

Mr. BENNETT: How is it made up?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In committee I shall be glad to give the details. I have not them before me at the moment.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: It would be better to give it now, so that we will understand it.

Mr. BENNETT: It is very vital.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is on page 9 of the statement.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, but that does not cover what he is speaking about now.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In committee I shall be glad to give the details. Page 9 gives the statement showing the advances which have been made for payment of underlying interest on principal on construction account and for the meeting of principal and instalment obligations.

Mr. BENNETT: Do you propose to take care of the income securities, $25,000,000?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, they do not enter at all.

Mr. BENNETT: You would not call that part of the funded debt, by any stretch of the imagination.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. I would not say "by any stretch of the imagination"; but to show that I am in agreement with my hon. friend, I showed the different securities and then mentioned income convertible debenture stock, but the interest on which is not payable except under certain conditions. The interest which it is proposed to pay from this $15,000,000 relates only to that portion of the interest indebtedness of the company which is payable upon securities ranking in priority to the $45,000,000 Canadian Northern mortgage guaranteed by the Dominion Government. In other words, the Dominion Government has a $45,000,000 mortgage upon the enterprise. If the interest upon the underlying securities was not paid, of course the Dominion Government would lose the security it has in the $45,000,000 mortgage. If the Dominion Government entered into possession under the $45,000,000 mortgage, it would have to do what any mortgagee would be obliged to do in order to protect his security, if he so desired, that is to pay the interest on the underlying securities which come in priority to it. There is provision in the trust mortgage which was executed under the legislation of 1914, which contemplates the payment of interest on underlying securities in order to protect the interest of the Dominion in the guaranteed securities.

I have stated that the minimum amount with which the Canadian Northern Railway Company will be able to carry through, to continue financially for the year, is $15,000,000; and the minimum amount with which we estimate the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will be able to continue a solvent going concern is $8,000,000. Those are the two amounts which appear in the Estimates which will be discussed by the House in Committee.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: Would the minister explain why $15,000,000 is the minimum at this juncture? This question is very involved, and when the minister comes to that point in his argument which is vital to an understanding of the question, he proposes to defer consideration of that very vital point until later.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend will look at the financial statement of the temporary loans which have been presented to the House, he will realize at once that the condition cannot continue; and the question arises as to what measure of relief must be afforded in order that the Canadian Northern Railway Company can continue. The advances which have been made temporarily will have to be, in large measure, cleared up before the company can get credit to enable it to continue. These borrowings have been upon securities, which are shown in the statement I have laid on the table of the House, for the purposes which I have mentioned, and the Canadian Northern Railway Company has come to the point where it has no more securities to issue, and, if it does not get this measure of aid, it will not be able to continue. I think that any financial man looking at the statement placed on the Table with reference to the Canadian Northern Railway will see that at least a sum of $15,000,000 will be needed to finance the company and to enable it to carry on its business as a going concern during the coming year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In looking over the statement I find what strikes me as a singular omission. There is no statement of the earnings or operating expenses of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Does the minister not think that that is an important matter to be presented to the House?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have stated to my hon. friend that the earnings and operating expenses for the fiscal year cannot be presented at the present time except by way of estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no estimate even.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I could get an estimate under the signature of the general manager of the company, but I should not think it advisable to lay estimates before the House, unless the House specially desires it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Take the last six months.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What I wish to lay before the House is facts. I have laid the facts, and, I think, all the facts, with regard to the financial condition of the company upon the Table, and if my hon. friend, or any other hon. member of the House, desires an estimate made by the general manager of the Canadian Northern

Railway Company, as to its earnings for the present fiscal year ending June 15, 1916, which I have stated to be $9,000,000, I can obtain it; I can obtain an estimate, according to their best judgment, as to what would be the net earnings for the year 1917, but I need not say that it would be only an estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would have thought it of importance and desirable to enable the House to form a judgment as to the advisability of giving aid to have a statement of the earnings and operating expenses for the past year, and also an estimate of the probable earnings and operating expenses for the coming year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The last financial statement of the company which was published, and which I can obtain, shows the net earnings for the year ended June 15, 1915. I stated to the House in an earlier part of my speech that the estimated earnings, based upon the actual earnings up to the 31st March of the current year, would be $9,000,000, but I would submit to the House that this is not so much a question of earnings as of finance.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister gave the earnings of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but not those of the Canadian Northern.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I have given the earnings of the Canadian Northern for the year 1915, and the estimated earnings for 1916, and in addition to that I have stated the fixed charges. I made a most complete statement with regard to that a few moments ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the statement submitted with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific there is an estimate of the loss in operation. An estimate is given of the net earnings of the prairie division and an estimate of the loss of the mountain division; but there is no such statement in the pamphlet presented in regard to the Canadian Northern railway.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If there is not, and my hon. friend desires an estimate, I will endeavour to get it.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The earnings are now complete up to the last week of April, and this is the first week in May, so that there would be only seven weeks' earnings to estimate.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am told, in order to give accurate information, that the actual earnings and expenditures are available up to the end of March. My hon. friend will no doubt realize that it takes some time to get the returns especially from the West.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I have them up to the end of April.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is speaking of published earnings; I am speaking of bookkeeping and the financial situation. At all events, my hon. friend is aware of the net earnings, which, he states, have been published up to the end of April, and that would no doubt be founded upon actual earnings and expenditures so far as they could ascertain them up to the date of publication.

In giving consideration to the question as to whether at this critical juncture in their affairs we should afford further aid to these two railway enterprises, embracing as they do some 12,000 miles of completed lines, and vitally involved as they are with the public credit of the Dominion and of the provinces, there are to be considered three alternatives, and three alternatives only, at least in my view. One course would be to withhold aid, and to permit the two railway companies in question to go into the hands of the receiver. I need not say to the House how grave a situation that would be to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada which, in case of a default, would be liable under its guarantees upon the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. There are two aspects in which the matter may be considered. The first is the aspect of our public credit. We are in the midst of a war in which we are belligerents. Our expenditures are increasing from day to day, and must increase in large measure as our forces increase. Our expenditure is on a vast scale, and is likely to increase. For the present year, our expenditures for war will aggregate at least $250,000,000, possibly $300,000,000; the amount will depend upon the increase in our forces which have now reached the total of some 320,000 men. In this posture of our affairs, confronted as we are with borrowings on account of the war, to the extent of $250,000,000 to $300,000,000—and in estimating what that means to the Dominion of Canada, we must bear in mind that before the outbreak of the war the net national debt of Canada was only some $360,000,000—we are increasing annually the national debt of the country to an amount almost equal to the total

national debt which had accumulated since Confederation. The question of our credit is therefore vital, because upon that credit will depend the part which we shall be able to play in this war. Not only is the amount, which I have mentioned, exceedingly large, but we are confined in our borrowings to this side of the Atlantic. The British market is closed to our borrowings, except such borrowings as we may obtain from the Imperial Exchequer for the purpose of carrying on the war. We have already made on loan of $75,000,000 in the United States, and under the terms of that loan we agreed not to go upon the American market again during the remainder of the present calendar year. In view of the financial situation with which we are confronted as to our borrowings, it behooves us in a very special sense to preserve the credit and the standing of the Dominion. I believe that the collapse of the two railway systems in question, with the involvment of the Grand Trunk, would have a most disastrous effect upon our entire credit, federal, provincial, municipal and industrial. It appears to me that at this of all times we should jealously guard the fabric of our credit. Under the circumstances the Government find themselves unable to favourably regard the contingency of allowing the two roads, with the probable involvement of a third, to go into liquidation.

There is another aspect of the matter to which I desire to draw the attention of the House. It relates particularly to the case of the Canadian Northern, but in the case of both systems, receivership would undoubtedly mean great public inconvenience and confusion. In the event of a receivership of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the position would be that the Dominion Government would have a first charge in respect to its guaranteed securities, the Grand Trunk would come next, the last security being the $16,000,000 of bonds guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada issued under the legislation of 1914. In the event of a receivership of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Dominion Government, would of course have to continue to pay the interest upon the $16,000,000 of guaranteed securities for which it is responsible under its guarantee and the Grand Trunk Railway Company would have to continue to provide money for the payment of the interest upon the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific which it has guaranteed. By the issue of receiver's certificates it is possible that the road would be carried on for some time.

In the case of the Canadian Northern a much more serious situation would arise because the Canadian Northern system consists of a congeries of railway and subsidiary companies, some thirty or forty in number and the consequence of a receivership of the Canadian Northern would undoubtedly be liquidation. It is not possible, having regard to the securities which have been issued, to reach any other conclusion than that a receivership of the Canadian Northern railway would mean that the several sets of bondholders, in the assertion of their legal rights, would be obliged to dismember the system. In such a case we would have the province of British Columbia taking the Canadian Northern Pacific, we should have Alberta taking the Canadian Northern Alberta, we should have Saskatchewan taking the portion of the line in Saskatchewan and we should have the Government of Manitoba, or the perpetual debenture holders, if they should associate together, taking over the Canadian Northern itself with the rolling stock which belongs to it and with the securities of the subsidiary companies which it owns, subject to the charge which has been created in the interest of the perpetual consolidated debenture holders. We should have the province of Ontario under its guarantee, taking the lines within that province. The result would be dismembering of the Canadian Northern system. The Government, in such a contingency, would be obliged to pay the interest upon its $45,000,000 loan because the mortgage which secured that loan is junior to the mortgages securing the issues which had been made prior to the legislation authorizing the Dominion guarantee. As I have said, in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk Railway Company would have to make good its guarantee. The consequences attendant upon the allowing these two, and possibly three, railway companies to go into the hands of a receiver would be so serious from the standpoint of the national credit and national interest that in our view it should not be permitted to take place especially at this critical period when we are engaged in financing a war waged upon an unparalleled scale and involving colossal expenditures on our part.

The second alternative is to permit default and take physical possession of the two railway systems in question; that is to say, foreclose the mortgages which we hold.

In that event the Dominion Government would take over the mortgaged premises and hold them as it does the Intercolonial railway. If it continued to hold them and operate them without a receivership or liquidation it would mean that it would have to pay all the interest on all the securities of these companies at present outstanding. It would have to provide the amount of temporary aid which we are now proposing and in addition it would have to provide for the future financing of these roads.

Mr. MACDONALD: Would it have to pay interest on the subsequent securities?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Dominion Government would have to pay interest upon its $45,000,000 and its $16,000,000 of securities because it is bound to do so under its guarantee. If the Dominion Government foreclosed under these two mortgages, and took over the two roads, it would have to pay interest upon the guaranteed securities.

Mr. MACDONALD: Only on those that were prior to the mortgage.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Prior to the mortgage, but the issues of $45,000,000 and $16,000,000 are junior securities and we would have to pay on those.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are they subsequent to all the guaranteed securities?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The $45,000,000 and the $16,000,000 mortgages are junior to the mortgages securing the issues outstanding on the two systems constituting the greater part of the indebtedness.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Except the income securities.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Except the income securities. Under the legislation of 1914 the Dominion Government was given power to appoint the Board of Directors of the Canadian Northern Railway and administer such company through such board, but in such event the Government would not only have to provide the temporary assistance which we propose now, but it would have to undertake the burden of financing the balance of $92,000,000 of temporary loans and current obligations. For the future, it would either have to allow the system to go into liquidation or it would have to provide for its future financing. If we were not in the midst of a war, and confined in our financing to this side of the Atlantic, if we had not before us the formidable burden of this war, with no prospect of its early termination, it would not appear to me to be so serious an obligation to take over the financing of these two railway systems. But it must not be forgotten that war or no war the taking over of two transcontinental railway systems, assuming their indebtedness, greater in the aggregate than the debt of the Dominion, and undertaking to provide in the future for their requirements as to fixed charges, as to deficits, betterments, improvements and rolling stock, would involve a burden which would not be regarded lightly by this House or the country. But, Sir, we are in the midst of a war and in considering the second alternative as to whether we should allow default and take possession, under the provisoins of our mortgages, or whether we should appoint the board of the Canadian Northern Railway and administer its affairs through that board, we must bear in mind that we have the burdens of the war actual and prospective upon us.

With the obligations of the war increasing and likely to increase, the Government finds itself unable, for the present at least, to consider favourably taking on such a heavy additional burden and becoming responsible for financing not only the war, but two transcontinental railway systems as well. It may well be, Sir, that with our expenditure upon the war this year and next year, if the war should last so long, and with further expenditure connected with the war succeeding the conclusion of the war—because we shall not immediately be able to disband our troops and stop our war expenditure—the national debt of Canada, when this war is concluded, will reach $1,000,000,000, That is no reason, however, for slackening our efforts. The interest upon that amount and a sinking fund to meet it are quite within the powers of this Dominion; but I should not be fair to myself, nor fair to the House, if I minimized or belittled the burden which the war is casting upon us, and which this House and this country are so ready and willing to assume.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it my hon. friend's opinion that, war or no war, he will have to take over at least one of the two railways?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am afraid I am taking up too long a time, but I regard the subject as one of considerable importance. I will come to that point in a moment or

two. The first business of Canada at the present time is the war; all other businesses, no matter how important they may be, are subsidiary and subordinate. What I am trying to show the House is this, that in the midst of the war, to undertake its burdens and at the same time to undertake the financing of two transcontinental railway systems would be a formidable proposition even for the Dominion Government.

The third alternative, and the one which we now propose to Parliament, is to afford the minimum of temporary assistance which will enable these two systems to continue in operation pending an investigation, which we propose to carry out by the best experts available, into the fiscal, economic and financial conditions of the railway situation as it exists in Canada to-day. It is perfectly clear that it is not possible, nor in the national interest, that we should go on, as has been the case for many years past under this and the preceding Government, making loans or giving guarantees at short intervals for the purpose of assisting these two large enterprises. A continuing condition such as this would be intolerable, and the time has arrived when, in our judgment, it has become imperatively necessary that a permanent solution should be found for the existing railway situation. No doubt that situation has been aggravated by the war, but it is none the less necessary that some permanent policy should be adopted. We cannot adopt a permanent policy until we know all the facts and have been advised by those most capable of giving advice as to what is really involved in the problem which confronts us and what the future of the existing systems is likely to be. We cannot adopt such a policy until we know what, if any, rearrangement, redistribution or linking up of existing lines or systems, may be necessary in order to get the best economic result from the enormous expenditures which have been made upon Canada's railway systems. It is possible, and even probable, that the permanent solution of this great question may involve the Dominion taking over one or more of the existing systems, or there may be involved the larger issue of nationalization of all the railways of Canada. The whole question is so vast in its complexity and manifold in its bearings that nothing but a thorough mastery of the problems involved, upon the best information and advice obtainable, can lead to its proper solution. Nevertheless, for reasons which I have given, this problem must now be faced, and the present measure of aid is designed as a temporary expedient to meet the situation as it is until such time as the whole problem can be fully studied and solved.

The House will observe that the loans which we propose, of $15,000,000 and $8,000,000 respectively, are repayable upon demand, so that, in a sense, we have a control of the situation through those demand loans. We are charging a rate of interest of six per cent, the Dominion Government being able to borrow at slightly less than that figure. We realize that the security upon which we are making these loans to both of the railway systems in question is rather slender, and therefore we have a vital interest in the administration of the affairs of these two railways. It is our intention, in order that we may be kept fully informed, pending our investigation by experts, which I have announced, as to the condition and administration of these companies, to appoint three directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and three directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will they be railway men?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They will be men of high standing. I am not in a position yet to give their names, but they will be men who can be depended upon to watch the interest of the Government in connection with the administration of these railways. The reason why we propose this is, as I have stated, that we are making these loans upon tenuous security. It is, therefore, in our view, important that we should be completely informed through our own representatives upon the two boards of directors as to the condition and administration of these railways from time to time until the report has been made by the experts whom we shall engage to make an investigation into the whole Canadian railway situation for the purpose which I have mentioned.

We propose also to provide for a continuous audit of the revenues and expenditures of these two railway systems. We have provided items in the Estimates for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the board of investigation which I have mentioned, and also of the continuous audit. As a result of the appointment of such auditors and our directors upon the boards of the two railway companies, we

expect to be kept thoroughly informed as to their administration and condition.

I have shown the present condition of the companies. I have pointed out that there are three alternatives, and three only namely, liquidation, taking over by the Government of the systems in question, or the affording of temporary assistance pending a solution of the larger question. The first alternative would, as I have stated, be at this juncture a most serious calamity and a great blow to the public credit and standing of the Dominion abroad. The second would add exceedingly heavy burdens to the increasing financial burden of the war, and would, I believe, seriously embarrass us in providing for its further financing on the increased scale to which we are looking forward. The third alternative, and the one which we propose, maintains the situation as it is at present and gives us time to investigate the whole problem with a view to such action at the next session of Parliament as may, it is to be hoped, solve in a permanent fashion Canada's railway difficulties. It seems to us that the latter course is unquestionably the course of wisdom, and I earnestly hope that the proposals of the Government looking to this end will meet the approval and endorsation of the House and of the country.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to deal with this proposition in any detail, because I have not had time to look at the figures, having only received them to-day. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that we might go into committee, and then take up some other business in order to give us an opportunity at least until to-morrow of looking into the matter. As I received a copy of the Canadian Northern report only about twenty minutes ago, I have not had time to read it over.

The difficulty that confronts the members and the House is this: How long, O Lord, how long? It does not need any arguments or figures to convince the members of this House that they want to do what is right for the Dominion of Canada, they want to do that which will have no bad effects on our financial position. But that is the argument that has been used for years and years. When we are discussing these things we are met with the suggestion that if this aid is not given something terrible is going to happen to the country. It is really embarrassing to know just what is the best thing to do,—we have done it so often. On several occasions we have been assured that this is the last time of asking; and the aid has gone through; and the very next morning after the Governor General has signed the measure, movements have begun for requests for another grant or some additional aid. Another difficulty that strikes me just now after hearing the Minister of Finance is this—that we are not absolutely sure on what ground this aid is needed. In the first place we have not all the figures about the Canadian Northern revenue and expenditure, and cost of operation. And, secondly, it looks as if one of the great incentives to the granting of aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific is that the Grand Trunk does not want to do it. These things just struck me casually. Is it possible that if this Parliament did not give aid the Grand Trunk would still decline to give it? I know that the shareholders of the Grand Trunk have been objecting for two or three years to giving further aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific. But so have the people of Canada been objecting to giving further aid to anybody. Is it outside the range of possibility that if we did not give it the Grand Trunk would have to give it?

I want a little time to look into these matters before I come to a decision. It is true that speaking generally seventy-five per cent of the railways of America have been in liquidation at one time or another —perhaps the percentage is greater than that. But what we have to do is to make sure that the interests of the people for whom these railways are constructed shall be protected. I am not sure that the interests of the people of the United States have not been as fully protected by having the railways go into liquidation, as they would have been otherwise. Of course, they have not aided railways, as a government, so much as we have. The statement appears in a British Columbia newspaper, and I would like to ask the Minister of Finance about it, that legislation here will have the effect of relieving the British Columbia Government of its obligation to the Canadian Government. I cannot think there is any foundation for that, but it is stated in the report of a deliverance of a public man in British Columbia. Of course, if we are to assume the liabilities of the provinces and other creditors, let us take over the railways at once. It is true, as the minister has stated,

that the war conditions have made it difficult to raise money. It is also true that the low rate of interest at which some of these securities were issued has made it impossible, no doubt, to realize nearly as much upon them as would have been realized had not the rate of interest risen, due to war conditions.

Let me go back to my original question: How long is it to continue, if Parliament grants this aid? The Minister of Finance tells us that there are three things that face us. As he states them they amount to this—liquidation, nationalization, and procrastination. Now, there may be things that have greater terrors than liquidation of a railway company under present conditions. Possibly it would not be a terrible calamity if nationalization took place—for what is proposed is only an expedient, a temporary arrangement, even at the best; the situation has to be faced, and faced before very long. Should we temporize, should we keep on putting off and putting off?—particularly, when it is such an expensive pastime? The minister says, and says with a good deal of force, that it would be a bad time to assume all the liabilities that these two railway companies have upon them. But would it? Are we not assuming them now? Are we not in the position, as a Parliament, of assuming the liabilities of these two companies to a very large extent?—and having nothing to show for our liability at that. If we were to go further, although we should, perhaps, assume a heavier liability, still, we should have some property to show for our liability, we should have the railway property at least to the extent of the liability, if it were worth the money. As we go on now, we are handing out money year after year, and have nothing to show for it except forty-five per cent of the Canadian Northern stock—

An hon. MEMBER: Forty per cent.

Mr. GRAHAM: Forty per cent of the Canadian Northern stock, which, I imagine, would not make anybody rich on the stock exchange at the present time.

Now, coming to the Grand Trunk Pacific. I think I told the Minister of Finance once in a quiet way that a certain report issued must have the effect of making it difficult for the Grand Trunk to obtain money; and, from the day the Staunton-Gutelius report was issued by this Government, the company began to have difficulty in securing money. I pointed out that that would be the only serious result of the report. For whether such statements be true or not, capital is very sensitive and shies at the least provocation, and sometimes without any provocation.

Now, perhaps I should not say what I am about to say, but I think I am justified in saying it from the position I have taken with the Grand Trunk people. They will understand that I am not saying anything new. That company will never make a success of its lines in Canada if it continues to operate them at long range. We in Canada are moving along so rapidly, as a new country, that the situation of yesterday is not the same as that of to-day and the situation of to-day may not be that of to-morrow. If any concern, a transportation company particularly, wishes to grapple with situations as they arise, it must have its directing forces on the ground. It is not so in the old land, where conditions are the result of centuries of work and development. We change in a day—in a few hours; what is a good policy now may not be a good policy to-morrow. The Canadian Pacific Railway has its board in Canada and can control its affairs. It can meet at 10 a.m., decide on a policy, and at 11 a.m. put it into force; in fact, it often puts the policy into force and meets afterwards. But as to the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific, while in a measure it manages its affairs in Canada, the fact is that no departure of any importance can take place, no real advancement can be made, without first submitting it to the board in London.

By the time that is received by that board and is studied as it necessarily must be, and reply is made to the Canadian management, the reason for the application has disappeared and the next order of business is at hand. Under these circumstances the application might as well never have been made, because the time has passed for it to be acted upon. While the Grand Trunk people in London are wondering what they are going to do, the Canadian Pacific railway, because it has the power, steps in and takes action. One of the difficulties in connection with the management of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway is that while it is the best main line of road on the American continent, it has not sufficient branch lines to feed it and give it the business that it ought to have. That neglect will be more marked as the years go by, unless it be remedied. I know that the management in Canada did endeavour time after time to make as rapid progress as could be made, but these things all had to be submitted

to the board in London, and by the time that board had made reply the Canadian Pacific railway had its men working on a branch line, and the Grand Trunk Pacific branch lines were not needed; they would be superfluous. I think it is the duty of the Government to take the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk management to one side—I do not mean the Canadian end of the management, I mean the home end—have a quiet talk with them, and tell them that so long as the control is 4,000 miles away from the railway, so long will its management be inefficient and its financing almost impossible. I discussed this with Mr. Smithers on two or three occasions—and I am not saying anything now that I have not said to him most emphatically. The difficulty with the Grand Trunk Pacific system, as I pointed out to him, is not the matter of management; it is financial. The greatest financial mind obtainable should have been secured years ago by this company, and should have been on the ground in the Dominion of Canada, knowing the conditions, knowing what to recommend, and having power to act quickly on that recommendation. I submit that, no matter what happens, if the Grand Trunk Pacific is to remain as a company-managed road, the body having control must be removed to Canada, or the road never can be successful.

Mr. MORPHY: What was the answer to the hon. gentleman's representations for headquarters in Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am expressing only my view; I shall not express the other gentleman's view.

Mr. MORPHY: I did not understand that it was private.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was not private so far as my views was concerned.

Mr. MORPHY: Is there no answer?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no answer from me. My private view, expressed here in public, is that no answer has been or can be given that will satisfy the Canadian people other than the removal of the managing force to the Dominion of Canada. A move was made along the line of having the offices of president and general manager combined in one person, with residence in Canada. Mr. Hays did have very wide powers; but on his death those powers were again divided; the financial management was again removed from the Dominion of Canada. That is as far as I care to go in discussing that side of the question.

The Minister has stated to us that the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert. Now, is it? Has Mr. Schreiber given his certificate that the work is all finished on the line from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert? I am simply asking for information, because I had thought that there was quite a bit of work to do there yet.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am informed that it is completed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the minister kindly put among the papers the certificate which would have to be filed by Mr. Schreiber before the road would be considered as completed? He is the chief engineer acting for the Government in the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert.

My hon. friend has said that he is going to put several directors on these two boards. Well, if they work with the same vigour that former Government directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific worked, I know that we shall not have a very voluminous or valuable report. The minister the other night could not even tell us the name of the man the Government has on that board. I at least knew who the man was that I had on the Board, although gentlemen opposite were never very much enlightened by the report that I always had to present.

4 p.m. It would be interesting to the people of Canada and to Parliament to know who these gentlemen are and what their duties are to be. It is very essential that the Government director should be notified every time the Board intend to hold a meeting, no matter what the business is. This is very essential, because Board meetings have been held without the knowledge of the Government director. Further, it should be the duty of the Government director or directors to report to the Government after every such meeting as to what occurred. If that be not done, the appointment of men as Government directors on this board will be merely a grand stand play, and no practical result will come in the way of information.

The Canadian Northern Railway Company has a debt of $492,000,000. If the Canadian Northern is as prosperous as I am told it is, then we ought to have all the figures as to net earnings and cost of operation. We ought to have also some general

statement as to the condition of the road in its various parts. The Canadian Northern is divided into several entities which make up the entire system. Even gentlemen from the West would have to be very astute to tell what part of the road they are riding on when they are travelling over the Canadian Northern railway. It may be the Canadian Northern Pacific, the Canadian Northern Ontario, the Canadian Northern Quebec—there are at least a dozen subdivisions. If we are to make a further investment in this line, of which we now hold 40 per cent, we ought to know what we are getting for our money. Outside of that, I think it is the duty of the Government this session, as part owners of that road, to put on the table of the House a report of the Government with regard to what is our property.

It would help us out materially. If we own 40 per cent of the property and all the liabilities, we ought to have a statement from the Government. They are our Board of Directors. It is true they have not been on the Canadian Northern Railway Board, but they are our representatives and should be able to tell us what condition our road is in, what it has done, what it proposes to do. There is only one point in that connection to which I wish to refer. I have received a lot of correspondence, and I know the Minister of Finance also has, concerning certain claims made by contractors against the Canadian Northern Railway. It was thought when one measure of aid was afforded that these liabiltities were to be settled; at least that is the impression I received. But several contractors have come to me in the last few weeks and have told me that that is not the case. I think this would be the time, when we are asked to grant further aid, that the legitimate claims of men who have performed work on the line ought to be considered and provided for, as I believe probably they are in the $92,000,000. The granting of this money without any such provision will be roundly condemned by a great many people, because not only are the contractors complaining, but the sub-contractors and the men who work for the sub-contractors complain that they have not been able yet to get their pay for work performed. I think the Government ought to inform us of its intentions on these points and ought to be able to tell us what provision, if any, is being made.

If the Canadian Northern railway had been content with its magnificent system of distribution and gathering in the West, connecting it with the East according to its first proposition, and had got that system well under way before attempting to go through to the coast, it would not now be in the condition it is.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Or come east from Fort William.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, if it had come all the way East and had connected its western system with the seaboard on the east, or with tide water at Quebec, making arrangements with the Government railway to go to Halifax and St. John, it would have been somewhat behind; but I submit that its greatest difficulty has been in trying to finance the road through and west of the Rocky mountains. This was discussed between the Canadian Northern Railway proprietors and myself on several occasions, and the position I always took with them was this: Ultimately you will have a transcontinental line undoubtedly, because you will want a western outlet as well as an eastern outlet; but for the time being, until you get your system in the Prairie Provinces connected with the East, do not go farther west; by the time you have that done, if Canada is going to be what we think, the conditions will enable you to judge of the feasibility of going through to the West. Mark you, that was not with any antipathy of their going to the western coast; that was for the purpose of keeping the enterprise on a sound footing as it went along, and I believe that had that been done, to-day the Canadian Northern railway, with at most very small aid, would have been able to finance itself, and we would not have had this continual coming, year after year, and this constant repetition of votes to aid this enterprise. I shall not discuss these matters further now, as I desire to study the figures in detail; and I suggest that if the minister is agreeable we might have an opportunity to look into them. The minister might now go into committee on some other business, taking this up to-morrow or the next day, when we have had an opportunity to look at the figures.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) desires some further information, and also a further opportunity to examine the documents which have been laid on the table of the House, I have only a few words to say now. This is an important subject, and it is manifestly only fair to postpone the discussion as he requests. There are, however, one or

two things I should like to say before the House goes into committee. One is that thirteen years ago, on the 18th day of next August, I asked the late Government, our predecessors, to make that very stipulation which the hon. gentleman now says should have been made; that is to say, that there should be from Edmonton west to the coast only one line of railway, common to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern Railway. That would have avoided what might perhaps be regarded as an economic waste, and would have effected a saving of from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. I made some further suggestions, which I shall be prepared to debate with my hon. friends when the time comes, to indicate to them that the situation which has arisen to-day is one for which they are very largely, if not wholly responsible. Every hon. gentleman in this House knows precisely the conditions that confronted us when we came into power in October, 1911 —two great transcontinental railway systems, both having received the imprimatur of the Government as such by statutes of this country, both uncompleted, and both of them impossible of completion unless assistance should be given. It would be proper to leave the consideration of that until my hon. friend has made himself familiar with the details of the present proposals. He asks about the condition of the Canadian Northern Railway line; he inquires who the directors will be and what part they will take. I may tell him that they will be men who will command the confidence of the country, and further than that, I have no doubt that they will take such part in the management of these roads as will be consistent with their duty as representatives of the interests of this country in connection with further construction, and with the operation of the two railways.

I pass by my hon. friend's suggestion that the difficulties which confront the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to-day are due to the fact that an investigation was made by the present Administration, after it came into power, into the construction of the road. That remark could not have been made by my hon. friend in any very serious spirit. As a matter of fact, the Grand Trunk Railway has been carrying on the financing for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway since its construction was first undertaken in 1904 or 1905. The conditions that confront the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to-day have been described by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The conditions which confront that road are in no way due to any report that was made or any investigation that was held. As a matter of fact, the Government have sought to co-operate in every possible way with the Grand Trunk in maintaining the stability and the financial credit of the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise from the day we came into power. It is true that the enterprise was launched under conditions of which the opposition of the day did not approve. It is perfectly true that we then made certain suggestions which were not adopted, and the value of which I shall be prepared to discuss before this debate is concluded. It is equally true that, as the proposals of the Government of that day were ratified by Parliament, as they were afterwards approved by the people of this country, we felt it our duty, when we came into power, to so guide our policies and our conduct as to support that enterprise in exactly the same way as we would have supported it had we been responsible for it in the first instance. In doing that we were doing no more than was proper and necessary, having regard to the principles of constitutional government which control such conditions. As an example of the extent to which we have gone in endeavouring to support the enterprise which was launched by my hon. friends opposite when they were in power, I may say that for the period of nearly four years that the Grand Trunk Pacific has been in operation in the Prairie Provinces, and for the year that it has been in operation through the mountains, it has been maintained, so far as the payment of interest is concerned, upon a construction basis which permitted interest to be paid out of capital. For that reason, the affairs of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have not been in the limelight to the same extent as the affairs of the Candian Northern Railway.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: We lent them the capital to do it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The actual fact is that in order to give fullest possible support to the enterprise which was launched by my hon. friends opposite, and to provoke as little public criticism of the results of its operation, as might be possible, nearly $12,000,000 has been paid out of capital during the period in which that road in the prairies and through the mountains has actually been in operation. If we had not

taken that course it would have been necessary, from public assistance or from some other source, to provide nearly $12,000,000 in order that interest might be met on the outstanding securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: We lent them the money to do it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was that illegal or in accordance with the contract?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We did not take over the road as completed but it remained on a construction basis. Technically, it might not have been quite complete, as the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has pointed out, but it was in practical operation, and during the period in which it was in practical operation the interest had to be paid out of capital in order to save a situation for which hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I take it from my right hon. friend's remarks that he considers the eastern section of the Transcontinental as an incubus. Will he tell the House and the country whether it is his intention to add to that incubus two other lines, namely, the Quebec and Saguenay railway, and the Lotbinière and Megantic line?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will come to the Quebec and Saguenay railway in good time and discuss it with my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it to be added to the Transcontinental?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will discuss that road when we come to it. I think that when the proposal is submitted to the House in regard to that road it will be found to be somewhat different from that which my hon. friend seems to imagine; but it will be time enough to discuss it when we come to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before the Prime Minister passes from the operation of the mountain section, may I ask if the operation was not in accordance with the terms of the contract, being carried on by the contracting or construction company in the West?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has been carried on by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, as I understand, and carried on as if the road were still under construction. While, I think, it might not have been technically complete, according to the report of the Government engineer, nevertheless it was, for all practical purposes of operation, complete, and if we had not extended the time by the authority of Parliament, as we did from session to session, the situation to which I have alluded, would have had to be met. I am merely pointing this out to indicate that, by reason of a situation created before they came into power, and for which they were not responsible, this Government were obliged to give support in that way and every other way to these roads in order that the stability of railway conditions in this country might be maintained to the fullest possible extent.

As my hon. friend the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) desires to postpone further discussion, we have no objection. We will take up the matter some other day, and resume the discussion when it will be entirely convenient to him. To-morrow, or the next day, or at any time he suggests, we shall be prepared to take it up again and go into committee and give all further information that may be desired.

Mr. TURRIFF: Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Finance a question or two for information. What reason have we to believe that this statement of Canadian Northern railway affairs is an absolutely correct statement, covering all their liabilities? For my part, I do not believe that the Canadian Northern are in a position to state what their liabilities are. I do not believe that they know what their position is. I would suggest that when we take the matter up again my hon. friend should give us some information as to what amount of money, in addition to the present liabilities of the company will be required to put the company on a commercial basis; that is, to put it where it can carry freight cheaply and perform the duties for which it was organized. For instance, in my part of the country they have a branch line which was practically idle all last winter, and it will take a great deal of expenditure on many of their branch lines to put them in shape so that they can meet operating expenses and pay interest on their indebtedness. In dealing with the question we should have some such information which would certainly be a very great help to us when we come to consider what ought to be done in connection with the proposals made by the Government. I would also like some information on this point: If we are going to finance this company, what will be the policy of the Gov-

ernment in regard to this company extending their field still further by purchasing or building lines and extending in a manner that makes it impossible for them to concentrate their energies on the part of the country which they now occupy.

Mr. MACDONALD: To enable us to understand this question, I think the Minister of Finance ought to give the House some information as to how this amount of $15,000,000 was arrived at, and as to the purposes for which it is to be used. The minister has asked the House to accept the statement that he made an examination, and that he was satisfied that $15,000,000 was the smallest amount which could be given to enable the Canadian Northern Railway Company to go on. I think that information ought to be given now, so that the House and the country might understand. While I am on my feet, may I be permitted to point out the singular method which the Government has adopted in presenting this matter for the consideration of Parliament. I think that this is the first occasion on which any Government has come to Parliament asking for such a large sum as $23,000,000 for two railway companies, and submitting it in the Estimates, without making the matter one of special legislation as it should be. There should have been a concrete Bill so that the proposals now submitted to Parliament could be reviewed and dealt with, and the legislation considered and enacted, if it is to be enacted, by the Government in accordance with precedent. There are reasons, I have no doubt, why the Government has gone outside the usual method of presenting legislation, and put these proposals in the Estimates. When my hon. friend the Minister of Finance dilated upon the condition of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and upon the position of this country at the present time, he simply stated what hon. gentlemen on this side of the House declared two years ago would be the result of the loan of $45,000,000. It was pointed out distinctly and clearly, not only by hon. gentlemen on this side, but by hon. gentlemen supporting the Prime Minister, that when the Government provided that loan of $45,000,000 it put this country in a position of being liable for every dollar of debt that had been incurred by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, both prior and subsequent to the granting of that security. It was urged by the Government then that that was not so, that the situation was such that, in order to enable the Canadian Northern to break through its financial difficulties, that loan of $45,000,000, even supposing it did leave $65,000,000 of liabilities still to be liquidated, would result in a condition of affairs in which the Government of this country would be relieved from further advances, and the company would be able to go on. To-day it is quite apparent—my hon. friend has told the House—that if the Government undertake to exercise the power contained in the mortgage, the result would be that we would be liable for every cent of this indebtedness, both prior and subsequent, including the floating liabilities. My hon. friend did not take advantage of the safeguard which they allege was of the most vital character at that time when they assured the House and the country that they proposed to appoint certain directors upon the Canadian Northern board. They gave us that assurance then, just as they are asserting to the country to-day, that they propose to provide safeguards for the future by putting a certain number of gentlemen on these railway boards. The statement was made to the House by the Government during the present session, that no director had ever been appointed by the Government to the Canadian Northern board to watch the interests of the country or guard the position of the Government after that loan was made two years ago. Why, therefore, are we to accept the statement of the hon. gentleman as being any vital guarantee that they are going to put three members on this board or that the interests of the country are going to be better protected in the future than they have in the past?

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Does not my hon. friend think that there is a complete answer to that in the fact that the road was not a completed system, and not open for traffic, until the 30th November last, and, not being a completed system and not open for traffic, the Government could not appoint a director for a portion of the year as the first fiscal year only ended on June 31, 1916.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am speaking particularly of the Canadian Northern propoistion.

Mr. BENNETT: I am referring to the Canadian Northern.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Canadian Northern loan passed this House in the spring of 1914. I perhaps did not catch my hon.

friend's point, but I do not appreciate the suggestion he makes as being any answer to the claim that, immediately after the passage of that legislation the Government should have put its representative on the board in order that the interests of Canada might be protected. The situation in which the Canadian Northern stands to-day, as far as one can gather from hurriedly looking over the statement, is the situation that has existed every moment during the past two years. It does not seem possible for this Government to initiate any policy in regard to any matter without providing for the appointment of a commission to go out and report, or it may be, never report at all, because some of these commissions are allowed to die a natural death. Nobody has ever heard of their reporting if they have ever done so. My hon. friends now propose to appoint the 85th or 86th commission which they have appointed since they came into power to make inquiry as to what should be done in regard to this railway problem. It is like locking the stable door after the horse is stolen, my hon. friends two years ago should have had these commissioners appointed. The Minister of Finance, knowing the position of the Canadian Northern and the burden which the country assumed when it provided for a loan to them of $45,000,000, should have taken up the question as to whether or not this country would be bound to assume this railway and nationalize it. It was the bounden duty of the Government to have done that two years ago. They are simply two years too late in dealing with this question, even assuming that the proposition brought down to-day is tenable in the slightest degree. The result has been that for two years Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann have had control of the operation, the finances, and the securities of the Canadian Northern, and they have been able to do what they pleased in regard to them without the slightest interference, or restrictions, or caretaking of the situation by this Government in any way. After two years of non-interference, after after two years of absolute failure to secure the interests of this country, or to make inquiries as to whether or not, or as to how, this road should be nationalized or taken over, the Minister of Finance to-day admits absolutely that they have done nothing; that we are up against the situation which exists to-day and which has existed for two years, and that they have permitted control to remain in the hands which brought about conditions which rendered interference necessary, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, in 1914. After two years my hon. friend comes to-day and says: I am going to ask the House to give these gentlemen $15,000,000 more because this is the least they can get along with. He expects the House and the country to accept that. In these times of thrift, of economy and of care being enjoined upon the private individual by advertisements and by publications issued by the Government, the Government themselves are playing the part of spendthrifts. They have permitted this situation to arise, as the result of which $15,000,000 is to be taken out of the public treasury, and we are asked to await the report of a commission, which may never report, and which we say is simply intended to postpone further action in the hope that something or another may arise in the future. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is a situation which demands more information than we have before us. If my hon. friend can give us any better information than he has I think we ought to have it. I would ask him to give a further explanation of this proposed expenditure of $15,000,000 and a definition of the statement which he has submitted.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The audited statement of temporary loans and current obligations shows the necessity of a loan of at least $15,000,000, but probably the matter can best be discussed in committee when I shall have all the information before me.

Mr. MACDONALD: That statement shows the necessity of a loan of $92,000,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not quite because the Canadian Northern assure us that they will be able to renew loans, or obtain new loans to replace existing loans, and that the one matter of concern to them is the item of current obligations and expenditures.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY (St. John): There is one matter in regard to which the Minister of Finance has not given any reasonable information to the House, and I think he might be very well expected to do it in answer to my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). My hon. friend from Pictou has called attention to the most extraordinary fact that probably for the first time in the history of this country an appropriation of this character was made by placing it in the Estimates instead of coming before Parliament with a resolution

followed by a Bill so that the details might be discussed, and so that any amendment might be made which the committee would deem desirable. We have here, in the ordinary Estimates submitted to Parliament, a proposal to make a loan of $8,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the only condition which is attached to it is that the disposition of the loan is to be subject to the direction of the Governor in Council. We have also a similar provision with respect to a proposed loan of $15,000,000 to the Canadian Northern. I say, Sir, it is unheard of in the history of this Parliament that a proposition of that kind should be submitted simply as an ordinary Estimate. That there must be some peculiar reason for it is apparent, because with respect to what is known as the Quebec and Saguenay railway, a proposal which is only going to involve some $4,000,000, the Government does not put it in the Estimates in the ordinary way, but the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals has introduced a Bill, which appears to-day on the Order Paper, to acquire that railway. The proper course, it seems to me, would have been for the Minister of Finance to submit a resolution in the ordinary form authorizing the Government to make this loan, and then to follow that up with a Bill, giving the regular authority of the Governor General in Council. The reason for the course adopted ought to be stated to the House.

Some condition, I think, ought to be attached to this loan. In 1914, when the question of giving $45,000,000 aid by guarantees to the Canadian Northern Railway Company was under consideration, I ventured to call attention to the fact that the time might come when it would be deemed in the interest of the country to take over the whole Canadian Northern Railway system and to operate it as a Government railway. I called attention to the fact that the company was admittedly in a bad condition financially, and that unless the country came to its aid at that time to the enormous amount of $45,000,000, it would be compelled to go into the hands of a receiver. I urged that, as the company was proposing that the Government should come to its assistance to that enormous extent, some provision should be made whereby the country could for a reasonable sum, take over this system in the future. I pointed out that the Government ought not to give the requisite assistance to tide this company over its financial difficulties until the day of prosperity would arrive, without some provision whereby, if the country decided to acquire the system in the future, it would not be mulcted in an enormous amount for the equities which Mackenzie and Mann would have in the system. If I remember rightly, I moved a resolution at that time fixing the amount at which the country would be entitled to take over the road, at a maximum of $30,000,000, and that resolution was put to a vote of the House. My hon. friend the Solicitor General made the statement at that time, that Messrs Mackenzie and Mann, rather than accept the sum of $30,000,000 for their equity in this road, would allow the whole system to go into liquidation. Upon what authority my hon. friend made that statement I do not know, but it struck me as an extraordinary statement that those gentlemen, in a condition, as they alleged, practically of bankruptcy at that time should refuse to fix as a maximum a sum of $30,000,000, which at 5 per cent would give to each of those men and his heirs the magnificent sum of $750,000 per year, or upwards of $2,000 per day, and that they would prefer to throw the whole system into liquidation to accepting it. This company comes again and says to this Government: Again we are practically bankrupt; again we say to you we cannot continue the operation of this road unless you come to our assistance. Is the Government going to go to their relief again without fixing any maximum sum in case the country should wish to take the road over in the future? The Minister of Finance says that the question of nationalization will come up very soon. The Minister of Public Works, giving us the benefit of a very eloquent address the other evening upon the whole railway system of Canada, stated that the whole question of nationalization would soon come up. Are we going to advance this at present bankrupt concern $15,000,000 in addition to the $45,000,000 guaranteed in 1914 and to the other assistance which has been given, so as to tide it over until a day when prosperity again may come to it, and then be obliged, in order to acquire the system and to nationalize the railway, to give Mackenzie and Mann, not $30,000,000, but practically whatsoever they choose to ask? Does not the Minister of Finance think this is the time to fix the terms upon which this country may take over the Canadian Northern railway should we decide to do so? I submit this for the consideration of my hon. friend. While it

is true he does not give us a very great opportunity to present amendments, yet I think that is an amendment which he himself ought to propose, so that if the country should decide to take over this system, it may know that the system will be taken over on reasonable terms.

I was surprised at the bravery of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, coming to this House with a proposition which I would think he would like to see treated in a non-partisan spirit, asking for this extra lgeislation, that he should seek to provoke party feeling in the speech which he has made. Instead of accepting, as I would have thought my right hon. friend would accept the responsibility for that part of the Canadian Northern railway system which is involving this country in the most tremendous part of its liability, namely, the construction of the road through the mountains of British Columbia, my right hon. friend seeks to throw upon the Liberal party the whole responsibility for the disastrous condition in which the country finds itself to-day in respect to the Canadian Northern. Upon what ground does he do so? Why, he says, I think it is thirteen years ago since I proposed to the then Government that they should provide that there should be only one line of railway through British Columbia to be used jointly by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern. Let us see whether my right hon. friend is right in saying that the refusal of the then Government to provide for that is the cause of the present situation. Does he forget that in the Transcontinental Railway Act, it is expressly provided that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company shall allow to any other company the use of its rails subject to an agreement to be made by approval of the Governor General in Council, and that under that the Canadian Northern Railway Company might and would necessarily have been allowed the use of the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Edmonton through to the Pacific coast. The very thing which my right hon. friend says he thought should be provided is provided for in the agreement for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The late Government refused to grant a subsidy to the Canadian Northern to build its railway west of Edmonton. The Government thought—and I think wisely—that they should not go ahead with the new transcontinental line through the Rocky mountains, but should allow the system to be developed, allowing the road to get into a position of financial strength before attempting this hazardous enterprise of building through the mountains to the coast. But when this Government came into power, it worked in harmony with Sir Richard McBride, then Premier of British Columbia, who seemed to think that there would be no limit to the wealth and the money which British Columbia could throw into this great enterprise, and he gave a very large subsidy for the road through the Rocky mountains, joining with the Government of British Columbia when that Government guaranteed bonds upon this road to the extent of nearly $40,000,000. Those members of this House who have been in British Columbia and who have gone over the line of the Canadian Pacific or of the Canadian Northern railway, know that for nearly two hundred miles those two railways run parallel to each other, one upon one side of the Fraser river and the other upon the other side, and that for at least one hundred and fifty miles through that portion of the mountains of British Columbia, there is no reasonable possibility of any traffic whatever to feed the Canadian Northern railway. And yet the hon. gentleman seeks to throw the responsibility for this useless and most expensive construction upon the Liberal party, which refused to countenance any proposition to extend the Canadian Northern through the mountains, but took authority for the use of the Grand Trunk Pacific line through the mountains should it be desired to afford that connection.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that in 1911 it was not understood by the late Government that the Canadian Northern Railway system was to be carried through the Rocky Mountains?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do state that the late Government did not grant any aid whatever for such a project.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. But, if he will pardon me, I would like to ask him this: In 1911, when the guarantee of $35,000,000 was given by the late Government to the Canadian Northern Railway in respect of the road between Montreal and Port Arthur, was it for the purpose of assisting the Canadian Northern Railway to become a transcontinental railway from Quebec to the waters of the Pacific ocean.

or was it not? Was that the understanding of the Government, or was it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY: So far as I am aware, the understanding was that it was to give the Canadian Northern Railway prairie section a connection with eastern Canada.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This has been so frequently stated in the House, that I want to correct the hon. gentleman and to call his attention to the resolution preceding the Bill which guaranteed the $35,000,000 of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway securities which was passed by this House in 1911, under the Administration of which my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) was a member. Let him consider the recital of that resolution which was:

> Whereas, having regard to the growth of population and the rapid development of the production and trade of that portion of Canada lying west of the Great Lakes, and to the rapidly expanding trade and commerce of the Dominion generally it is in the interest of Canada as a whole that another line of railway designed to assist in the direct and economic interchange of traffic between the eastern and western portions of the Dominion, to open up and develop portions of Canada as yet without railway facilities, to promote the internal and foreign trade of Canada, to develop commerce through Canadian ports, and to afford the Government system of railways in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island an interchange of through traffic, should be constructed from the Pacific ocean to the city of Montreal; and whereas the projected line of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company extending from Port Arthur to the city of Montreal will provide the uncompleted portion of the said through line lying east of the Great Lakes.

In other words it contemplated an extension to the waters of the Pacific.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The other day the Acting Minister of Railways—to compare great things with small—told us that he was going to give us a connection between Andover and St. John; and a part of his plan was to apply for running rights over a portion of the Canadian Pacific railway covering fourteen or fifteen miles of that distance. If the Canadian Northern Railway Company had come to the Government and said: You have given us aid as far as Edmonton, and from Edmonton west to the Pacific ocean there is a railway already under construction over which we wish you to give us running rights in accordance with the reservation that was made in your Transcontinental Railway Act of 1903, the granting of that would have been carrying out to the fullest extent and in the most effective manner the spirit of the resolution which the hon. gentleman has just quoted. The point I make is that the Prime Minister is not willing to divide the responsibility with us on this side. He is not willing to say: The Liberal party is responsible for giving birth to the Canadian Northern railway; but we found that they had provided for construction only to the foot of the Rockies, and we gave money which enabled them to push through to the Pacific ocean. If he said that I should have nothing to complain of, for we on this side have no desire to shirk our responsibilities either for the Canadian Northern, so far as we are responsible for it, or for the Grand Trunk Pacific. We are proud of what we did in connection with these railways.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hon. gentlemen on the other side laugh. It is extraordinary to think that hon. gentlemen who are usually courteous, usually polite, usually willing to hear an argument, yet, when anything touches them upon the raw, burst into laughter, thinking in that way to hide the chagrin they feel. We are proud—at least I am proud—of what the late Government did so far as the Canadian Northern railway is concerned. The Canadian Northern railway has a magnificent system extending in every direction throughout our western prairies, a system laid out with great judgment, and which has been, up to the present time, a most important factor in the development of that country. We are proud of what we did in encouraging the building of the lines of railway from Port Arthur west to the Rocky mountains. I need not speak of the different portions of this system. Suffice it to say that the whole system, from the day of the construction of the first hundred miles of line, has continued to pay not merely the operating expenses, but also interest upon all the bonds issued. It is a splendid system of railway, with good earning powers, and could be made—and will in the future be made—a great success. Was it not a reasonable thing to link up the prairie system of the Canadian Northern with eastern Canada? I think it was. Was it not a splendid thing to open up the portion of the clay belt of Ontario which is traversed by the Canadian Northern? We all know that the Canadian Pacific line runs close to the shore of lake Superior and does not traverse a fertile country. But the fertile country to the north of that line is being

opened up by the Canadian Northern, and millions upon millions of acres of splendid land are being made available for settlement by the building of that line. Therefore, as one member of the Liberal party, I have nothing to be ashamed of in the assistance given to the Canadian Northern. It was when this present Government, jointly with the Government of British Columbia, conceived the idea of making a separate and independent line of railway through the mountains of British Columbia that the difficulties of the Canadian Northern began. I have no doubt that the operating expenses of that portion of the line are enormously greater than its earnings, and it will be found for years and years a great source of difficulty to the system.

So far as the Grand Trunk Pacific is concerned, of course the Liberal party must take the entire responsibility for that system. As to that I am proud to belong to the party which has been the means of building that road and of opening up a vast section of country which would otherwise not have been made accessible. I do not believe that, if we have faith in our country, we should look forward with despair, so far as this Canadian railway system is concerned. Take the Canadian Northern and also the Grand Trunk, so far as they develop the prairie country, and I think that it is a low estimate to say that 200,000,000 acres of land is opened up by these great railways. And, Sir, what does that mean. I speak of 200,000,000 acres of land which are capable of cultivation, capable of being made the homes of millions of people in the future. Without these railways, that land would be practically of no value. Any man who is familiar with the western country knows that the land which has been opened up by those two railway systems, is worth today upon an average, and will be worth within the next fifteen years upon an average, at least $15 per acre. Multiplying that 200,000,000 by 15, you have the enormous sum of $3,000,000,000 which have been added to the potential wealth of this country by the building of these railway systems. Therefore, I feel that we have not anything to regret for having engaged upon these great enterprises. The mere consideration of increased money value is nothing as compared with the enormously increased value which will come to our western country and to the fertile portion of Northern Ontario by the hundreds of thousands—nay by the millions of people who in the next quarter of a century will inhabit those districts. As one member of this House, let me say that if it is reasonably necessary to grant assistance in order to tide these companies over this present period of depression, over the terrible times of stress which have been caused by the war, I for one would be very sorry to give my vote in refusal of the proposal which has been submitted by the Government. But I think, Sir, that the Government has not treated this House fairly in not coming before us with information as to the earnings of the Canadian Northern Railway Company; because that is the most important question which we have to consider. The Government ought to come frankly before us with a statement of the earnings of this company during the past year upon the different lines which go to make up the whole Canadian Northern system. It is desirable that we should be in a position to know whether we should make provision to hold on to that road which runs from Winnipeg down into the United States and which has its terminus on lake Superior. This road was acquired by the Canadian Northern not to bring traffic to the Canadian ports or through Canadian channels, but to take Canadian traffic out of Canadian channels down through the United States. I want to know what are the earnings of this road and what are its operating expenses. I want to know also the earnings and operating expenses of the prairie system, likewise those of the line between Port Arthur and Montreal. We have a right to know whether it is wise for us to make some provision to carry over the entire system or whether it would be better to let some of these branches be taken away. We want to know whether it would be better not to let some of these branches go which are not mortgaged by this Government or by the Government of any province, simply holding on to those in respect of which there are public obligations made either by the Dominion or by the provinces. If the Minister of Finance will pardon my saying so, in respect of two things he has not treated the House fairly. I do not charge him with deliberately treating the House unfairly, but he should have submitted to us a statement of the earnings and operating expenses of the different railroads that go to make up the entire Canadian Northern Railway System, and he should have acquired from these companies an agreement under which at any time

within the next three years or the next five years, if the country desires to take over the system, the Government shall have the right to do so at a stated maximum price. These are two very important matters which we have a right to consider, and which I trust the Finance Minister will give us an opportunity of considering when the question comes before the committee.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): I have heard with amazement the words "bankrupt" and "bankruptcy" in connection with these railway systems. I do not believe that they are bankrupt, or that there will soon be any bankruptcy about them. I hope that the Canadian people will be sufficiently broad-minded and patriotic to do what is necessary to help these two roads if they really need this further aid, subject, of course, to the furnishing of all the particular information to which the House is entitled. If it is true that the Government contemplates appointing a commission to nationalize the two systems, I think the Government would be very unwise to incur further expenditure by acquiring the two other lines of railway mentioned in a notice of motion on the Order Paper to-day. All I want to say is this: when the Minister of Finance brings in the information which was asked for by the member for South Renfrew, I wish he would also submit the figures establishing the amount spent on the construction of the Quebec railway and the other road between Lyster and St. Jean des Chaillons. Will he state, also, whether these two roads are to be acquired with a view to their forming part of the National Transcontinental, and what amount will be required to complete them? I understand that one runs on the south shore of the St. Lawrence from Lyster on the Intercolonial railway to St. Jean des Chaillons, and the other on the north shore from Quebec to Murray Bay. From St. Joachim to Murray Bay, on the north shore, I understand that nothing has been done but the grading; what will it cost the country to complete that road? It is very important that we should get this information, in order that we may know if, with the railway situation as it stands to-day, we are going to extend one of the two systems, namely, the National Transcontinental.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Blain in the Chair.

Militia and Defence—Dominion arsenal, $100,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When this item was under discussion on a previous occasion some information was asked for by the member for Pictou as to whether the house of a merchant named Strickland, of Trenton, had been put out of bounds for the troops stationed there. The following telegram has been received:

Strickland's store placed out bounds account strong suspicion selling intoxicants and statements of proprietor calculating great trouble amongst troops.

The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) asked for certain information, which has been thus summarized by the department:

(a) When were the 6 Battalions now stationed at Edmonton authorized?
(b) Why were they all authorized at the same time?
(c) What is the present strength.

The answer placed in my hands by the deputy minister is as follows:

(a and c) Dates and present strength of battalions as follows:

Battalion.	Date authorized.	Present strength. Officers.	Other ranks.	Total.
138th.. ..	19-11-15	33	1,023	1,056
151st.. ..	26-11-15	33	1,241	1,274
194th.. ..	28-1-16	31	994	1,025
196th.. ..	1-2-16	6	216	222
202nd.. ..	4-2-16	31	491	522
218th.. ..	23-2-16	5	542	547
233rd.. ..	14-3-16	8	41	49

The 196th Battalion will be raised by the western universities, one company being raised in each province independently to begin with, and later the battalion staff will be furnished by the four provinces. A committee has been appointed by the western universities to work in conjunction with the District Officers Commanding, Military Districts Nos. 10, 11 and 13.

The 233rd Battalion is French Canadian Battalion from the western provinces.

(b) The Units mentioned above are authorized on dates given, in order that recruiting and organization might be completed as much as possible, before the commencement of camp.

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) asked for some information about recruiting officers in Ottawa, and guards on some of the canals. The memorandum handed to me is as follows:

There is no recruiting office now stationed at the corner of Sparks and Elgin streets. The base recruiting office is located on Sparks street, between Bank and O'Connor streets. No expense was attached to this recruiting office for rent of

building, as the space occupied was given free by the owners until a month ago, when, an offer having been made by other parties, the Government agreed to pay rent at the rate of $200 per month. Other recruiting offices, including the one on Elgin street, which have from time to time been established, have been at no expense to the public, as they have been run regimentally, and the buildings have been donated free of rent. 4,758 men enlisted in Ottawa since beginning of war.

The Guards on the Iroquois, Morrisburg and Cardinal sections have cost since the beginning of the war $258,274.35. 350 men have been employed since the beginning of the war as guards on these canals.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice that the facts are as I stated them to be, that there are to-day four regiments besides the Universities Regiment, that is five altogether, being recruited at Edmonton at the moment, besides two others at full strength; and I am satisfied that there are others being recruited there. I know there was recruiting for a regiment to be known as the Bantams of Vancouver, at Edmonton. They may have ceased their operations at Edmonton now. This fact demonstrates that no discrimination whatever is used in the securing of recruits, in the way of having regard to the requirements of civil life; that the department simply goes after recruits whenever and wherever it can get them, without regard to any other circumstance. And more than that, the fact that so many units are being recruited in the same place at the same time tends against the success of the work. There is instituted a spirit of competition between the different officers who are engaged in recruiting that does not tend to success. I admit that probably to have two battalions recruiting at the same time and in the same place may give a healthy measure of competition; but when more than two are recruited it certainly is injurious rather than beneficial. I think it is only fair to draw the attention of the minister to my opinion in regard to that. I have done so in view of the number of men recruited in Edmonton and the number of branches of the service for which they have been recruited. I may claim to speak for a part of the country that has shown as good a military spirit as any other.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think that is eminently true. My hon. friend no doubt has in mind that these regiments are recruited, I suppose, from a considerable district around Edmonton. I remember one which went through not long ago whose members had come to a considerable extent from the Peace river country. There has been an endeavour in some cases at least, to my certain knowledge, to adjust the recruiting to the requirements of local conditions. I cannot recall that any representations ever came to my attention concerning Edmonton, but I do recall other cases; and in those cases an endeavour was made by the department to meet local conditions through the guidance of recruiting officers.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not want it to be understod that I am making destructive criticism; I am making what I believe to be constructive criticism, and I speak from a desire to secure the best possible results. In the case of the men from Peace river, two battalions were authorized simultaneously and were in process of recruiting during the last harvest. Recruiting officers went up into the Peace river country and were able to get a number of homesteaders there to actually leave their harvest in the field, to come down to Edmonton and enlist in those regiments. Those are the men who went away the other day. While every credit has to be given to the men who volunteered under those circumstances, believing that their services were urgently required, I must say that there was not good judgment shown on the part of the department in securing their enlistment. At the same time that those men were being drawn away from their harvesting operations, the men in the brigade camps were authorized to leave their drill and go out and assist in the harvest field. I draw attention to this fact as showing that, so far as our experience is concerned, there has been an absolute lack of judgment, and that the department is not able to claim that they did show any judgment in the matter of recruiting in that part of the country, having regard to the requirements of civil life.

I mentioned the other day the fact of 100 men being called upon, as they believed, to protect the city of Quebec from immediate attack. Having dropped their occupations, they arrived at Quebec to find that they were merely required to fill the ranks of a battalion which, I am told, remained in garrison at Quebec for five or six months afterwards. I have no sympathy with those who desire in any way to hold back our men from going to the front as universally and as quickly as possible, but when claims are made that the work of recruiting has been conducted with judgment, I am bound to put before the House the facts, so far as they have come

under my notice, and they certainly do not bear out that contention.

If I may be permitted, I would like to refer to something that came up when this item was under discussion on Saturday. I discussed what had happened to the 9th Battalion recruited at Edmonton, and I informed the committee of the fact that the colonel who had recruited that battalion, and who had been colonel of the original volunteer battalion out of which the 9th Battalion was formed, had been displaced by Colonel Maynard Rogers, formerly of Ottawa, and that under Colonel Maynard Rogers' command the battalion had been broken up and had not been sent to the front as a unit. The men themselves, their relatives and friends, and the community from which they came, certainly felt a great sense of grievance, and they believe that Col. Maynard Rogers was in large measure responsible for that result. To-day I have been favoured with a letter from General Hughes, enclosing a letter from Colonel Rogers to myself, in which both General Hughes and Colonel Rogers take exception to the statements I made. I will not trouble the House by reading the letters; I will just draw attention to one paragraph in General Hughes' letter. He says:

> Permit me to say you are entirely in error, and that Colonel Osborne was relieved on account of his incapacity, and by my direction.

I am not going to discuss Colonel Osborne; I do not know whether he was capable or incapable; but I do know that he was the means of raising a regiment, one of the first regiments to reach Valcartier, and that, to that degree, he certainly rendered good service to his country, and, in all fairness, I think, was entitled to some consideration. I do not suggest that, because Colonel Osborne was successful in raising a regiment, he would therefore be a competent military commander in the field. I do not say that any injustice was done to Colonel Osborne by his being retired, but I do say that when the Department of Militia, or the Government, saw fit to replace Colonel Osborne by Colonel Rogers, and that then under the command of Colonel Rogers that battalion was not considered fit to take the field, I am compelled to reach the conclusion that Colonel Rogers was not competent. At any rate, without discussing the matter at any greater length, General Hughes and Colonel Rogers will have to divide between them the responsibility for the fact which resulted in such a tremendous disappointment to the men who had enlisted in that battalion, to their relatives and friends, and to the community from which they came, by reason of its being broken up, disbanded practically, or attached to other units, thus being deprived of the privilege of going forward as an Edmonton battalion which was of course their desire. The men did go forward as members of other units, and casualty lists show that they played their part as other men played their parts. We are not complaining, because they volunteered to render service in the Empire's cause; they were privileged to render that service, but there is a certain reasonable measure of consideration to which men and officers are entitled, and which they certainly did not receive in this case. In his letter General Hughes says that I am attacking Colonel Rogers. I have no desire to attack Colonel Rogers; it is a condition of facts of which I complain. Colonel Rogers in his letter also seems to suggest that I am attacking him. I repeat that I have no desire to attack Colonel Rogers. But I do desire to place before the House the fact that every man in the 9th Battalion, and his right to take his part in the cause for which he volunteered, is just as important to me as Colonel Rogers or General Hughes. I do not propose to allow such an occurrence to pass without due notice in this House, even though Colonel Rogers, and even General Hughes, may consider it in some degree a reflection on them. I have no desire to reflect on either of them, but I make a statement of fact, and that fact was certainly most unpleasant and most injurious to the men who were concerned, and to the locality from which they came.

It is a fact that that occurrence has not prevented further recruiting in Edmonton; it is a fact that the patriotism of the people, not of Edmonton alone, but of the country surrounding, is such that they are prepared to come forward and offer themselves even although they do not get that recognition which they have a right to expect. But I must point out to the minister that while that may be the case in Edmonton, it is not likely to be the case throughout the country. When an instance, such as I speak of, occurs in Edmonton—and I think it must be admitted that it was a most aggrevated instance—similar instances may have occurred in other places; and when we comment, as sometimes people do comment, upon the slackness of recruiting in different localities, perhaps such incidents may have some-

thing to do with it. I say it would be well for those who are responsible for the conduct of our affairs to see that such incidents do not occur, and to see that no reason is given to cause such a sense of disappointment and unfairness amongst the men as would tend to prevent others from offering themselves for service. When a man offers himself, with the sacrifice of his time, his position, and even his life, he is surely entitled to a square deal. If he does not get it he and his friends feel a sense of injustice.

There is another instance I desire to draw attention to. The 3rd C.M.R. was not from Edmonton city, but from the country east of Edmonton. Major Fane, the commander of the unit, came from Vegreville. The unit went into action some time in December of last year. They suffered very heavy casualties; I think one-third of them were killed and wounded in one day's operations. One of the officers was killed and the major was very badly wounded. They were very severely cut up. As far as I am aware, they conducted themselves with all credit; and our authorities showed their regard for the services rendered by this unit by wiping them out. There is no 3rd C.M.R. now. The unit has ceased to exist because it has been distributed among other forces just as the 9th battalion was. I do not think that such a system as that is good for the service, I do not think it is to the advantage of recruiting, nor do I think it is creditable to anybody who is concerned in it. Right from the start as far as our experience goes, no regard whatever has been paid to locality in the matter of recruiting, no regard has been paid to the establishment of fixed units attached to a certain locality where the presence of friends might tend to hold men together and give them a certain spirit in carrying on their operations. No regard has been paid to that and, due to that fact, we perhaps in a very large measure feel a certain slackness in recruiting that is complained of in a great many cases. In our own case we had three battalions training at Edmonton for the greater part of a year, one of them for over a year. From all of these battalions drafts were sent—two drafts from the 51st and one each from the 63rd and 66th. I do not know where they went or what units they were attached to. No doubt they are serving their country, no doubt they are fighting in the same cause as if they were called the Edmonton or the Alberta battalions, but this is not a good way to inspire our population with a desire for service. Every consideration should be given to the question of sentiment and it is well to encourage the idea of community of interest among the people of a certain locality. If a certain battalion is known as an Edmonton battalion, or an Alberta battalion, if it is recruited from Edmonton or Alberta, when the men who belong to it go forward, every one concerned, those who remain behind and those who have gone forward, have an interest in what that battalion is doing that he otherwise would not have had, and the ignoring of that fact has tended very greatly against rapid recruiting in many parts of the country. It is true that we have done magnificently in the way of recruiting. We have, as the right hon. the Prime Minister has said, raised over 300,000, but we have to raise 200,000 more. It must be remembered that raising the last 200,000 is a very different matter from raising the first 200,000, because the same conditions that produced the first 200,000 do not exist in connection with the last 200,000. Now that we are coming to the point when there is an abundance of employment, when every man who joins must certainly leave a lucrative position, we are facing a situation in connection with which we must recognize all those motives and sentiments that tend towards a willingness to sacrifice for the good of the cause. This has not been done in the past. We have done well without it, but we cannot expect to continue to do well and to carry on the business in that way. When we claim to have raised 300,000, that means that we have included in that number the rejections, which have been stated as over 20,000. That is not a fair count. These men may have been enlisted, but they have been rejected, they are not part of our forces, and we have no right to count them as simply enlisted. We must count only the men who either have rendered service, or are actually on the road to service.

Mr. MORPHY: I wish to bring before my hon. friend the Prime Minister, while he is acting as Minister of Militia and Defence, a subject that has been communicated to me by a gentleman living in my own constituency, a gentleman of some standing and repute, who has been warden of the county, and, for many years, reeve of the township in which he resides, Mr. James Donaldson. Mr. Donaldson writes me that the Militia Department has promulgated an order that soldiers may assist

the farmers for a certain time during the present spring. In the city of Stratford, in the county that I have the honour to represent, there is located the 110th Battalion, probably recruited up to 700 or 800. This order apparently is applied to that battalion and the men have gone into the country districts to work. This gentleman points out that the season has been very wet and backward, and that while the soldiers have been, and are now, engaged amongst the farmers, the spring work has hardly commenced owing to the wet nature of the ground, and he has asked me to bring the matter up and suggest that the time be extended. I may observe here that what is true in my district may be true elsewhere in Canada and I would therefore request the militia authorities to consider, having regard to the condition of the land throughout every portion of the country, whether the time should not be extended and that, if any action is to be taken, an early announcement of it, almost forthwith if possible, should be made in order that disturbance would not be the outcome of it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Where the weather conditions are unusual I should think the time could be extended as my hon. friend suggests because without an extension, the arrangements under which these men were to assist in putting in the crops, seeding and ploughing would not be productive, of much benefit. The deputy minister tells me that he thinks it can be arranged. In regard to the matters spoken of by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) we have had calls for drafts from time to time from the War Office. These drafts have been sent forward from a great many battalions in different parts of the country. There has been an endeavour to keep men from a particular locality as much together as possible, but the drafts must be supplied when they are asked for.

Mr. MARCIL: On Friday afternoon I had the honour to put a question to the Prime Minister regarding recruiting. I do not know whether I expressed myself properly or whether I was misunderstood by the newspapers, but one newspaper to-night criticises my putting the question on the ground that I advocated that being done. I merely wanted information; I asked the Prime Minister, in view of conscription being about to be adopted in England and the recent claim that was made that taking away a large number of men would dislocate the agricultural industry in Canada, if the Government were contemplating recruiting to the full extent of 500,000 men. I would like to know if a census has been taken as to recruiting in Canada. I see that one of the senators has been giving out some statistics showing that on the 15th of March last the men enlisted consisted of 61 per cent of British born, 28½ per cent of English-Canadian born, 4½ per cent of French-Canadian born, and 6 per cent of foreign born. I know that several questions were put in this House last session in regard to that matter, especially as to the extent of recruiting in the province of Quebec, and I think that the Minister of Militia replied that he could not give any information on that score. I would like to know if the figures I have quoted are official?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The figures in question are not official.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to say that the Government is authorizing the recruiting of a number of French Canadian battalions. A French Canadian battalion is being recruited as far west as Edmonton. It would be a great mistake to imagine that French Canadians are recruited only in the province of Quebec. A large number of my constituents have been drafted into New Brunswick battalions, and a large number of French Canadians have been drafted into Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island battalions. The same is true of Ontario; in fact, in some of the battalions recruited in Ottawa some of the companies consist of French Canadians, and the same is true throughout Canada. Recruiting in the province of Quebec has perhaps not been as large as it should be, due to various causes, but I think it would be unfair to cast aspersions upon those who have enlisted and who are doing their duty splendidly at the front, because recruiting has perhaps not been as large as it should have been. I think that if proper measures are taken, recruiting can be increased in the province of Quebec; I think the Government has undertaken the recruiting of men in certain rural parts of the province.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am very glad to have the information that my hon. friend has given and I join with him in paying a tribute to that splendid service which has been rendered by the French-Canadians who are at the front.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has the Prime Minister taken into consideration since

Friday last the question of the voting of soldiers enlisted from the province of Nova Scotia?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really have not had an opportunity of taking it up. I had hoped to have a militia council to-day, but it will have to be postponed until to-morrow and the subject will then be discussed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I would like to point out to the minister the urgency of the matter because, if any provincial legislation were necessary, as there is likely to be an early prorogation of the legislature, such legislation would have to be presented as soon as possible.

Mr. TURRIFF: If I understood my right hon. friend the Prime Minister aright, he stated that the cost of patrolling the canal on the Iroquois, Morrisburg and Cardinal sections amounted to $258,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it was something like that.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think the committee will agree with me that that is a very large sum for the amount of work that is being done. I want to point out to my right hon. friend, who is now Acting Minister of Militia, how to a certain extent the account has been run up to such a high figure. My information is—and I am satisfied that it is fairly correct—that in one company of Hussars, the horses are not owned by the Government, but are hired, and that the Government pays 50 cents a day for each horse, and, of course, the expenses and the keep of the horses; that a good many of the horses are horses that cost about $120 in that locality, and that the owner of each horse has the payment in full of his horse in eight months; or, if a horse costs $150 he would receive the total value of it in ten months, so that those who have had horses hired to the Government from the outbreeak of the war have collected already about double their value. My information is that some of the officers own a number of horses and are therefore making a very considerable revenue and running up the cost of the guarding of the canal over and above what it would be if the Government followed its usual course and owned the horses that those men are using.

There is another matter that I think accounts to a slight extent for the very high cost of protecting that canal, and that is that with 120 men stationed at Morrisburg, there are 16 officers, or one officer for fewer than eight men. If that is the case—and I am assured it is—it is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs, and I am drawing it to the attention of the acting minister in order that he may look into it and see if that is so, because I can hardly believe it.

I would like to ask a question as to who is the present contractor for clothing supplied to the department, and who was the contractor last year. I do not think the department bought much clothing last year.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before the Chairman of the War Purchasing Commission answers by hon. friend with regard to that matter I would like to say that I understand there are not many horses employed on the canal. There are a few mounted men required. The arrangement, I believe, is that the owner provides the stabling and takes care of the horse; the department provides the fodder, and I think the rate is what my hon. friend has suggested. I will have the matter looked into and see whether the expense can be reduced.

With regard to the patrolling, I am informed by the deputy minister that every patrol on the canal must be in charge of an officer, and some times a patrol consists of only eight or ten men. The work has to be carried on day and night. I do not know about the particular district to which my hon. friend has alluded, but I do know something about the work which was carried on in the vicinity of the Niagara peninsula, because I inspected some of the posts there last summer. The work is important and has to be attended to with a great deal of diligence, and if my hon. friend were made acquainted with all the intimations that have come to us from time to time as to the danger at this, that, or the other point, he would feel with us, I am sure, that even if the expense be pretty large, the Government ought not to relax any reasonable precautions. A lack of vigilance at some particular place, even for a very short time, might result in great destruction of property. It has been held that these precautions ought to be of the most efficient character possible.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have no intention of suggesting that precaution should be relaxed in any way. My information is that men going out on patrol go two men at a time for two hours and patrol three miles and back. Possibly it may be that a larger proportion of officers are necessary. However, I am quite satisfied to have drawn the matter to the attention of the minister,

and I feel sure that if unnecessary expense is being incurred an effort will be made to curtail it.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A patrol of two or three men was sent on without officer last year with the result that one man was killed and another severely wounded in some shooting that took place. It created some international difficulty at that time. I understand that since then the military authorities have taken the ground that the men who are doing patrol duty must be in command of an officer.

Mr. KEMP: The hon. member for Assiniboia as I understood him wanted to know who was the contractor for clothing previous to the war and who is the contractor at the present time.

Mr. TURRIFF: I wanted to find out who was the present contractor and who was the previous contractor, if they were different.

Mr. KEMP: Before the war broke out?

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Mr. KEMP: There are scores of contractors for clothing at the present time. Clothing is open to competition; tenders are asked for, and the lowest tenderer gets the contract.

Mr. TURRIFF: Not always.

Mr. KEMP: Always. In order to give competition, it was divided into units, so that the clothing manufacturers could become interested, and the saving has been very great.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is a vote of $800,000 for clothing this year. Is that clothing purchased through the War Purchasing Commission?

Mr. KEMP: I understand that that vote is for clothing for the militia force. Last year there was no vote of that character for clothing. I am inclined to think though I am not speaking by the book, and am not certain of the policy of the department. that the department will draw on the stores for that clothing. If not, they will need to buy it by tender, or have it made under the present contract with the department.

Mr. TURRIFF: If this clothing is used by our army, why is it charged to the Militia Department, instead of to the war vote like other munitions of war?

[Mr. Turriff.]

Mr. KEMP: As I explained, this item of $800,000 to which the hon. member for Pictou has referred, is for the militia force. Therefore, it is in the militia Estimates. But the war appropriation vote is $250,000,000 which went through last week.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is it the policy of the department to go on with the training and issuing of clothing to the militia when nearly all have gone overseas? There is only a skeleton organization.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That was explained when the item passed. No clothing has been bought for some time, and it is necessary to provide it now. Some of the militia are on active service. This may also provide some clothing for a force raised for home defence, as suggested, I think, by the hon. member for Edmonton, when we were discussing this matter a day or two ago.

Mr. MACDONALD: At $20 a suit this would provide for 40,000 men. There is not that number of our militia who have not gone overseas.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The information I have is that the money is needed to provide the militia, permanent and non-permanent, with clothing and necessaries. No vote for this purpose was taken in 1915-16 and consequently provision for 1916-17 is all the more necessary. The estimate of the Quartermaster General shows a total of over $1,000,000 but $800,000 will provide for present wants. I have details here of the number of caps and other articles in store. It does not follow that all this money will be used this year.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will this clothing be made by the contractors for the Militia Department?

Mr. KEMP: The contractors for the militia clothing are Mark Workman of Montreal and the Sanford Company. Their contract for militia clothing expires in 1917. They have been manufacturers, I believe, for a good many years past.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I desire to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a condition regarding recruiting which prevails in Edmonton. As he is aware the city of Edmonton and surrounding country has done a large amount of recruiting, and at present we have six battalions, a portion of which have not their full complement of men. I find a news item in an Edmonton paper which states that the 210th Battalion

of Moosejaw has opened a recruiting office in Edmonton. The item is as follows:

Captain J. L. Thomas, the recruiting officer for the 210th Battalion, with headquarters in Moosejaw, Sask., announces that an office for recruiting has been opened in Room 5 in the Empire Block, corner of Jasper avenue and 101st street. He also desires to contradict a report that has been set in circulation to the effect that this battalion is not an overseas unit. The 210th has been authorized by Ottawa for mobilizaion in Moosejaw, Sask., and to recruit for overseas service in not only Saskatchewan, but Alberta also. Free transportation is given eligible recruits and owing to the fact that the men of this unit are either nearly all soldiers with previous active service or at any rate military training a much earlier departure for overseas is looked for than is usual. The 210th will put in their summer training at Sewell camp.

The point is that the province of Alberta has recruited more than her quota according to population in the overseas battalions. We have regiments not yet recruited to full strength. I understand that the policy of the department is not to authorize any new battalion until the battalions already authorized are up to strength. In view of that policy I think it is an injustice to Alberta, and to the city of Edmonton in particular, that an outside battalion with headquarters in Moosejaw should be permitted to have its officers come up and recruit soldiers from Alberta, pay transportation to Moosejaw, and take eligible men away who may be required to fill battalions at present being organized in Edmonton.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think there is a good deal of force in the hon. gentleman's suggestion. I will bring the matter to the attention of the Adjutant General, who has control of such matters, and ask him to deal with it.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the Prime Minister be good enough to get from the department, for the information of the committee, a list of the various units, detachments and sections that have been recruited at Edmonton?

Mr. LOGGIE: When I was home at Easter my attention was drawn to the fact that the railway bridges crossing the two branches of the Miramichi river were inefficiently protected, and I was asked to draw the attention of the department to the fact. In the event of any disaster happening through the action of an enemy, certainly transportation would be very much interfered with. I simply draw the attention of the department to the fact that the interests of the country are more or less at stake through these bridges not being properly and efficiently patrolled.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I may say that my attention has been called to the matter. I communicated with the Department of Railways and Canals, and I understand that an intimation has come from the general manager that the subject is being dealt with.

Department of Militia and Defence—contingencies, $9,000.

Mr. OLIVER: There are some matters that I should like to discuss under this item, particularly that of the necessity of larger allowances to dependents, with a view to relieving the Patriotic Fund.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend might discuss that when the Bill comes before the committee.

Mr. OLIVER: I would very much rather discuss it on the Estimate, and if possible this evening.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am afraid I cannot very well be here this evening. We can let the item stand, if the hon. gentleman wishes; but there is precisely the same opportunity of discussion in committee upon the Bill as there is now.

Mr. OLIVER: I would rather have the discussion on this item than on the Bill.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Very good; we had better let the item stand.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Supplementary Estimates 1916-17. Railways and Canals—St. John terminal facilities—rebuilding grain elevator, $500,000.

Mr. REID: Before taking up this item, may I give some information which was asked for by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) about the garden plot at Antigonish station. I wired to Moncton for the information and received this telegram in reply:

The loam used in making Antigonish garden plot was taken from our right of way near Malagash station. After four cars had been unloaded it was found that two carloads were sufficient. As a result two cars were loaded back on the cars and shipped to Mulgrave, where it was used for similar purposes. The cost of loading done by regular sectionmen was about five dollars per car. The cost of reloading the two cars at Antigonish was approximately ten dollars.

F. P. Gautelius.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) asked me the date when the single fare for soldiers went into effect. I wired Moncton and have received this telegram from Mr. Hayes:

> Your message fifth. Arrangements for single fare for soldiers on leave is generally in effect on Government railways. Frst arranged for Easter holidays, April twentieth to twenty-fourth inclusive and became generally effective April twenty-eight, it taking few days to print and distribute instructions to agents. If Mr. Macdonald has any instance where agents failing to carry out instructions would be pleased to investigate.
>
> C. A. Hayes.

With reference to the item before us, the St. John elevator, the Intercolonial had an elevator at St. John which was destroyed by fire on August 13, 1914. It is the intention to build a transfer elevator at St. John, at Reid's point, with a capacity of about 500,000 bushels, which will serve a new slip. Conveyors would be extended to McLeod's and Pettinger's wharves. The object of locating at this point, instead of on the site of the old elevator, is to preserve the old site for yard accommodation. There is also an item for $55,000 for the steamer Northumberland. This steamer has been plying between Prince Edward Island and Northumberland for a number of years. The company have disposed of their two vessels. The Northumberland was purchased by the Government for $55,000, and will now be operated as part of the railway system.

Mr. OLIVER: What will be the capacity of the elevator to be erected?

Mr. REID: The machinery of the elevator will have a capacity of 1,000,000 bushels, but the storage at first will be only 500,000 bushels. It is more of a transfer elevator. We hope to get the 500,000 bushel elevator up before next winter, and it will then be easy to add as much additional capacity as we wish.

Mr. OLIVER: It seems to be a large price for an elevator of small capacity.

Mr. REID: The initial cost of erecting an elevator is estimated at about $1 a bushel. That is largely for the machinery. Then, of course, when additional storage capacity is erected that costs much less in proportion, as the machinery is already installed. This will be done by tender, of course, and if we could have an elevator of 750,000 bushel capacity erected for $500,000 we should be very glad.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. OLIVER: I quite agree that it is necessary to have this elevator, and I approve of the vote. My only criticism would be as to the limited capacity of the elevator. What is the capacity of the Canadian Pacific railway elevator at St. John?

Mr. REID: They have built a new elevator, with a capacity of one and a half millions, then there was an old elevator with a capacity of about one million. The difficulty with the Intercolonial has been that if we did take grain to St. John we had no elevator of our own, and the Canadian Pacific railway always claimed that they had all the grain they could handle from their own line, and then, of course, there were the shunting charges across St. John, so that we were really not in a position to handle grain. Even with 500,000 bushels we would be able to handle quite a little outward-bound grain. In addition to that, if we come in on the St. John Valley road, we go right into the Canadian Pacific railway yards, and we will not have the heavy shunting charges.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the new elevator to be on the same side of the harbour as the Canadian Pacific railway elevators, or is it at Courtenay bay?

Mr. REID: It is to be on the Courtenay bay or east side of the harbour. The Government own a lot of property, part of which they sold for a sugar refinery, and this is to be near the sugar refinery with carriers that will serve on the west side. It is on the east side of the harbour, but west of the elevator, and it will also serve Courtenay bay. It is intended to provide a storage capacity of more than 500,000 bushels, but we thought that if we could have 500,000 bushels capacity. and these vessels came next winter as they came last winter, we could put through a large quantity of grain by that transfer as well as by the transfer at Halifax.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it the intention of the Government to make the connections over the St. John Valley line with this elevator; is it part of the scheme?

Mr. REID: Yes, we will go right over that line.

Mr. OLIVER: This elevator is to be part of the new system of handling trade to St. John over the St. John Valley line?

Mr. REID: Yes. As the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) stated the other

night, this route is 100 miles shorter than by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Of course, when we go over the eleven miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway we go through the Canadian Pacific Railway yards and right over to the Intercolonial terminals which are around Courtenay bay. We run right through to our own station. Our station will be on the east side, near where the other elevator was established.

Mr. OLIVER: Is this elevator accessible to the Intercolonial?

Mr. REID: It is right on the Intercolonial.

Mr. OLIVER: My only criticism would be, first, that there might be a danger of the elevator not being built soon enough, and next that there is a very great probability of it not being big enough. To carry on the discussion, which we had with the minister some time ago, I would like to go on record as holding the view that it is absolutely necessary for the proper handling of the grain in the West over the Transcontinental line by all the year-round transit that there should be ample accommodation at the city of St. John, not merely sufficient to make a transfer of one or two cargoes, but to carry a considerable amount of grain as it is carried, though not to such a large extent, at the head of the lakes in storage. In order to be of value in handling the grain, the railroad must bring it forward as its rolling stock will permit, so many thousand bushels a day, or so many thousands a week. That quantity cannot be speeded up very much. The railways must carry the grain forward as their rolling stock will permit it to be carried forward, and, if there is not ample storage accommodation at the winter port, in the event of the market being depressed, or of vessels not being available, that movement by rail would have to cease until the small capacity transfer elevator at St. John was relieved; whereas if there was ample capacity at the St. John elevator that movement could be kept up continuously. That is the principle which I see in the successful handling of the grain of the Northwest, the possibility of keeping up a continuous movement by rail all the year round, in winter, as well as in summer. I am emphasizing this point because the Minister of Trade and Commerce the other night, and the Acting Minister of Railways to-night, seemed rather to hold the view that there is no necessity for any considerable storage at the Atlantic winter port which is open and available to vessels all the year round, and that it might be supposed that the vessels would remove the grain as fast as it was brought in. In theory they would, but not in practice. The grain must go forward in a continuous stream, as the rolling stock of the railway will permit, and its transfer across the ocean then depends, partly on the condition of the market, and partly on the available ocean transport. There must be a large amount of storage accommodation, or that movement cannot take place in that way. My suggestion is that the minister get the biggest elevator he can for the money, and if he cares to double the amount, assuming that it is intended to transact business over the Transcontinental with the view of giving a continuous outlet of grain all the year round, he can go as far as he likes in elevator-building at St. John, and I will be glad to support him.

Mr. REID: The hon. member misunderstood me if he thinks that I was discussing this along the line that we did not require large storage capacity at the winter port. Years ago, in discussing this elevator question, I took the stand, and I think it was almost the unanimous opinion of the House, that we should have a large terminal storage capacity at our ocean ports. At that time it was Montreal that we had chiefly in mind, and at that time, I think, we had a capacity of only 1,000,000 bushels there. Now we have a capacity of 15,000,000 bushels, and a capacity of one and a half million bushels at Quebec. Last year, or probably two years ago, the capacity at St. John was increased by the establishment of a new elevator. We have now a capacity of one and a half million bushels in the new elevator, and, I think, a capacity of 1,000,000 bushels in the old elevator. I think we should have a great deal more accommodation, and no doubt it will have to be increased each year until we get a large capacity at St. John and Halifax. But I thought that we should have at once an elevator with a large capacity at Transcona, or at some other place in that section, and also that we should have one at once at St. John. In discussing the matter with the Minister of Finance, he asked me what I thought we would be able to get along with this year, that is, up till next spring, and I thought that if we could succeed in getting at each place a capacity of 500,000

bushels, then next year we could go on and extend it. I thought that that would be much better than building an elevator with a capacity of 1,000,000 bushels or 1,500,000 bushels at St. John without the small one at Winnipeg. The difficulty, I am informed by the management of the railway, is that they have to haul the grain to Fort William, which means a back haul on account of not having a transfer elevator at Winnipeg, where they could weigh the grain, inspect it, and give the certificates the same as is done at Saskatoon and Fort William. By having this elevator at a point where the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific meet, so that the grain could pass through the elevator and be weighed, and certified, the Transcontinental will save that back haul down to Fort William, and, on that account, be able to handle very much more grain. It will go right straight through to Armstrong, Quebec, St. John and Halifax. We will be in this position as far as the Intercolonial is concerned: If we can get this 500,000 bushel elevator up, we will have 1,250,000 bushels capacity between Halifax and St. John. That will put us in not a bad position to start with next fall. I do not think we can spend more than $1,000,000 between the two this year. At the same time I have tried to carry out the wishes of the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) that I should just place in the Estimates what I thought I could spend. If it overruns the amount a little, we may have to have a Supplementary Estimate next year but we will try and get as large a capacity as we can for this amount.

Mr. COPP: Did I understand the minister as telling my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) that the Intercolonial tracks now run to the point selected for the building of this elevator?

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman knows where the sugar refinery has been built. The track runs around and out to this point they call Reid's Point. The elevator is to be built in that vicinity near the sugar refinery. Then carriers can be run along the shore on the west side to it, and when Courtenay bay is developed so that vessels can get in there, carriers can go the other way. This elevator has only 500,000 bushels capacity. Of course, it will be extended on down towards the Courtenay bay side as well. The management tell me that they think that would be better for the Intercolonial railway.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. COPP: What I want to find out from the minister is whether the spur line running from the Intercolonial track is already built to the point where the elevator will be?

Mr. REID: At the present time a little line runs over there but when the Courtenay bay scheme is carried out it will not be used as it now is. That is a new scheme altogether.

Mr. COPP: That is the Courtenay bay scheme?

Mr. REID: Yes, with the Courtenay bay scheme, there is a new way of coming in. The line we have now would never do for that.

Mr. COPP: Is there a way by which they can come in to that elevator until the Courtenay bay scheme is developed?

Mr. REID: As soon as we can get sufficient work done on the Courtenay bay route, so that we can change the route to come in by Courtenay bay, we will do so. We have an amount in the Estimates for that work.

Mr. COPP: I understand that what the minister is proposing is that grain for export coming over the Transcontinental railway, will come down over the Transcontinental to McGivney junction, then over the St. John Valley railway and the Canadian Pacific to St. John?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. COPP: And on through to this proposed elevator?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. COPP: Provided you want to take the grain over the Transcontinental railway to Moncton and down over the Intercolonial to St. John, what connection have you to enable you to get these car loads of grain to the boats?

Mr. REID: Just the same.

Mr. COPP: The link of the Valley railway from Gagetown to Westfield is not supposed to be completed until the first of February, 1917, and it is very doubtful if all the contracts will be completed by that date; therefore, during this coming fall, the export grain which cannot go down by way of the Valley railway ought to go by Moncton and St. John.

Mr. REID: We have that connection now and they are using it every day. We have a shunting engine that is kept busy shunt-

ing around there now. That is where they load the lumber and that is where the sugar refinery takes in its supplies.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why should this elevator be charged to the Intercolonial railway when it is for the business of the St. John Valley and Transcontinental? Is it proposed to bring grain over the Intercolonial railway and not over the Transcontinental? Why not build it as a Government elevator and allow either the Intercolonial or the other road to use it? There will be that capital charge, or burden, upon the Intercolonial railway when it is for the use of another road unless you propose to allow the Intercolonial to make a profit out of the charges for handling the grain.

Mr. REID: The Intercolonial always had an elevator. I never thought of that point. I thought it was simply replacing the old elevator that the Intercolonial had. I do not think it is a very serious matter. The hon. gentleman will see that in the next item we have an elevator charged against the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: But that is on the Transcontinental railway, and for the use of the Transcontinental.

Mr. REID: This is really on the Intercolonial Railway system.

Mr. GRAHAM: But not for Intercolonial traffic.

Mr. REID: It is partly for Intercolonial traffic. We propose to put this elevator on property which is owned and controlled by the Intercolonial railway. The St. John Valley road will go into the Intercolonial station and will use our terminals and yet it could not be called a part of the Intercolonial railway. I do not think that is a very serious point.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not very serious. I was to-day asked the question: What capital has been expended on the Intercolonial railway? The argument against the Intercolonial is based quite often on the amount of money that has been expended on capital account. Here is half a million being charged up to the Intercolonial railway although primarily it is not for Intercolonial traffic. This is only a unit, as I understand. Other units are to be added and in time we may have a further capital charge of a million and a half before we get through although it is to accommodate the traffic of another road.

Mr. REID: There is a difference of opinion in regard to that. It is to be on Intercolonial property and the Intercolonial should have an elevator anyway. It will have the use of the elevator.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will there be any revenue for the Intercolonial railway from the traffic that is created through this elevator?

Mr. REID: I do not suppose there will be. If it goes through the yard of the Intercolonial railway there might be some but I do not know what the nature of the traffic would be there.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Intercolonial gets all the expense and none of the benefit.

Mr. REID: I do not know what we could charge it too. We could only charge it to the Intercolonial or the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: You build elevators elsewhere and you do not charge them to the roads that the elevators are placed on. At St. John there will be just a plain elevator built and you can call it a Government elevator.

Mr. REID: It adds to the value of the property.

Mr. GRAHAM: Certainly it does in a way. I just raised the point because it seemed to me that it might perhaps have been overlooked. The Transcontinental railway will have the benefit of the elevator but it will be an expense to the Intercolonial. The St. John Valley railway is to be extended to meet the Transcontinental traffic and bring it across by the short way into St. John and it is not to go around by the Intercolonial. If it were not to do that it would not be built. But we have an elevator to receive that traffic and we are charaging it up to the poor, overburdened Intercolonial railway which has everything charged to it when we cannot find some other account to charge to.

Mr. MARCIL: What does the minister intend doing with the section of the Transcontinental railway between Lévis and Moncton? I have heard that there is a great deal of congestion on the Intercolonial railway. Does he intend carrying the traffic that reaches Quebec, and that is to be sent down to Halifax and St. John, over the Intercolonial railway and not utilize that section of the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows the position in which we have been during the past winter. The equipment on the Intercolonial was all the equipment we had, and that equipment was run over the Intercolonial and part over the Levis-Moncton branch, and quite a lot of freight went over that branch at times during the winter. Until we can get more equipment for the Transcontinental it will be hard for us to do more than we have been doing. We have ordered a large amount of equipment and we will operate the two systems to the best advantage. The branch from Levis to Moncton is a good road, and after next fall we will use it almost entirely for the St. John traffic, because we go in by McGivney junction and on down to St. John. I hope that the elevator which we will have at St. John next year will help us out very materially.

Mr. MARCIL: You are not going to carry any grain beyond Quebec next summer?

Mr. REID: Not likely, because when it gets to Quebec it is at an ocean port, and it would only be adding so much to the freight to carry it on to St. John or Halifax. Of course, there are transports being sent to Canadian ports by the Admiralty, and some of them may be ordered to St. John or Halifax even during the summer months, and the Admiralty may order us to take grain, or hay, or ammunition to those ports. In that case, we will carry out their instructions, but it is not natural to carry freight past Quebec or Montreal during the summer months.

Mr. MARCIL: What kind of a passenger service is given between Levis and Moncton on the Transcontinental?

Mr. REID: The road is in operation and a tri-weekly passenger service is given.

Mr. MARCIL: Is there a regular freight service?

Mr. REID: Freight is also carried.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the service be improved during the coming summer?

Mr. REID: We are at present able to keep up the freight and passenger service fairly well and we will keep it up during the summer. Now that navigation has opened on the St. Lawrence, with the equipment we have we do not anticipate much trouble along the road.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the minister been giving serious consideration to the question of the elevator capacity for storage purposes at the city of Quebec? If the Transcontinental is to be used to any extent, I suppose the Government will wish to get as much grain as possible to Quebec in the fall for shipment out in the spring.

Mr. REID: We have a storage capacity of 1,500,000 bushels.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the Government that storage?

Mr. REID: That is under the Harbour Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: It has no connection with the Government railway system?

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the Government thought of developing elevator facilities at the city of Quebec to handle the traffic coming over the Transcontinental from the West?

Mr. REID: We have been thinking over that matter as well as elevator capacity at other points along the line, but we have not decided to do anything during the present year. We intend to see how we can get along with the capacity that we have during the coming season, and having the other two ports besides Montreal and Quebec to take the grain to, with this elevator that we are getting at St. John, I anticipate we shall be able to handle a large quantity of grain. We did not provide for any more elevator capacity this year for the reason that we thought the grain would be going through pretty fast and that we would get along without much storage.

Mr. OLIVER: When the minister gets next year the elevator capacity that he speaks about at St. John, does he expect that the connection that has been under discussion by the St. John valley will be completed?

Mr. REID: The members of the New Brunswick Government told me that they expected to have that completed and ready for operation by the 1st of December, but in order to be sure, they asked that the date be filled in—I think it is February 1. That is the understanding that I have with them.

Mr. OLIVER: If you have the elevator ready, you can reach it over the Intercolonial.

Mr. REID: Just the same; it is only a question of so many miles further.

Mr. OLIVER: During the past winter the department put into force between Winnipeg and Montreal or Quebec a rate that was recognized as a very reasonable one, and one which competed with water traffic, but they did not put in a rate from Quebec or Montreal to St. John. They are going to build an elevator at St. John, but unless they put in a rate to St. John that will correspond with the rate that they put into force during the past winter from Winnipeg to Quebec or Montreal, they might as well not build that elevator. It will be of no use because last winter's rate was so adjusted that it simply made it possible to use the storage capacity at Montreal and Quebec without any advantage to the shipper and did not make it possible to use the accommodation at St. John, because there was no rate reduction that would enable that to be done. I am asking the minister if, in view of the proposed construction of this elevator at St. John, it is to be the policy of the department that a through rate to the port of St. John will be given at a corresponding charge per mile to that given last winter from Winnipeg to Quebec.

Mr. REID: That rate from Winnipeg to Quebec proved to be quite an advantage. There was an enormous quantity of grain in the West last year, and pressure was put on the Minister of Railways to see if he could do anything to relieve the congestion. He had only a small equipment—just what he could take from the Intercolonial. At Montreal and Quebec there was quite a large storage capacity that was not being filled. If the Canadian Pacific Railway took the grain through, they would take it right to St. John, because they had an elevator there, and if the Grand Trunk took it through, they would take it to their elevators at Portland. We had no elevators at St. John and there was not much chance of the Transcontinental taking grain to St. John.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to revive that argument. All I am asking is, what is the policy for the future?

Mr. REID: I want to show the hon. member that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) said: as an experiment we will take this grain to Montreal at the same rate as the summer rate of last year, that is 6 cents, and fill those elevators. That, of course, must have been a great advantage during the winter.

Mr. OLIVER: It was a certain amount of advantage.

Mr. REID: If there had been elevator capacity at Fort William, the grain would have gone there and the shippers would have had to pay the same storage rates as they would at Montreal, so the storage question was exactly the same.

Mr. OLIVER: That is right.

Mr. REID: As to the question of what is to be done next year; the hon. member knows that through rates are always made between Winnipeg, or the West, and ocean ports. That matter will be taken up by the minister and his general freight agent, and a conclusion will be reached as to a through rate between Winnipeg and St. John and Halifax. This grain that went through last fall all went to Montreal and Quebec, except a small quantity.

Mr. OLIVER: I said a little while ago that I should be glad to see elevator capacity provided at St. John, and wished the minister to go as far as he likes in establishing that capacity. But, of course, that is all contingent on the winter railway rate to St. John being on a basis that will enable the grain to be brought forward in winter. I made a little calculation some time ago on this subject, and I find that the winter rate from Winnipeg to Quebec was 12 cents for 1,352 miles. From Quebec to St. John, by the present route—that is by Transcontinental to Moncton and thence by Intercolonial to St. John—is 541 miles. At the same rate per mile as was charged from Winnipeg to Quebec, the rate would be 4½ cents, or a total rate from Winnipeg to St. John of 16½ cents. But the rate actually charged from Winnipeg to St. John this winter, whether by the Canadian Pacific railway through Montreal or by Transcontinental by Montreal or Quebec, was 20¼ cents. That just made the difference between a rate that would bring traffic and a rate that would stop traffic.

Mr. REID: Did I understand the hon. member to say that grain from Winnipeg to St. John either by the Canadian Pacific or the Transcontinental would be 20¼ cents?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. The rate from Quebec or Montreal to St. John was so much higher per mile than the rate from Winnipeg to Montreal, that it balanced up and made the through rate just the same as that of the Canadian Pacific. If that policy is continued next year, there is very little object in building the elevator, or certainly a

very small elevator would answer the purpose. But my view is that the purpose of the building of the Transcontinental was to enable a winter movement of grain to the Atlantic ports to be carried on. What has been done this winter goes to prove that this is practicable; and it is in view of that that I am urging the construction of the elevator at St. John and that next winter a freight rate to St. John be charged that will be as good on a mileage basis as that given this winter from Winnipeg to Quebec. If that is not done, there is no great advantage in establishing any large elevator accommodation at St. John. The Quebec Board of Trade has gone into this matter very thoroughly, and amongst the figures they have given in their report is the statement that grain is now hauled from Goderich, a lake port, to Halifax, a distance of 1,231 miles, at 6 1-10 cents per bushel. That seems to be a low rate. If credence is given to their statement, then it is manifest that the through rate given on the Transcontinental is not phenomenally low, but one at which the railway ought to do business. If it was able to do business between Winnipeg and Quebec, it surely was able to do business between Winnipeg and St. John.

I wish to add a word to what the acting minister (Mr. Reid) said with regard to the storage at Quebec. While St. John is an open port all the year around, and while there is therefore some argument for there being only transfer accommodation there, Quebec is a sealed port for a part of the year. And it is beyond any question that Quebec has tremendous advantages in the summer time over any other possible port of Canada. And, as it is a substantially shorter distance from the prairies to Quebec by the Transcontinental than by any other present railroad route to Montreal, there is every reason why there should be ample storage accommodation at Quebec. So, while we desire the advantage of the open port at St. John during the whole of the winter, at the same time we shall always be very glad to save the cost of haul from Levis to St. John by taking advantage of the storage at Quebec, so that the grain may have to carry the least possible charge in getting to market. That is the whole purpose of this discussion, and of all this railroad building and elevator building—it is to cut down the cost of transport and handling between the producer and the consumer. With present world conditions, with the world crop increasing as it has been increasing, there is no doubt that from year to year it becomes more and more necessary, if our production is to increase by reason of the prosperity of our people, that the cost of transport and handling and the profits received between the producer and consumer, must be systematically cut down by every means possible. That is the main duty and responsibility of the department of the Government over which my hon. friend presides, and that will be arrived at by the use of the Transcontinental and by the subsidary accommodation of ample elevators at St. John and Quebec.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is absolutely right; we should have more storage. But we can only provide it as we have the money voted to build elevators and to carry on that work, and we will do it as fast as we can. Anything that can be saved in the way of transportation or storage charges is saved to the farmer—no doubt about that. I go further, and I say I am heartily in accord with some arrangement —by nationalization of the railways if that can be shown to be the most advantageous to get this railway system into such shape that we can operate the railways together and save a lot of money. Whatever you save, as I have said, is saved to the farmers of the West, and the people who have freight going over the railway system. Some people say that if the Government owned the railways so that there would be no looking for large dividends or profits, but operated them in the interests of the people, probably they could be operated at a great deal cheaper rate than at present. If that can be done it will certainly be a saving to the people who have products to transport. I look forward with a great deal of interest to the next session, when we shall be in a position to take up this great question —in fact, we must—and if a solution is arrived at, as I feel it will be, by taking over one or two of these systems, I believe that the cheaper transportation that probably will be got will have a great effect in the future so far as the development of the West is concerned. The question of increased accommodation at Quebec and at other ports will require consideration. The Montreal elevator has a capacity of 15,000,000 bushels, but that is a small quantity; Montreal will likely have to have increased accommodation. We should have large storage facilities at St. John and Halifax. At Portland and some of the other railway terminals the storage capacity is very large;

yet you could not get any grain through them this year; they were all filled to their utmost capacity. If the grain can be sent to Quebec and the elevators filled, there will be a saving of four or five cents a bushel, the cost of shipping from Quebec to Halifax or St. John; and that will go right into the farmer's pocket. If the farmer wishes to ship his grain to Quebec and hold it until the spring, he will get that advantage.

Mr. ROBB: The intention of the Government in reducing all rail rates over the National Transcontinental railway to 6 cents a bushel to Montreal and Quebec for export no doubt was good. But notwithstanding all that the minister has said since his Estimates have been up, he has not convinced me—and I do not believe that there is any man in the trade that has been convinced—that it worked out to be of any particular advantage either to the shipper or to the farmer. I will tell the minister why. The great trouble last year was to get grain on wheels. Grain on wheels right through the season was worth a premium running from 3½ cents to as high as 8 cents a bushel over the May price; consequently the exporters could see a good deal better profit in buying the May option and waiting for the opening of navigation. The minister has laid a good deal of stress on the advantage which this arrangement gave and the amount of grain that was carried to Quebec and Montreal for export. Last year when navigation closed in the fall there was a considerable amount of grain in the elevators at Montreal. I have not the figures before me, but we do know from a statement brought down here that some of the New Zealand wheat put there last summer was still in the elevators at Montreal in the month of March. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Edmonton, this special rate of 6 cents a bushel was good only going to Montreal or Quebec for export. If the grain was re-consigned from Montreal or Quebec to St. John or Halifax for export, the shippers had to go back to the regular rate enforced by the Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Railway Companies—and that rate was 23.3 cents per hundred pounds. Notwithstanding the enormous amount of grain that the minister claims was carried by the National Transcontinental, my statement is correct that this rate was of practically no value. A good deal of grain was carried, but I think we got practically the full rate for it. It was probably more profitable to the country and to the railroad not to carry it at the cheap rate, but very little grain was carried on that cheap rate. A return brought down in the House told us, I think, that altogether there were 80 cars to one point and twenty to the other—something like that, more or less. I have here the statistics of the wheat in Canada, issued on April 3 by the Department of Trade and Commerce. It shows that the total quantity of wheat in the elevator at Quebec on that date was 99,000 bushels. No ships had come up to Quebec at that time, so that this was wheat which had been carried there during the winter; possibly some of the grain had been left over in the fall when navigation closed. There were 42,917 bushels of oats there and 5,000 bushels of barley. The total quantity of grain in the elevator in the city of Quebec on April 3 was 148,920 bushels. Remember that the elevator at the city of Quebec has a capacity of a million and a half bushels; so that you can put a good deal of grain there yet before you require other elevators. The elevators at Montreal have a capacity of 15,000,000 bushels. How much grain do you think there was in Montreal on the third of April? The total quantity of all grain 9 p.m. in Montreal on that date was just a little over a million and a half bushels. These are official statements published by the Department of Trade and Commerce, I imagine they must be correct. There is some justification for the minister's statement that we require more storage capacity at West St. John, because we find that on that date there were at West St. John a total of 950,093 bushels of grain, of which 730,516 bushels were wheat. At Halifax on that date there were 36,685 bushels of grain. So we could carry a good deal of grain down to those ports before we should need to start building elevators. Instead of listening to the demands of local people who are anxious to see construction going on in their cities; instead of running the risk of repeating the mistake that was made at Calgary, where we put up a big elevator that is practically of no use as a transfer elevator because it is located out of the running belt of grain, it would be well for the department to think out some plan of establishing elevators where they are most needed and where they will earn some money. Elevators with a capacity of 15,000,000 bushels in which only a million and a half

bushels are stored are not earning very much money for the shareholders, the Government. There is a great demand upon the Government for money for the different railroads. I imagine they need money, but I do not think they need it so much for the extension of their lines as they do for rolling stock. It seems to me that if the Government were to figure on a plan of owning, say, 10,000 freight cars and of leasing them at reasonable rates to the railroads during the grain carrying season, that would be of more advantage to the western farmer just now than elevator capacity. He does not want elevator capacity unless he can get the grain out of the elevator. We know from the experience of the past winter that there are sections in the West where very little grain has yet been moved. Take the Gilbert Plains district; I am told that many farmers there have not been able to ship a carload. What this country requires is more freight cars and more power. That is what the railroads need, not more miles of railway or more elevators. I submit this to the consideration of the minister, without condemning too strongly this policy of greater elevator capacity. I think that there is an indication at West St. John that we need it. But certainly we must get more grain down to Montreal and Quebec before we start talking of building greater elevator capacity.

Mr. REID: With all due respect to the hon. minister, we all have our own opinions as to the best way to improve this transportation system. The hon. member does not think it is good policy to have so many elevators where water navigation commences. My own opinion has always been that that is where we do require storage. Fort William and Port Arthur form the first water port, and surely we should there have as large storage capacity as possible. My own opinion is that if a farmer can load his grain in the winter on the car and get it right through to Quebec or Montreal at the same rate as it would cost for summer transportation through Port Arthur or Fort William, and have his grain stored at the seaboard instead of at Port Arthur, he would save the elevator charges on the grain at Fort Arthur. I think we should have large storage capacity at Port Arthur or at the head of the lakes, and also at Montreal, St. John and Halifax. As to the quantity of grain in Quebec and Montreal, the manager of the railways told me that they put one and a half million bushels of grain into the elevators at Quebec, and between Quebec and Montreal they had eight million bushels from the West over the National Transcontinental railway. I asked Mr. Hayes, the general freight agent, and those were the figures he gave me. What became of it after that I am not in a position to say, and we could not ascertain until after navigation opened. For instance, we may have put five million or six million bushels into the elevators at Montreal. That may have gone on by the Canadian Pacific railway; the parties who owned the grain may have had it re-shipped to Portland over the Grand Trunk railroad, or to St. John over the Canadian Pacific railroad. The hon. member states that there would be no advantage to the western farmer providing it had been re-shipped from Montreal. My understanding of it is that if you shipped last winter over the Canadian Pacific railroad or the Canadian Northern railroad, or the Grand Trunk under the old through rates, the winter rate was, say, 6 cents from Winnipeg to Fort William. Then I think it was 12 cents to Montreal, and then a certain amount, which I do not know, from Montreal to Portland over the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific railroad rate from Montreal to St. John being the same. Taking the figures, 6 cents to Fort William and 12 cents to Montreal, and whatever the other rate was Montreal to Portland or St. John, the through rate from Winnipeg to Portland or St. John would be 18 cents plus the rate Montreal to the winter port. The advantage which the farmer in the West got was that he paid 6 cents from Winnipeg to Armstrong and 6 cents to Montreal. If it was then shipped on to Portland or St. John he paid the pro rata rate from Montreal to Portland or St. John that through grain pays, and he thus had the advantage of the 6-cent rate against the 12-cent rate between Armstrong and Montreal, or between Fort William and Montreal. The farmers in the West, if they got the advantage of the 6-cent rate, paid only 12 cents a bushel from Winnipeg to Montreal and Quebec, as against 18 cents if consigned to Montreal during the winter on the Canadian Pacific railroad. On our rate it was 6 cents to Armstrong and 6 cents to Montreal, or 12 cents against the rate I have stated. That is the advantage it was to the shipper.

Mr. ROBB: There is not much difference between the minister's view and mine on the storage capacity at the head of the

Great Lakes. He will admit that we have immense storage capacity there now. It has been fairly well filled this year, but there has always been room for a little more. But to come back to the rate, I have told the minister how much grain there was, according to the statistics furnished by the Department of Trade and Commerce, in Montreal and in Quebec, on the 3rd of April. The minister himself gave an answer from his own department on the 1st of March, according to Hansard, giving the number of cars shipped on that rate from Armstrong to Montreal, at 20 cars and from Armstrong to Montreal and 80 cars to Quebec. That clears up that matter from the statistics and as furnished in the minister's own answer. Probably the minister is right as to the rate from Winnipeg to Fort William, but that is not the way to figure on grain. The rate from Brandon to Fort William or Armstrong is 14 cents a hundred pounds. Tariff C G 18 gives the rate as 6 cents from Armstrong to Montreal or Quebec for export. Then there is a notation re consigning:

If grain is loaded out for export by Halifax, N.S., St. John, N.B., Portland, Maine, or Boston, Mass., through rates from Armstrong, Ont., will be applied in accordance with Transcontinental railway tariff, No. (C.G. 12 and C.G. 13) and supplements thereof.

Here is C G 13, giving the rates from Armstrong to St. John and Halifax. That rate is 23.3 per 100 pounds on grain and grain products. Then the rate to Portland, Maine, is the same, 23.3 (No. 3-G 12). The minister can settle that question with his traffic department.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: I was not present when the minister answered an inquiry which I made a few days ago, but I have had an opportunity of seeing the telegram which he read to the House, and I find that it is neither full nor frank, and, besides, is misleading. The garden plot at Antigonish station was constructed I think last year, and although as rich alluvial soil can be got in and around Antigonish as is to be had in any part of the Maritime Provinces, they actually went to Malagash station, between 100 and 150 miles distant, to get loam to make that plot. According to the telegram, after they had unloaded four cars, it was found that two cars were sufficient, and they sent the balance of the stuff down to Mulgrave. Here is where the information is misleading: My information is that after the plot was completed the yard was so overcrowded that businessmen protested because of the obstruction to traffic, and that, consequently, they reduced it by about half. What I want to find out is what it cost to make the reduction. What became of the loam that was taken from Malagash when there was excellent soil right on the spot? Was it given to some friend to be taken away at his own expense, or was it given to him at a price? Did he cart it away free of charge or was the carting paid for? It is notorious that teams carried that stuff through the town. I want to find out from the minister where it went, and what the arrangement was, whether this man was paid for trucking that stuff from the station and through the town, and, if so, how much he was paid. Therefore I would like the minister to supplement the information given in that telegram. I received a copy of it from his secretary and sent a reply suggesting that this information should be given. Perhaps the minister can give it now.

Mr. REID: I told my secretary to see that the information was given to the hon. member. It does seem strange that they should go 100 miles away for loam, but I am a farmer myself, and I know that sometimes it is good policy to have a change of soil; if you took some soil from Ontario and mix it with Nova Scotia soil, you might have better crops.

Mr. CHISHOLM: We have the best of crops in Antigonish.

Mr. REID: I know that some farmers in Ontario get soil from Nova Scotia, and very good stuff it is. I get carload after carload of it, and I think that next time I will urge the manager to send to Ontario for soil and have it mixed with the Nova Scotia soil. I will be very glad to get the information which the hon. member wants. He can see that I did my best to get it, but if they have not furnished it in full, I will get it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I thank the minister for the efforts he has made to secure the information. But the case referred to is on a par with a good deal of the work that these highly trained specialists, who have been hired, borrowed, or imported from the Canadian Pacific railway and other railroads, have been doing on the Intercolonial railway. Just fancy going 100 or 150 miles to get loam for a place like Antigonish where there is alluvial soil of the richest kind. The minister has treated the matter

in a rather joking vein, and I do not wonder at it. The thing is ridiculous. It is a small matter, and I apologize for bringing it up, but it is a sample of the way in which those connected with the Intercolonial railway do things.

Mr. OLIVER: We have had a good deal of argument about the transportation of wheat last winter at the low rate. I understood very distinctly from the minister that that rate was for the purpose of filling the elevators, of utilizing the storage capacity of the elevators at Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. REID: That is right.

Mr. OLIVER: But by the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, that statement is not borne out, so far as the Quebec elevator is concerned. We will assume that the grain delivered at the Montreal elevator was passed on to Portland or St. John by the other road, but, so far as the Quebec elevator is concerned, there was no such opportunity. Grain was certainly not forwarded from Quebec to St. John or from Halifax, because the Halifax elevator was not filled; therefore it could not have been put into the Quebec elevator. As long as there was vacant space in Quebec, and there was grain in the West to bring forward, the Transcontinental railway was not fulfilling its purpose, nor was the rate being utilized.

Mr. REID: All I can say is that I had the assurance of our general freight agent that that quantity of grain was put into the Quebec elevator and came over the Transcontinental railway during the past winter. The statement submitted by the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) is headed: "The total quantity in store on March 24, 1916." Whether or not the grain came after that date, or whether it went in and was shipped on again, is a question regarding which I have not information at present. I shall get the general freight agent to give me in writing a statement of the quantity of grain which went in, and I will give the hon. member for Edmonton the information. I will either show him that 1,500,000 bushels—it might have been a little more or less—went from Quebec, or I will stand up here and admit that I was wrong. But I got that information from him only ten days ago in this very building, and of course I must adhere to it. I will be able tto give my hon. friend fuller information, I hope, within the next 48 hours. I will have the exact figures for Montreal and Quebec and the dates on which the grain was put in. From the close of navigation up to a few days ago, eight million bushels went into the Montreal and Quebec elevators.

Mr. OLIVER: The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) suggested that if this railroad was to meet the purposes for which it was intended, there would have to be more rolling stock provided. I am not familiar with the workings of the Department of Railways, but, from what the minister has said during the discussions in the House, it would seem to me that it is a fact, that there is not sufficient rolling stock in the hands of the Government to handle a large amount of traffic over the Transcontinental. Is it proposed by the department to take measures to increase that rolling stock adequately so as to be able to bring forward a large quantity of grain during the winter months, and to what extent?

Mr. REID: I am going to award contracts for cars within the next three or four weeks; probably $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 worth will be ordered.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there anything for that in the Estimates?

Mr. REID: We have a part of the money in the Estimates and we have our Intercolonial surplus. The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) is right; if we had 10,000 cars and 200 engines it would be a great advantage but 10,000 cars would cost $10,000,000 or $12,000,000. These iron freight cars cost $1,200 or $1,400 each. They used to cost about $1,100 but they are now worth, I expect, $200 or $300 more. We cannot buy $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 worth of cars just now. You require power, vans and a lot of equipment. We will get these things as fast as we can. With reference to the rate question, as I stated during a previous discussion, we only started in last year as an experiment with this Transcontinental railway, we started in without equipment, without organization and just to get a little experience, we put on this 6-cent rate and handled 8,000,000 bushels of grain with such equipment as we had divided between the two roads. We expect to have sufficient equipment to enable us to handle a very large quantity of grain next winter. With good organization and extra equipment we will be of great service to the West next year.

Mr. MARCIL: With the acquisition of the Forget road, and the opening of a

winter port at St. Catharine's bay, will not the conditions be entirely changed at St. John and Halifax?

Mr. REID: There is work for all our winter ports.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Where is Ste. Catherine's bay?

Mr. REID: Across the Saguenay river from Tadousac there is a large bay and a splendid harbour. This road was first intended to go to Ste. Catherine's bay. Murray bay is within 30 or 40 miles of Ste. Catherine's bay.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the port at Ste. Catherine's bay be open in the winter?

Mr. REID: Yes, they tell me that it is open nearly all winter.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that an official report?

Mr. REID: I understand that to be so, but I will see if there is any official report.

Mr. MARCIL: Our friends from the West and from the Maritime Provinces who take an interest in this grain question might very well be informed in regard to this because conditions may be entirely changed. If we can regard Ste. Catherine's bay as the open winter port of the St. Lawrence the other ports in the Maritime Provinces may look very small. There is no rolling stock at all on the Quebec and Saguenay railway at the present time?

Mr. REID: I do not know that there is, but there is on some other part of the road. The hon. gentleman talks about the Quebec and Saguenay railway! He knows to-day that from Quebec to Saguenay there were the electric and steamboat services which are really part of the system.

Mr. MARCIL: The electric road running between Quebec and Ste. Anne de Beaupré does a very large business in carrying pilgrims to the shrine at Ste Anne, but beyond that I do not think there is much business.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then there will be pilgrimages to St. Catherine's bay. I would like to divert the Minister's attention from what must be an unpleasant situation to one which will give him more joy. I was told recently by a gentleman who lives in Chipman that every day there are long trains of cars full of freight passing over the Transcontinental railway that it is no uncommon thing to see one locomotive hauling a train half a mile long over this level road bed. I want to ask the minister if he has any report with regard to the traffic which is being carried on that line and where that traffic originates?

Mr. REID: I have not that information but the hon. gentleman knows that both of these roads belong now to the Government and they will be operated by the Government. It is only natural that we should operate them in the very best way possible for the Government. If we could haul 50 cars between Levis and St. John over the Transcontinental railway we would not start a train over the Intercolonial with 25 or 30 cars if that was all we could take.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That shows the advantage of the Transcontinental railway grades.

Mr. REID: I know, but at the same time it has cost us a great many millions to build that road. I do not want to go into a discussion of the Transcontinental railway system to-night. We have done it very often before, and I do not think there is anything to be gained by it. That road was built to run in opposition to the Intercolonial. Now that we own it, we intend to operate the two roads as a business proposition, and if we have a lot of cars at Lévis to take to St. John or Moncton, or, if you wish, to Halifax, we are going to take them with engines that will draw all the cars possible, and operate the roads in the best possible manner.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister says that we "own" it. That affords a text for some quite lengthy remarks. When did we secure the ownership of it? Some time ago I asked the right hon. Prime Minister if any permanent arrangement had been made for the Government operation of the Transcontinental railway, and he said: No permanent arrangement could be made except by legislation and the action of Parliament. No such legislation has yet been introduced. Therefore, I would like to know why the minister, in contradistinction to the statement of the Prime Minister, says that we own the Transcontinental.

Mr. REID: I will tell the hon. gentleman why I think we own it. I was under the impression that according to the Act passed the Government had built that portion of the road between Winnipeg and Moncton and owned it, and that we were to lease it to the Grand Trunk Pacific. So, I say we own it, and I think I am not mistaken in that. Am I not right in the statement that we were to build, own and lease

it for a certain number of years, and that the Grand Trunk were to pay interest upon it? That is the reason I say that we own it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister said that it was built as a road which was to be run in competition with the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. REID: Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the minister says now that we own it, as if something had taken place which had taken away the right of the Grand Trunk Pacific to operate it and placed the ownership in the Crown.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman is drawing a pretty fine distinction. I did say that it was built to be run in competition with the Intercolonial railway. The original proposition was that the Government should build, own and lease it to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But did not the minister say now that we owned it, as if there had been some change in the ownership?

Mr. REID: There is no change in the ownership. We are operating it, if you wish to draw that fine distinction. However, we are operating it and we will no doubt do so to the advantage of the public. But this afternoon I noticed that the hon. gentleman was criticising the Government and asking why they should not take over the Grand Trunk Pacific at once and operate it. He found fault because we would not take over and operate the whole line between Winnipeg and the Pacific coast. Now he is finding fault because we did take over the Transcontinental.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the minister referring to me?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When did I so argue?

Mr. REID: I understood that to-day my hon. friend's argument was that we should take over these roads because they were bankrupt; that giving money to them was not in the public interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I said was that, as these companies are now coming to the Government and are saying in effect: We are bankrupt; we cannot carry on the operation of these roads any longer, unless you assist us, and as the Government, according to the statements of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works are looking forward to the nationalization of the railways of Canada, they ought now, as a condition of giving this assistance, to stipulate for a maximum price at which the country would have in the future the right to take over the roads. In other words, this country should not help them over this period of adversity and then put them in a position, when the time of prosperity comes, to demand what they please for the roads, including prospective profits, which might amount to a very large sum.

Mr. REID: At all events, the discussion to-day would surely convince the hon. member that the Grand Trunk Pacific is not in a position to operate this road between Winnipeg and Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not immediately.

Mr. REID: And that is the reason why the Government is operating it. We believe that next session, when we have a report as to the whole railway situation, there can be a reorganization of the railway system of Canada that will be a great advantage to every one concerned. As the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance stated to-day, something must be done. It will be only six or eight months until we meet again, and then we shall be in a position to go thoroughly into the whole railway system and see what is best to be done under the circumstances in the interest of the public.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are you going to have a fall session?

Mr. REID: That may be necessary.

Mr. COPP: As the minister has been discussing the matter of providing more equipment during the coming summer for the operation of the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial railway, I want again to protest as strongly as I can to the minister against the Government robbing the Intercolonial of its rolling stock, and curtailing the freight and passenger service of the Maritime Provinces over the Intercolonial, and in this way destroying the Intercolonial for the benefit of the Transcontinental. That is what happened last winter. As I pointed out to the minister the other evening, the Intercolonial was made simply a local road in so far as through traffic was concerned. Traffic was held up; passenger trains running from Montreal to Halifax were delayed five, six or ten hours simply because the rolling stock of the Intercolonial was taken away and placed on the Transcontinental for the purpose of keeping that road in operation. That was inequitable and

unfair to the people of the Maritime Provinces for whose service the Intercolonial railway was really built. My hon. friend said that he proposed to buy three or four million dollars' worth of rolling stock apparently for the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial, and he stated that there was not enough in the Estimates, but that he was going to take the surplus from the Intercolonial and put it into rolling stock.

Mr. REID: I did not say that; I said that some was going to be taken from the surplus of the Intercolonial and that that would be put on the Government railway system. I do not think the hon. member will object to rolling stock being run through from Levis to Moncton. We will operate the stock on both roads. In addition to that surplus an amount has been placed in the Estimates for the Transcontinental. I said we were going to take the money from both the surplus and the Estimates, but it has always been the policy to use any surplus there may be on the Intercolonial for purchasing rolling stock for the Intercolonial. The hon. member has argued before that it was not right to take any part of the Intercolonial equipment last year. We could not get any equipment from any other railway; the Grand Trunk Pacific was to have some rolling stock for the Transcontinenal, but we did not get a car, and if we had not used a small portion of the Intercolonial rolling stock for the Transcontinental, we could not have operated it at all. I do not think the hon. member will say that we should have closed up the Transcontinental and not operated it at all between Winnipeg and Moncton during last winter. There were settlements along the line, and it was necessary to have some passenger traffic. There had to be cars and engines for that and supplies had also to be taken in and out. There was also this grain in the West that had to be carried out. Some people along the Intercolonial were inconvenienced, but there would have been much more hardship if we had had to close up the Transcontinental. We did our best to get what equipment we could, but we did not get it in time.

Mr. COPP: I do not intend to argue at length in regard to the conditions of last winter, because it is past and gone. Things are better now; the snow has disappeared, and the freight is going through much more rapidly. I rose, however, to enter my protest on behalf of the people of the Maritime Provinces in the future. My hon. friend says he would not think I would say that we should not operate the Transcontinental. I am not in a position to say that we should operate the Transcontinental or not. It is only a few years ago that those settlements spoken of by the acting minister, along the Transcontinental, have had railway accommodation. The people of the Maritime Provinces have had the Intercolonial ever since Confederation, and I contend that the minister had no right to rob the Intercolonial and sacrifice the rights of the people who are served by that railway for the benefit of the people who live along the Transcontinental. I want to put myself on record as protesting in the strongest manner possible that during the coming summer and the coming winter the Intercolonial should have proper rolling stock as it has had in the past and not have it depleted, as it was during the past winter, for the benefit of the Transcontinental. Whatever surplus has been laid aside from the Intercolonial should be expended on the betterment of that railway, both in roadbed and equipment, in order to give that railway its proper status as the railway which has served the people of the Maritime Provinces since Confederation, and I say that its interests should not be sacrified to those of any other great transcontinental railway.

Mr. OLIVER: What the minister has said in regard to the provision of rolling stock is rather of the character that he is going to strain a point in order to get some rolling stock for the Transcontinental. The Transcontinental has cost the country something like $200,000,000 to build, and that capital expenditure is of no value unless there is rolling stock to handle the business over the road. There was business this year to be handled if we had had the rolling stock. Unfortunately we may not have as much business next year because we have not been able to handle the business this year.

The question should be approached, not in any parsimonious spirit, but in the spirit of meeting the conditions of traffic as they exist and may be expected to exist some time in the near future. Of last season's crop, something like sixty or seventy million bushels found its outlet by way of Buffalo. Of this year's crop 125,000,000 bushels remain in the West, still to come forward; and if it comes forward at all, it will come by the lakes, and the larger part of that

crop will find its way out by Buffalo. We are producing the crop and it is the United Kingdom that needs it; and we have built railroads at enormous cost to do this very traffic; yet we allowed the traffic to pass away from us both last year and this year. We are continually talking of not having business for our railroads, but this year we not only have business but an enormous amount of business which has gone away from us simply because we were not prepared to handle it. What I urge is that means be taken to utilize the transportation facilities of the Transcontinental railway by ample elevator capacity at the winter port of St. John and at the summer port of Quebec, and by ample rolling stock to bring the crop forward all the year around so that we shall not be in the position in the future of carrying on the production and other people doing the business.

It has been generally assumed that because the grain has come forward by the lakes up to the present time, it must always come forward by the lakes. There is no ground for that supposition. When the Erie canal was built all grain from the West went by the Erie canal; but to-day the amount that goes by the Erie canal is little; the railways having displaced the water transportation to a tremendous degree. The Great Lakes, of course, are on a larger scale than lake Ontario or the St. Lawrence, or our canals; but the position of the Transcontinental from Winnipeg to Quebec is one of vast advantage. I do not see that there is any reason why the conditions which prevailed in regard to water traffic on lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence canals, in which the traffic has practically been driven off the lake, should not be repeated as between the Transcontinental and Canadian Northern on one hand and the navigation of the Great Lakes on the other. Of course, having built the railroads, we must equip them with rolling stock and other facilities. But let us not sit down and complain that we have not the business to do when the city of Buffalo and the American business of transportation on the Great Lakes is being built up out of the business that we create.

Mr. LOGGIE: I wish to refer to a matter not relevant to that which has been discussed, but which, I understand, comes within the minister's announcement of willingness to discuss any matter relating to his department. The question is that of deep water facilities at Newcastle, N.B. A survey was made and a proposition to extend the wharf. Nothing further has been done. When I was at home I found some of my constituents making inquiry about the matter, and I promised to have it brought to the attention of the minister.

Mr. REID: I will place on Hansard or give to the hon. gentleman, when we are discussing some other railway item, a full explanation of that matter.

Mr. ROBB: Now that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has shown that what we require is more rolling stock for the railway, which is the idea that I have urged, I wonder if we could not go a little further and let that Hudson bay scheme lie over for a year or two, and put the money into ships to carry grain from Atlantic ports to Liverpool. It is of little use to bring grain to deep water if you have not ships to carry it to the other side. Would not the minister think it well to take some of this money that some of us think is being wasted in the Hudson bay scheme and put it into ships?

Mr. REID: Personally, I have strong opinions on the question of ships. To buy new ships is impossible at the present time —there are none for sale. And if you start to build a new ship now you will not get it for a year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This is a good time to commence.

Mr. REID: Yes, but you have to consider that the cost of a ship in normal times is about $50 a ton, while now it is $120 per ton. A vessel of 10,000 tons would cost you in normal times $500,000, but to-day the cost would be $1,200,000, and you would not have the use of it for a year. If the war was going to last two or three years it would be a good idea to order ships and have them for the year's operations. Under present conditions, if you were to pay $1,200,000 to have delivered to you in a year's time a vessel which, under ordinary conditions, would cost $500,000, the investment might not be a very good one. I am strongly in favour of building vessels in our own country; but whether we build them in our own country or not you cannot get them at less, roughly speaking, than $120 a ton. These are the figures I have had given to me in discussing this subject with shipbuilders. I have in mind the case of a man who has in course of construction a 10,000-ton vessel which he expects to be finished in July; and he tells

me that he can get just double his contract price for the vessel, but he could not get another, probably, for more than twice as much as the contract. These are things to be taken into consideration. My idea is that if we had normal conditions we ought at once to start shipbuilding in our own country. We are a growing country and we require vessels to take our own products from our own ocean terminals to foreign countries; and by doing that and connecting with our own railway service we can greatly increase our trade.

We are facing these difficulties now, and in view of the conditions it is hard to tell what is really the best thing to be done. This consideration, together with the great expenditures for war, makes us hesitate to engage in such work as is suggested by the hon. member. The hon. member is absolutely right; we should have these vessels and run them in connection with our railways. But the hon. member is a business man, and he can see why we should hesitate to give an order for a vessel which in these times would cost $1,200,000 and in normal times $500,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Will not the prices be equally high for a period of five years after the war?

Mr. REID: There is a difference of opinion on that. Some men say that they will be higher than they were in normal times, because so many vessels are being destroyed. Others say that there will be a very large drop in the price for the reason that a large number of vessels are interned at the present time, and a very large number of vessels are being used by different nations for their own purposes of transport. These will all again come into the mercantile trade, and that will tend to bring freights down and reduce the cost of building vessels. I have seen no one yet who will make the statement that as soon as the war is over the cost of building vessels will keep up to what it is at the present time. I think the drop will be very considerable.

Mr. ROBB: It is very satisfactory that the minister endorses that idea. If I understand him rightly, he claims that under normal conditions after the war we could build three ships for the price of one that we could build now. The extra expenses would be in the matter of labour and iron, I imagine?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: Would not the same principle apply to the Hudson Bay railway? Would it not be just as well to delay that work until after the war, when labour and iron will be cheaper?

Mr. REID: No, because the Hudson Bay railway is under contract. Of course, we are holding it down; we are not doing nearly the amount of work we should do in normal times. We are holding it down as much as we can without rendering ourselves liable to the contractors for damages for shutting down the work.

Mr. GRAHAM: That steamship that you are buying, is it by contract?

Mr. REID: It is the Northumberland, that ran on that route a great many years. A company owned the Northumberland and the Empress, the former running between Summerside and Point du Chene and the latter between Pictou and Charlottetown.

Mr. COPP: Is the Government going to run that boat now between Point du Chene and Summerside?

Mr. REID: The company have sold their boats. They sold the Empress to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and we bought the Northumberland. We are running the Northumberland between Point du Chene and Summerside, and we are running the car ferry between Pictou and Charlottetown.

Mr. COPP: All the communication, then, between the island and the mainland is being carried on by the Government?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Canals—bridge between Iberville and St. John—revote of lapsed amount, $52,000.

Mr. REID: An item was put in the Estimates in 1911-12 for $40,000, and an additional amount was put in the Supplementary Estimates for 1911-12 for $12,000, making $52,000. An arrangement was made between the Government and the municipalities at that time to build a bridge across the canal, and the municipalities entered into a contract under which four-tenths of the cost was to be paid by the Government, not to exceed $52,000. The amount was dropped from the Estimates by the Minister of Railways and Canals, for the reason that nothing was done by the municipalities. The Minister of Railways promised that if they carried out their part of the agreement and built the bridge he would again

. put the amount in the Estimates.

10 p.m. When the minister was absent I made the same promise. The bridge has been constructed, and we are asked to carry out our agreement. Therefore, I have put this amount, which I think we are entitled to pay, back in the Estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: This arrangement is a good one, because I made it myself.

Mr. REID: Did I explain it correctly?

Mr. GRAHAM: Nearly. The arrangement was that the Provincial Government was to pay a certain amount, the municipalities a certain amount, and this Government, on account of the canal and approaches, a certain amount. There was a good deal of disappointment when this item was dropped out of the Estimates, and I am glad to see it in again.

Galops canals—in full settlement of all outstanding claims of contractors, Murray and Cleveland, in connection with the construction of the upper entrance, $20,028.25.

Mr. REID: There were two contracts in connection with this, one with Murray and Cleveland for building the locks and the upper entrance to the canal, and another after that with M. A. Cleveland for building what is known as the North Channel. Murray died a few years ago, and M. A. Cleveland died a couple of years ago. They are all dead but one man, Stephen.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has nobody living had anything to do with this?

Mr. REID: The estates have been trying to have this matter settled. Stephen Cleveland has had the matter up with the Minister of Railways, with a view to having it settled. This item is in connection with the Murray and Cleveland contract for the Galops canal. They put in a claim on thirteen different items, aggregating $117,961.29. The chief engineer allowed a little on each of four items. On item No. 1, for deepening the prism of the canal below the depth specified, for which they claimed $40,917, he allowed $10,760. He allowed item No. 10, for $85,343 for delay to dredging plant caused by navigation going down passing over work. Item No. 11, for additional painting of lock gates, $1,525 he allowed. He also allowed item 11, for fitting, erecting, constructing, and cutting checks for keys of lock gates, $3,480.

Mr. GRAHAM: Any interest?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. REID: No interest at all. Mr. Bowden recommended that this amount be allowed. That goes to the Murray estate. The other claim was for $284,894. On this the Minister of Railways made an offer of $48,955.31, on the recommendation of Chief Engineer Bowden.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When was that offer made?

Mr. REID: Last fall, before the minister went away.

Mr. MACLEAN: Did any former Minister of Railways, during the last 15, or 20, or 30 years, decline to pay this, or were negotiations proceeding all the time and coming to nothing?

Mr. REID: I am quite satisfied that they have been up before different ministers, probably before the hon. member for Renfrew among others. The claims amounted to $284,894, and the Minister of Railways, after going over these different items, allowed portions of some of them. On item No. 2, which was for $72,813, additional price for re-excavating stuff for gut dam and elsewhere on account of excavation of prism having been finished before other works, he allowed $18,277. The ground they took was that they were supposed to excavate this lock, to take it up and convey it down and place it on the dam between Adam's island and the Big island.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the north channel?

Mr. REID: Yes, taking it out of the north channel and putting it on the dam at the head of the Galops rapids. But they were not ready for it at the Galops rapids, and they had to put it on the island, and that was re-handling. He allowed one other item. They claimed $91,240 extra for excavation at 27 station plus 50, on account of material proving harder than anticipated in original location, and having to be drilled and blasted, and he allowed $30,678.

Mr. GRAHAM: That brings up the question of classification.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the minister been in negotiation with Gilbert for settlement of his claim?

Mr. REID: I never heard of the Gilbert claim until the other day. The claim has been pressed for many years. I was always of the opinion, and I take the ground to-day, that those parties had not a fair claim, for the reason that according to the original

contract they were to be paid a certain amount for going down so many feet. Then there was a dispute and they were paid for having to do what, in my opinion, they had been paid for originally. They were paid for going down 100 or 200 feet below the grade required for going through that channel, and now they put in another claim for going down still farther. I always took the ground with every minister that they had no good claim, and I am on record in this House as saying that. I understand they have applied for a fiat and are going to take it to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. COPP: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister a matter which I placed before the Minister of Public Works, the other evening, that is the connecting of the Intercolonial by a spur line with a public wharf at Sackville. In 1910, or thereabouts, a new wharf was constructed at Sackville. After the engineers had made careful investigation and examination, and after conference with a number of sea captains who were operating vessels between St. John and Boston and elsewhere from that port, it was decided that it was in the interests of the town of Sackville to build the new wharf 300 or 400 yards lower down the river than the present old wharf which was absolutely dilapidated and fallen to pieces. The reason for that particularly is that at the site of the new wharf there was a very sharp bend in the river, and as the river is a tidal water, vessels leaving the wharf, and going out on a heavy tide found it difficult to go down the river and round the bend without running aground on the opposite side. By placing the new wharf at the point where it is constructed, that condition of affairs was overcome as vessels leaving the new wharf would get a straight run out of the river. I do not know what the custom is in regard to these matters, as between different departments of the Government, but it is natural to suppose that when the Public Works Department undertook to build that new wharf they expected the Railway Department to connect it with the main line of the Intercolonial railway, as the old wharf was connected with it. The new wharf was built at a cost of upwards of $40,000. It was begun in 1910, I think, and completed in 1912, and from that time till now it has not been of one cent's advantage to the people of that portion of the county of Westmorland. Not one vessel, so far as I know, has tied up to it and none will be tied up unless there is railway accommodation provided. I drew the attention of the Minister of Railways last year to this condition and he promised consideration. It is a small matter to be sure, but nevertheless Sackville is a town which we think is of some importance, and, in years gone by, before the old wharf went into decay, a large number of schooners, small-sized vessels, and barques even came up the river, received and discharged their cargoes at the port of Sackville. Now that the old wharf has gone, there is practically no shipping at that port and the larger schooners refuse to tie up at the old wharf. The people in the locality cannot get their freight coming to Sackville except by a wagon road.

The Deputy Minister of Public Works kindly drew the attention of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals to the matter, after the discussion we had in the House the other evening, and he has sent me a copy of a letter which is as follows:

Wednesday, May 3rd, 1916.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 29th ultimo, enclosing an excerpt from Hansard of the 27th ultimo, containing some remarks concerning an application for a railway siding to connect with the public works wharf at Sackville.

In reply, I beg to say that some years ago a wharf was built on the northeast side of the harbour of Sackville by the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, and that the Intercolonial railway has a connection with this wharf. It appears that four or five years ago your department built a wharf on the opposite side of the bay—

He is wrong about that; it is not on the opposite side, but further down.

—and made no provision for railway connection with it. In 1913, a petition from the citizens of Sackville was sent to this department by the Sackville Board of Trade asking that rail connections be made with the new wharf. The matter was submitted to the Intercolonial officials, and a report was submitted showing the propositions for such a connection, one at an estimated cost of $10,949, and a second one at an estimated cost of $12,611.20. General Superintendent Brady—

Mr. Brady was on the Board of Management of the Intercolonial railway.

—reporting on the matter stated: There is already a wharf track from our yard to the old wharf at Sackville and we cannot see where we are going to get one cent of additional earnings by spending the above-named amount of money.

This is the particular part to which I would call the minister's attention.

In fact, we can see where we are going to lose earnings, particularly from freight received from the Cape Tormentine line, which

we now haul to Dorchester wharf, which we will not haul at all as it will be delivered to the new wharf at Sackville and we will not get one cent of earnings out of it.

The whole subject was brought before the minister and he expressed the opinion that inasmuch as the railway had already provided rail connection with an existing wharf at Sackville, he did not think the Intercolonial railway should be called upon to make such a further expenditure of $10,000 or $12,000.

The minister will notice that Mr. Brady's idea was that in shipping lumber and other products coming over the Cape Tormentine line for export, the Intercolonial railway was going to make some money by hauling them past Sackville to Dorchester, and the people would pay the extra freight. The idea was to force the shippers to pay for hauling the freight 15 miles further. Without arguing the question at any length, because I think the minister understands the situation, it seems to me an absolutely absurd proposition that the Government of the country, after building a wharf at a cost of $40,000 to accommodate the people of Sackville, should refuse to make any connection between the main line of railway and that wharf. The only reason given is that on account of having no railway connection there the shippers will have to pay for carrying the freight 15 miles further, thus enabling the Intercolonial railway to make more money at the expense of the people who should have an opportunity of using the wharf at Sackville. The proposition seems so absurd that it should not require any argument. If the Railway Department does not take up this matter and build a spur line to the wharf, which is only a short distance away, the $40,000 expended on the wharf, might as well have been used in building a wharf in the woods between Sackville and Dorchester. Under present conditions, the wharf is not worth one cent to the people of Sackville. It is all very well to be economical, but I am afraid that Mr. Brady, in his dealings with the Intercolonial railway, was not so careful in the expenditure of public money in other directions. The expenditure called for is very small, and I can assure the acting minister that it would be of great advantage to the people of that locality. I would like to have from the minister an assurance that he will take the matter up, and see that a connection is made between the wharf and the main line.

Mr. REID: This is the first I have heard of this matter, but I will take it up with the management and see if there is any possibility of getting the connection.

Mr. DESCARRIES: I would draw the acting minister's attention to a demand on the part of the citizens of Lachine in my constituency, to get rid of the nuisance caused by the whistles of vessels going down lake St. Louis to Lachine lock. During the night the vessels pass along the front of the city of Lachine, and each vessel gives four blasts, and as the vessels now are very big, they have big whistles. During the silence of the night, when every citizen has a right to take his rest without being disturbed by anything of an annoying character, suddenly we hear that big noise, and if it so happens that there is a baby, a woman or any other person sick, it is very trying and all are bothered by it. I have very often been asked if it is possible to devise some means to give a signal to the men attending the locks instead of using the whistle. I call the minister's attention to it, and I hope he will be good enough to study the question and if possible grant the request of the citizens of Lachine. While passing through that part of the Lachine canal which is within the limits of Montreal, these vessels do not sound their whistles. Why should not the same consideration be shown for Lachine, which is a city of great importance now, in order that the citizens may be for ever rid of that annoyance?

Mr. REID: This was brought to my attention the other evening by an hon. member from Montreal, and the same thing applies to Lachine. I will take it up with the officials and ask them to communicate with the officers of the Lachine canal and see if something cannot be done. I will find out what has been done, and I will let my hon. friend know. I understand that this is quite a nuisance, and I will see if something cannot be done to improve the situation. If so it will be done.

Mr. DESCARRIES: There is a big dam at the head of the Lachine canal, and if necessary a man could be placed at the dam with a telephone to give the signal to those attending the locks.

Mr. REID: That is a good suggestion.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—public buildings—Ottawa Eastern Departmental Block—new fireproof roof, etc., $240,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Has the contract been let for that?

Mr. ROGERS: No. This is for a new roof for the East Block. The roof is not

fireproof, and we felt the need of a fireproof roof when the fire in the main buildings took place. It is regarded by the officers as being essential.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will that put the roof on the building?

Mr. ROGERS: That will put the roof on.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: Is the rest of the building fireproof?

Mr. ROGERS: Partly so, but it is not as good as it should be.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the matter with the present roof?

Mr. ROGERS: It is not fireproof at all.

Mr. NESBITT: There is not much use putting a fireproof top on a match. The building itself is not fireproof.

Mr. ROGERS: The main building is fairly fireproof. That part built recently is fireproof.

Mr. NESBITT: There is not much use spending money putting a fireproof roof on a building that is not fireproof.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN: It would be worth the miniser's while to consult with his officers, I think. It does not sound very logical to put a fireproof roof on a building that is not fireproof.

Mr. ROGERS: I brought the same point up when the matter was presented the other day with the deputy, but he convinced me that it was the proper thing to do.

Mr. NESBITT: If the roof is sound there is no possible object in putting a fireproof roof on it. The only object would be in case of fire close by, to guard against the danger from cinders, but I hope that we are not going to have another fire.

Mr. ROGERS: We will give it very careful consideration before we decide to spend the money. It has not been decided to spend it yet.

Ottawa Parliament building—restoration—the plans for the said building and the method to be adopted for securing the reconstruction thereof to be subject to the approval of the joint committee appointed by the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition, $1,500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: That committee has been appointed?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who compose it?

Mr. ROGERS: The Hon. Dr. Reid, the Hon. Mr. Hazen, the Hon. Mr. Blondin, the Hon. Senator Lougheed, the Hon. Mr. Pugsley, the Hon. Mr. Lemieux, the Hon. Mr. Murphy, and the Hon. Senator Watson. They have held one meeting already, and they are to hold another meeting tomorrow night.

Mr. GRAHAM: You are on it too?

Mr. ROGERS: I am on it.

Mr. NESBITT: You are the committee?

Mr. ROGERS: I am a member of it.

Mr. GRAHAM: This committee is associated with the minister and the work is to be carried on as it agrees?

Mr. ROGERS: That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM: As to whether it will be let by contract and to whom it will be let?

Mr. ROGERS: That is right.

Harbours and rivers—Vancouver harbour improvements—further amount required, $200,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that under contract?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, that is to finish the False creek work.

Public Works—chargeable to income—public buildings—New Brunswick—West St. John—medical inspection building, site, $2,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that for immigration purposes?

Mr. ROGERS: This is to make provision for the purchase of a site at West St. John for the erection of a medical inspection building for the Immigration Department. This property is bounded by Clarence, Lancaster and Sutton streets, and comprises ten lots of land. It is reported as being especially cheap.

Ontario—Cayuga public building, heating and plumbing improvements, $3,500.

Mr. NESBITT: Is that a new building?

Mr. ROGERS: This is an old building which is being fitted up with plumbing.

Mr. NESBITT: What is it used for?

Mr. ROGERS: Public building, post office, and so on.

Kingston—Royal Military College—covered drill hall—further amount required, $55,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is this a new building?

Mr. ROGERS: This is a new building that the Militia Department are pressing for and that is very necessary at Kingston

in connection with the taking of the officers' course in cavalry.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Is this the one in regard to which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) was trying to get information for so long and about which he was so patient?

Mr. ROGERS: It may be.

Ottawa public buildings—fire escapes, $15,000.

Mr. NESBITT: I suppose that is for those belly bands we have up in our windows?

Mr. ROGERS: No, it is for iron ladders. There is a general idea that we should have fire escapes around our public buildings now. I would like my hon. friend to try one of those belly bands.

Ottawa Royal Mint—repairs and improvements, $10,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Are these repairs necessary? The minister has about $2,000,000 in these further Supplementary Estimates for public works. It hardly seems like carrying out the pledge that he has been making to us every other day.

Mr. ROGERS: $1,500,000 is for the main Parliament building.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It does not take long to get away with $1,000,000 on that.

Mr. ROGERS: We have to build the Parliament building. The other items are very small.

Winnipeg post office—sidewalk mail receiver, $6,200.

Mr. NESBITT: Is that for just one mail receiver?

Mr. ROGERS: That is at the back of the post office in a lane which is our property. The postmaster states that the time and labour which would be saved would be equivalent to at least one porter's salary per annum, for the reason that the mail delivered in the chute would land upon the sorting table in the basement instead of having to be received by the porters at the rear of the post office piece by piece or in sacks, placed upon a truck, taken down one floor and then hauled a hundred feet back and then lifted item by item or sack by sack on to the sorting table.

Mr. GRAHAM: You will have to hire a new porter to watch the mail receiver.

Winnipeg—to fit up old immigration building as postal station, $50,000.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: What is that?

Mr. ROGERS: We have an immigration hall adjoining the Winnipeg station and it is not a suitable place for an immigration hall. We have to have an additional postal station and we have decided to fit up the immigration hall for the postal station, thus saving the building of a new one.

Mr. NESBITT: What will you do with the immigrants?

Mr. ROGERS: We have an old building alongside to use for as many immigrants as are coming in now. We are practising economy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why does it take $50,000 to fix this place up?

Mr. ROGERS: It will take all of that. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made great improvements there and we have to make certain improvements to conform with the layout of the place.

Regina public buildings—Government's share of cost of local improvement rates, $4,600.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the Government pay the frontage tax or the local improvement rates in every city?

Mr. ROGERS: Every place, yes.

Sutherland—building in connection with Forest nursery station, $5,000.

Mr. NESBITT: What is that item for?

Mr. ROGERS: For the erection of a building to be used as a boarding house for the men employed in connection with the nursery station at Sutherland. The building is 28 by 32, two and a half stories, with rear wing 20 by 12, a frame building on stone foundation. The lowest tenderer was $3,365; contingencies and superintendence, $1,335; total, $5,000. The deputy minister strongly recommended that provision be made for the boarding house as it was urgently needed. Eight tenders were received.

Mr. NESBITT: Is there $1,335 for superintendence on a $3,365 building?

Mr. ROGERS: That is for all the contingencies, fitting it up inside and that sort of thing.

Calgary drill hall—further amount required, $100,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Are you erecting that building?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: There is $100,000 already in the Estimates.

Mr. ROGERS: It will take $200,000. There was some delay in going ahead with the work on account of arrangements having to be made with the city for the site. It is absolutely necessary to put up this building because more soldiers are being recruited in Calgary than in probably any other city in Canada, and there is no accommodation there of any kind.

Victoria immigration building—to provide for Government's share of cost of laying a heavy asphalt pavement on Dallas road and Simcoe street, $1,345.02.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I suppose we cannot criticise the present minister very much for these votes in aid of construction of sidewalks, because it has been the practice, I believe, for some years. I only rise to suggest the wisdom of a change in that policy hereafter. I think these towns may well construct the sidewalks around the buildings that the Canadian Government erects.

Mr. ROGERS: This has been the practice for so many years that it is now expected, and it will be unacceptable if a change is attempted.

Mr. MACLEAN: But it grows so rapidly.

Mr. ROGERS: The Dominion Government should keep pace with the enterprise of a growing town.

Mr. MACLEAN: But if the Government erects a building should not the town assume the responsibility for the sidewalk?

Mr. ROGERS: If in a town or city a person erects a store or dwelling, he contributes in taxation on that building for the maintenance of sidewalks and other public works and services. But we pay no taxes, and surely it is only in keeping with our proper relation to the development of a growing town to provide as a local improvement the necessary sidewalk.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, $119,400.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is an item here for East river, improvements, a further amount required of $60,000. That is a large item.

Mr. ROGERS: That is for the lock gates and the completion of the great work we are doing on the East river for the development of that growing and thriving portion of our Dominion.

Mr. GRAHAM: What county is that in?

Mr. ROGERS: Pictou county, I believe.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister please state why he has not awarded the contract for the construction of the lock gates? I understood that tenders have been called for, and we should like to see the work go on. If the gates are not put in during the summer, long delay will be caused.

Mr. ROGERS: We have called for tenders, but I did not like to award the contract until the vote had passed Parliament. As soon as the vote is passed we will take the matter up and get ahead.

Mr. A. W. CHISHOLM: There is an item here of $1,500 to construct a pile wharf at Whycocomagh. What is to be done there?

Mr. ROGERS: This is to reconstruct the wharf. Assistant Engineer McKeen reports that on September 2 last he made an examination of the wharf and found it in a very bad condition, so bad that he considered it dangerous to load any great weight upon it, unless extensive repairs were made. Eighty-seven out of 154 piles supporting the wharf were badly worm-eaten, and practically gave no support to the wharf, some of them being completely cut off.

Mr. McKENZIE: In connection with the item in this vote of $1,000 to repair the breakwater at Jamesville. I understand that the work now proposed to be carried out is much smaller than was at first desired, and that it will not fulfil the purpose of the engineer. I do not know whether the minister has before him the information as to that. But in connection with the construction of that breakwater, I desire to call his attention now to a matter with regard to which I have had some correspondence with the department and on the subject of which I wrote him a letter today. Those carrying on the work engaged the scow of a man there and kept it for two months, but they decline to pay him except for the days during which they actually worked with the scow. It is no fault of the owner if they did not use the scow every day during which they kept it, and all he asks is that they should pay him what other people pay him for the use of the scow, namely $3.50 a day. I do not know whether the minister thinks that that is too high a price to pay for a large scow, but that is another question and one of which I am no judge. It is not fair that

they should take the man's scow and keep it for two months and then pay only for the days when they were at work. While I am on my feet, I desire to ask what is to be done under the item in this vote of $2,300 for repairs to ballast wharf at North Sydney.

Mr. ROGERS: As to the question of the scow to which the hon. gentleman has called attention, when I receive his letter I shall be glad to have the matter looked into. It is the usual practice of the department to pay for a scow only for the days it is used. If there is any special reason to justify what the hon. gentleman recommends, I shall be glad to give it consideration. As to the item with regard to North Sydney, this work is asked for by the district engineer. It is to build the outer face of a wharf where vessels lie for the discharge of ballast. The estimated cost is $2,270.

Mr. McKENZIE: That work is yet to be done?

Mr. ROGERS: To be done.

Progress reported.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY AND LOTBINIERE AND MEGANTIC RAILWAYS.

ACQUISITION OF BRANCH LINES.

Mr. ROGERS: This afternoon some hon. gentleman asked for certain information with regard to our railway legislation, in connection with lines of railway to be built below Quebec. I would ask the House to go back to the introduction of Bills, so that I can introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorize the acquisition of lines of railway between the city of Quebec and Nairn Falls and between Lyster and St. Jean des Chaillons," in order that it may be printed and place given to it on the Order Paper.

Mr. GRAHAM: This Bill has to be preceded by resolution.

Mr. ROGERS: Not necessarily.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It involves the expenditure of public moneys.

Mr. GRAHAM: My view is that any Bill involving the expenditure of money should be introduced by resolution. Notice of the resolution is given, the resolution goes through its various stages, and a Bill is introduced founded on the resolution.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. ROGERS: In any case an Estimate will follow the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I suggest that the motion to revert to this order of business be put, and that any discussion take place on that motion?

Motion agreed to, and the House proceeded to the order "Introduction of Bills."

Mr. ROGERS moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 101, to authorize the acquisition of lines of railway between the city of Quebec and Nairn Falls and between Lyster and St. Jean des Chaillons.

Mr. GRAHAM: I still maintain that this Bill ought to be founded on a resolution. My hon. friend says that the Bill will be followed by an Estimate. That certainly is a roundabout proceeding; it is a new method of doing business in this House. Where we are providing by a Bill to do certain things surely that Bill, being a money Bill, ought to be founded on a resolution. The proposed aid to the Canadian Northern railway and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies, not being brought in in the form of a Bill, need not necessarily have been proceeded by a resolution. This method, I may say, is very objectionable; a resolution would have been better. The procedure, however, suggested by my hon. friend is so contrary to all the practices of the House that I must protest against that way of doing it.

Mr. ROGERS: This Bill is founded on an Act passed in 1915 for the acquirement of branch line railways.

Mr. GRAHAM: This one line cannot apply to that.

Mr. ROGERS: No, it cannot apply to that, but this Bill applies to it, and is followed by an Estimate. That is why a resolution is unnecessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the hon. member for South Renfrew is right in the view that he takes, because the Bill certainly proposes a money obligation.

Mr. ROGERS: Not without an Estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, yes. It says this:

The Governor in Council may authorize and empower the Minister of Railways and Canals to acquire, under the provision of "An Act to amend the Government Railways Act and to authorize the purchase of certain railways", chapter 16 of the statutes of 1915, and upon such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve, the railways described in the schedule hereto, together with such equipment, etc.

The consideration to be paid for each of the said railways and for any equipment, appurtenances and properties that may be acquired as aforesaid shall be the value thereof as determined by the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Mr. ROGERS: And to be followed by an Estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It does not say that.

Mr. ROGERS: It has to be, in order to be of any value.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is clear that if this Bill were passed it would authorize the Minister of Railways to purchase a road, the actual price paid to be fixed by the Exchequer Court of Canada. Rule 77 of the House says:

If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned until such further day as the House thinks fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House before any resolution or vote of the House do pass thereupon.

The meaning of that is that this Bill must be preceded by a resolution. Perhaps, however, it might be better to let the Bill be read the first time, and any objection could be taken on the second reading.

Mr. ROGERS: I simply made the motion for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite who wanted the information.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I withdraw the suggestion that I made, because I understand that the member for South Renfrew feels like urging his point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has referred to rule 77, which says that any motion for any public aid or charge upon the people shall be preceded by a resolution in committee. Further, it must be recommended by His Royal Highness the Governor General. I observe in looking over this Bill that, while it authorizes the purchase of a railway and provides the machinery, it makes no provision for the raising of funds. My mind goes back to a decision which was rendered by Mr. Speaker Sproule in the session of 1912, I think, on the question of the Highways Bill, which was an instance precisely in accord with this, if I mistake not. His decision at that time was that it was not a money Bill, inasmuch as any money to be expended would have to be provided either by Estimate or in some other manner authorised by Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: But he changed that decision.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think not. At all events, I think, having in view that decision, this cannot be regarded as a money Bill inasmuch as it does not provide for the expenditure of money, and the purchase cannot be completed until money is provided by Parliament by some constitutional means.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the Highway Bill there was this difference, that the Bill provided that any moneys to be appropriated to the provinces should be voted by Parliament. But this Bill provides for the purchase of a railway, the price to be fixed by the Exchequer Court of Canada. That would authorize a positive agreement of purchase to be entered into, and if the Government should fail to carry out the agreement, I should think an action might be brought in the Exchequer Court and the price would be fixed by the Exchequer Court. The owner of the railway could recover the amount of the legal obligation. The Bill is clearly for the purpose of creating a charge. The Minister of Railways is authorized to make the agreement, the price to be fixed by the Exchequer Court. Then the Railway Company would commence suit in the Exchequer and would recover against the Crown the amount the Exchequer Court might fix as the value of their property.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Bill provides:

The Governor in Council may authorize and empower the Minister of Railways and Canals to acquire, under the provisions of an Act to amend the Government Railways Act, and to authorize the purchase of certain railways, chapter 16 of the Statutes, of 1915.

That is the so-called Branch Lines Act. This Bill, as I understand it, purports to bring the purchase or acquisition of this railway under the provisions of the Act of 1915, and if the objection of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) holds good in this case, it would hold good in the case of that Act, because that Act authorizes the purchase of certain branch lines of railways, but that purchase cannot be made complete until Parliament, by some constitutional means, afterwards provides the money. That, I submit places this Bill in exactly the same position as the Branch Lines Railway Bill, and for that reason as well as for the reason previously indicated, without professing to have gone into the

matter exhaustively, I am quite clear in my own mind that the minister is in order in bringing in this Bill as it has been brought in, by notice on the Order Paper, rather than by resolution, as if it were a money Bill, or a Bill in respect of trade.

Mr. ROGERS: I was only putting the Bill forward to suit the convenience of the House in view of the fact that we all know that this legislation is coming forward, and I understood that hon. gentlemen opposite were anxious to know exactly what it was. I put it forward with a view to getting it printed at once, and we shall, of course, be glad to discuss it on further readings when it suits the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is no special haste; it is only because we are getting close to the end of the session and I wanted to give the hon. gentlemen opposite all the information the Bill contains.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is very important that we should proceed correctly, because if this is a money Bill it cannot be amended in another branch of Parliament; if it is not it can be amended as the other branch may determine. Therefore it is very important always to have the correct idea.

Mr. ROGERS: That is right. The Speaker has ruled.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: You had better be safe.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Tuesday, May 9, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

On the Orders of the Day:

THE MEMBER FOR BELLECHASSE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): I would like to know if it is true that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallee) has resigned his seat. I heard that he was to be a candidate in the provincial elections. I would ask his honour the Speaker whether he has received his resignation?

The SPEAKER: I was told that the hon. member for Bellechasse was to be a candidate in Berthier, but I have not received his resignation yet.

[The Deputy Speaker.]

THE BILINGUAL QUESTION.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden for Committee of Supply:

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska) moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. E. B. Devlin:

That all the words after "that" in the main motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"It has long been the settled policy of Great Britain whenever a country passed under the sovereignty of the Crown by treaty or otherwise, to respect the religion, usages and language of the inhabitants who thus become British subjects:

"That His Majesty's subjects of French origin in the province of Ontario complain that by recent legislation they have been to a large extent deprived of the privilege which they and their fathers have always enjoyed since Canada passed under the sovereignty of the British Crown, of having their children taught in French.

"That this House especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with."

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): I rise to a point of order. I take this point of order entirely on my own initiative and without consulting any one. It will be for you, Mr. Speaker, to decide whether it is well taken; I think it is. My point of order is that the suggested amendment of the hon. member for Kamouraska is not within the jurisdiction of this House. I might illustrate my meaning by comparing it with other matters. I submit that this House has no more jurisdiction to discuss this question than it would have to deal with the question of whether Prince Edward Island should take into consideration the matter of running automobiles on the country roads. I think it would be as much within our jurisdiction to discuss the question of whether the United States should take into consideration the matter of better preparedness, or to consider the matter of state ownership in Australia, or any other subject. There is a proper way in which this House could exercise the jurisdiction with which it is vested by the Constitution, namely, by disallowance, or by a motion criticising the Government for not having disallowed the Ontario legislation within the specified time. I think the question is as foreign to the duties of this House and

to the jurisdiction of this House as any of the other matters which I have cited for the purpose of illustration. True, we are supreme in this country, but supreme only within our own scope. We have no power beyond that scope over the legislatures or municipalities or any other kind of organization or corporation that may exist in the country. I respectfully submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the question as to what should be done in the province of Ontario is beyond the jurisdiction of this House, and is therefore not a proper subject for this House to debate.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Whatever may be said about the point of order, which will be within your disposition, Mr. Speaker, and as to which it might be well for you to take time to make your ruling, I would suggest to my hon. friend who proposes this motion that, whether the point of order be well taken or not, he is bringing into this House a subject over which this House has no jurisdiction, and that, therefore, he ought most carefully to consider whether he is well advised in introducing it here. There is no question that a certain feeling has been aroused in different parts of the country—it is not confined to one part of the country—with respect to matters that are the subject of provincial jurisdiction; and I desire to appeal most earnestly to the hon. gentleman who proposes to introduce this resolution that he should not proceed with it. Its terms, perhaps, I did not accurately gather. A proposed resolution was handed to me last evening by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, but after listening to the resolution which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lapointe) proposes, I find that it differs somewhat from that which I received from my right hon. friend. In any event, it seems to me that, if my hon. friend is determined to precipitate a debate, which, so far as I see, can do no possible good, and which, in my judgment, may do an infinite amount of harm, the exact terms of the proposed resolution ought to be submitted for the information of the House before any debate takes place. Therefore it would be well, in order that His Honour the Speaker should have an opportunity of considering the point of order which has been raised, and also that my hon. friend who proposes to move this resolution may have the opportunity for more careful and weighty reflection and consideration, that this motion should stand until to-morrow. In the meantime His Honour the Speaker may take into consideration the point of order which has been raised by the hon. member for Moosejaw.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit, in all humility, but with great force, that the point of order of my hon. friend from Moosejaw is not at all well taken. There is an abundance of precedents in this very House against it. As to the legislation of the province of Ontario which it is proposed to discuss to-day, in no hostile spirit, I am sure, we have the precedents in this House, in the time of Sir John Macdonald, in the time of Liberal and Conservative Administrations, of resolutions in favour of Home Rule being presented and adopted, not once, not twice, but three times, and perhaps four, within my recollection. I have to say also that upon more than one occasion the British Parliament was moved, amongst others by Mr. Gladstone, to consider the treatment of Christian populations in the Orient. If I had supposed that any question would be raised as to the power of this House to consider or pass such a resolution, I could have armed myself with any number of precedents. As to the wisdom, or otherwise, of this motion, may I say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that for my part I have another and a totally different view from the one which he has expressed. Everybody knows that there is in this province at the present time a widespread agitation with regard to the rights of the French language in this Dominion. It is never a wise thing to run away from a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not want any applause. I address myself to the common sense and the spirit of fairness of my fellow countrymen in the province of Ontario, and I repeat that we have nothing to gain by running away from the question. Let us discuss it like men; let us discuss it like the British subjects that we are. I speak here as a member of the minority; but no one is prouder of his British rights than I am myself, and I can appeal to my forty years in this House to justify what I now say. There is nothing to be gained by running away from this question. Let us discuss it; let us hear both sides of it; and then, Sir, I believe that from this discussion we shall rise wiser and better men, knowing better what our position is, knowing better what the rights of the minority

are; and I venture to say that when the question has been settled, as it ought to be settled, the minority will accept the situation whatever it may be.

Hon. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, just a word upon the question of order raised by my hon. friend from Moosejaw. I do not think the precedents which have been advanced by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition have any application. The precedents that he has referred to are the precedents of Home Rule resolutions, which on several occasions were moved in this House, and also certain resolutions which were moved in the House of Commons in England with reference to the Christian populations of the Orient. I do not think that any benefit can be derived from the first precedent, that is, the passage of Home Rule resolutions by this House. I have not seen the terms of the present resolution, but, if I am correctly informed, we are asked to comment to a certain degree upon the action of a legislature in this Dominion. The powers conferred upon the legislature and upon the Dominion are defined very clearly by the British North America Act, and it seems to me that, by reason of that clear definition, any interference by this House in a question which concerns a legislature is an interference which cannot be justified by saying that upon another occasion the House expressed itself in favour of Home Rule. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the resolutions which were passed in favour of Home Rule were addressed to His Majesty's Government, and did not have the same significance as a resolution in this Federal House approving or blaming a legislature in the Dominion. Let me say one word to my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) who has moved this resolution. I am as much concerned over this question as my hon. friend. I take as much interest, and have taken as much interest in it from the very first time that it was mentioned, as my hon. friend, and more than my hon. friend has done while he has been a member of this House. I have not had occasion to see the motion. I was unavoidably kept away from the House last evening. I saw a form of resolution this morning, but I am told that that is not the resolution which is before the House. I suppose that what my hon. friend has in mind is the good of the cause which he is advocating. If it is, and if he really does want an intelligent and clear discussion of the question, let him give notice of the resolution which he intends to move, so that we may see what attitude we upon this side of the House, or amongst ourselves, will take upon it; or, let him at least give us time to prepare any argument which he thinks we should bring forward either in favour of the resolution or against it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask that if hon. gentlemen want to have until to-morrow, or another day, to examine the resolution which is presented, I certainly would advise my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) to agree at once to the suggestion.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the initial proceedings here to-day were had, and I do not quite understand all that has taken place up to the present moment. My understanding is, however, that an hon. member of this House wishes to move a resolution on the subject which has been mentioned, and that the point of order has been taken as to whether or not this is a subject which ought properly to come before this House. It is that question of order that is now being discussed. I do not wish to say anything at all in reference to the question of order. My right hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has asked his supporter, in reference to what has been said, to let this motion stand for another day. I wish to the bottom of my heart that he had put his plea that the question should stand forever and a day. For many days now there has been in the air the threatening of a coming menace. It has been stated that from one side or the other a question would be forced into this—

Mr. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am sorry if my point of order has precipitated this discussion. I do not think it is fair to my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). I now raise the point of order, in regard to the remarks made by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), that he is not addressing himself to the point of order, but that he is discussing the merits of the proposed resolution. I would ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether it is now in order to discuss

the merits of the proposed resolution. I felt it my duty to bring this point of order to the attention of the House, but I do not want any unfair advantage to be taken of my hon. friend from Kamouraska.

Mr. SPEAKER: The last point of order of the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) is certainly well taken.

Mr. KNOWLES: On the first point of order, I want to say a word in reply before you decide.

Mr. SPEAKER: If objection is taken, I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce will have to discontinue his remarks. The main point of order is certainly of very great importance and has, I must say, taken me quite by surprise—I only got back from Quebec to-day—and I would rather reserve my ruling on it until to-morrow.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Does that mean that I must reserve my remarks till to-morrow?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the House is certainly of the greatest importance. If the House is disposed to listen to the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce there will be no objection from the Chair; but, if objection comes from the House, I have already ruled that the minister must discontinue his remarks.

Mr. KNOWLES: I wish to say a word on the point of order, in reply to what my right hon. leader has said. The belief that has been in my mind ever since this resolution—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have the floor, I believe. So far as the Speaker is concerned, I am not denied the privilege of continuing my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the Minister of Trade and Commerce is coming to the point of order.

Mr. KNOWLES: He said he was not going to discuss the point of order.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I can easily frame an argument which will touch the point of order. However, it was not my intention at all to discuss the merits of a resolution which I have not yet seen, and about which it would therefore be quite impossible for me to offer an opinion or advance an argument.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can the minister say whether it ought to come here or not?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I wish to make an appeal to Parliament as to a member of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Minister of Trade and Commerce is permitted to make his suggestions to the House other members will claim the same privilege in which case a discussion would be had forthwith on the motion of the hon. member for Kamouraska. I think it is the desire of the House to postpone the discussion until to-morrow. With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Moosejaw, at first glance I do not think it is well taken, but I should prefer to study the point and reserve my ruling until to-morrow.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will not make any further remarks. The spirit and the intention of what I meant to say will, I think be well understood by the House and by the country.

Mr. KNOWLES: I wish to say a word on the point of order, in reply to what my right hon. leader has said.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is entitled to reply. I understand the point of order will be raised again to-morrow.

Mr. KNOWLES: Nobody was objecting to my saying a word.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Minister of Trade and Commerce was allowed to continue until somebody stopped him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman had better wait until to-morrow, when I shall give my ruling on the point of order.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Public Works—harbours and rivers, New Brunswick—Kouchibouguac, $10,500.

Mr. LOGGIE: What is to be done here?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $10,500 is asked for by District Engineer Stead for repairs and improvements to the harbour at Kouchibouguac, which was badly damaged by a storm on 20th November, 1914. The proposed works will consist of the con-

struction of a new dam, the repairing and extension of the old dam, and the rebuilding of pile breastworks. The estimated cost is as follows: dam to close new opening in beach, 800 feet long, at $9 per foot, $7,200; pile breastworks repaired and rebuilt, 1,000 feet, at $1.50, $1,500; extending old dam, 200 feet, at $4, $800; repairing dam, 125 feet; and contingencies, $1,000.

Mr. LOGGIE: I heartily agree with what the minister proposes to do at Kouchibouguac. The storm caused very serious damage, and I hope the minister will see that the new work is done very thoroughly, so that the breakwater will not be carried away by the next bad storm.

Mr. VERVILLE: If the minister would permit me on this item, I should like to remind him that on Friday last, I think, I asked him to lay on the Table a copy of the fair-wage clause in regard to the work to be done at the Parliament Buildings. The minister's answer was that the committee would meet the next day. Of course, I did not understand that that committee which was to meet next day had anything to do with the fair wage clause in connection with that work; I assumed that that belonged to the Labour Department, and, I suppose, to the Minister of Public Works. It seems to me that it should be laid on the table for a good many reasons. My information is that the wages of some of the workmen on the building have been lowered since last winter, notwithstanding that we hear it stated in Parliament every day that the cost of living is increasing. I do not know how this work is to be carried on, whether by contract, or on a percentage, or in any other way; but that makes no real difference, the Government of Canada ought to pay at least as much as any private contractor in the city of Ottawa is called upon to pay. And it seems to me it would be much better in the interests of labour in this country that we should know as soon as possible the wages that the workers may expect to receive in this work of rebuilding. I have just said that wages were lower. My information comes directly from the men working on the building. Last winter the carpenters received 40 cents an hour, but now they are paid 35 cents an hour. I believe that 35 cents an hour was the rate provided for in the fair wage clause applied to the custom house building. But the contract for that was made six years ago, and conditions have greatly changed since that time—the Minister of Public Works knows

that as well as I do. Therefore, it would not be fair to suppose that the same rate would apply to the present work as applied to the construction of the custom house. Furthermore, in the case of the custom house contract, provision was made for an eight-hour day. As the work of rebuilding the Parliament buildings is supposed to go on with rapidity, it may be found necessary to have three shifts a day. In that case it will be much better for the contractor, and for the Government as well, that an eight-hour day should be provided. If you have a nine-hour day, you cannot have more than two shifts, and you are liable, not infrequently, to be in such a position as to be compelled to use overtime; whereas, if you have three shifts, no overtime has to be paid. Of course, the wages should be in proportion to the cost of living. The Minister of Labour knows that according to the report of his department a family cannot live honestly on much less than $900 a year. The total of items contained in his report is about $800, but there are many items omitted which simply must be paid for by every family. I bring this matter up now because I suppose arrangements for the work are not yet completed, and it is well to provide in such a way as to give satisfaction to those interested in the work. I have spoken specially of the carpenters, but I might refer to those in other trades. I trust the Minister of Labour will consult the representatives of the different trades in Ottawa, and will get the report of his fair wage officers on this subject. I think he will find that the wages are, in some cases, far below what they ought to be. It would be in the interest of the contract itself that the Minister of Public Works should do as his predecessor did in the case of the customs house building, and provide for an eight-hour day. The work will go on more rapidly, which will be a benefit to Parliament and to the country at large.

Mr. ROGERS: I have very little objection to what my hon. friend has said with respect to the fair wage clause. I shall be glad to take this up with the Minister of Labour, as I intend to do, before we get started, and ask him to arrange a schedule of prices for the labour engaged in the reconstruction of the building. The eight hour day arrangement is something upon which I would not like to make a definite statement until I have had an opportunity to look into it with the officers of the department and study what the custom has been in the past in this particular locality.

We must have regard to conditions as they exist; and, having regard to these conditions, we will treat the matter in the best light and give it very favourable consideration.

Public Works—harbours and rivers, Quebec—Anse à Beaufils—to repair breakwater, $1,450.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I had not expected to speak on any of these votes, but on this item for Anse à Beaufils breakwater I have something to suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. I regret that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) is not in his place, for what I have to say relates more to his department, but as the Minister of Public Works is the "master of the Administration" he can give his orders to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This Anse à Beaufils is a little cove on the Baie de Chaleur, in the county of Gaspé. I initiated the work there myself and happen to know exactly the conditions. This is an excellent little harbour for the fishermen. The fishermen on that coast go pretty far out in the gulf of St. Lawrence to fish, and as my hon. friend is aware there are more wrecks in that district, perhaps, than in any other part of the gulf of St. Lawrence. There is a bank there called the Orphans' bank, because of the many wrecks that have taken place. This little harbour was built in order to give protection in time of storm, a harbour of refuge for the fishermen. I have visited the harbour on several occasions, and the fishermen have expressed great gratification that this harbour had been provided. But consider what has happened during the last three or four years. I received a letter a few days ago, and I saw the fishermen myself when I passed there last Thanksgiving day. The harbour is so good and is so well equipped that the fishermen from all the neighbouring localities, from Bonaventure island, from the county of Bonaventure, and even from neighbouring places in New Brunswick, when there is a storm in the gulf, make direct for Anse à Beaufils, and thus the fishermen of Anse à Beaufiils themselves are deprived of their harbour for the benefit of outsiders. Of course, a true fisherman must always be liberal and generous to neighbouring fishermen. Therefore, one of two things should be done by the department in this case, either to enlarge the harbour or give instructions to the harbour master to limit the use of the place to the people of the locality. I suggest to the minister that he widen the approaches of the harbour rather than limit the number of fishermen who may take shelter there. I shall be very glad if my hon. friend will note my remarks and instruct his engineer during the coming season to visit the locality and see what can be done in order to meet the exigencies of the case. I can assure him that this is a grievance on the part of the fishermen of the locality, because, although it is their own home, they are dislodged from it by their neighbours—good neighbours, as they are—from Gloucester and Bonaventure.

Mr. TURGEON: May I be permitted to say that I concur in the suggestions made by the hon. member for Rouville? These natural harbours will have to be enlarged or given additional protection if they are to render the service that they should. Our fishermen are numerous in Gloucester. We have two hundred sailing vessels going to the banks, and when the wind strikes in one direction they have to get shelter wherever the elements take them. I remember that complaint was made a few years ago by members from Prince Edward Island with regard to the harbour of Tignish, which was sometimes filled by the Gloucester sailing vessels. The Minister of Public Works at that time did enlarge the breakwater there, and now all the fishermen of Gloucester and Gaspé can get what protection they need in that harbour without causing any detriment to the fishermen of the locality. I hope that the minister will take this matter into consideration during the coming summer and see what can be done.

Mr. ROGERS: I have listened with interest to what the hon. member for Gloucester has said, as well as the hon. member for Rouville, in respect to this important harbour. I find that it is a rather important harbour of its kind; it is a harbour of refuge, and the population immediately affected amounts to something like 4,000. A considerable amount of money has been spent there, nearly $30,000. The amount asked for in the Estimates is simply $1,450 for the repair of the breakwater. Some work was done on the breakwater last year; $3,000 was spent. We have improved the breakwater, therefore, sufficiently, but we have not yet given consideration to the idea of widening the harbour, as has been suggested by my hon. friend. I shall be

glad to have the engineer look into it and see if there is necessity for it.

Anse St. Jean—completion of wharf extension, $3,500.

Mr. MARCIL: Does that complete the work?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Grands Machins—enlargement of wharf, $7,200.

Mr. MARCIL: Is this a new work?

Mr. ROGERS: This is practically a new work of widening the wharf. The matter of going on this year is under consideration.

Mr. MARCIL: That is in the county of Rimouski, I understand?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Point Pizeau—repairs to wharf, $11,100.

Mr. MARCIL: Where is that situated?

Mr. ROGERS: About two miles from the city of Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that to be done this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes, that is the intention.

Port Lewis, repairs to wharf, $1,600.

Mr. ROBB: Will the minister explain what this work is?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is asked for by the district engineer to remove the face timbers of the wharf, which are badly decayed for a height of 6 feet, and to replace the same with a concrete wall 18 feet thick at the base and 9 feet thick at the top. The approach of the wharf also requires concreting. The estimated cost is $1,600.

Mr. ROBB: I hope that the minister, now that the amount is in the Estimates, will not treat that as he has treated the works on La Guerre river. There has been in the Estimates since 1911 an amount of $15,000 for the works on La Guerre river. Last November, about the time that we heard considerable talk of a general election, La Presse newspaper had a write-up on the La Guerre river. They sent out this statement to the people of Huntingdon:

Happy Initiative.

The electors of Huntingdon have been very pleased to learn that the Government, thanks to the initiative of the Minister of Public Works (the Hon. Mr. Rogers) had practically decided to execute the old promises and use the sums of money which have been placed at his disposal for those works and which lie dormant in the coffers.

That money has been sleeping there since this Government came into power in 1911. I think a couple of weeks ago, in answer to the hon. member for Bonaventure, the Minister of Public Works stated that they did not intend to go on with the work this year. I gather, therefore, that La Presse newspaper in November was badly informed.

Mr. ROGERS: We are going on with this $1,600 work.

Quyon—in full and final settlement of claim of T. and J. Moran in connection with their contract for construction of wharf, $843.63.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is that?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required to pay the claim of T. and J. Moran in connection with their contract for the construction of a wharf at Quyon. The claim is made up as follows: Increased quantities of timber used in work, $478.38; extra cost to provide temporary landing for steamer G. B. Greene while the wharf was under construction, $365.25; total $843.62.

Rimouski wharf—water supply, $6,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister explain that item?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required to provide for the extension of the waterworks at Rimouski to the outer end of the wharf, for the purpose of supplying fresh water to the Government and other vessels. The town of Rimouski undertakes to instal this system in a first-class manner for this amount.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the resident engineer of Bonaventure county reported in favour of repairs being made to certain of the wharfs down there—I refer particularly to Bonaventure, Gascon, St. Godfroy, Caplan and Paspebiac? Is provision made for the completion of the beach protection work at Carleton and Maria? Is work to be carried on the wharf of Robin, Jones & Whitman at Paspebiac? Bonaventure county does does not appear in the Main or the Supplementary Estimates. I wanted to know whether the engineer had omitted to make any report, or whether the department had decided not to make any expenditures. I ask this, because a lot of these repairs are necessary.

Mr. ROGERS: In general terms, all repairs asked for by the engineers appear in

the Estimates; but the deputy will look the matter up, and if we have any recommendations from the engineer in the department, we shall be glad to send a copy to my hon. friend. The Paspebiac wharf has not yet been transferred to the department.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister's explanation last year was that it was intended to spend three or four thousand dollars on this wharf, the wharf to remain the property of the private owners, but to be available for the use of the public. Is no work to be done until the wharf is transferred to the Department?

Mr. ROGERS: That is my understanding.

Mr. MARCIL: The highways at Carleton and Maria have been washed away by the heavy tides and storms. Is that beach protection work to be continued this year?

Mr. ROGERS: There is a difference of opinion as to whether the work that has been carried on in the past at Carleton and Maria should be done by this department or by the municipal authorities. Of course, at present, when we can get any excuse to delay expenditure we are doing so, and that may be the explanation in this case.

3 p.m.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—Bruce Mines—repairs to and reconstruction of wharf, $12,750.

Mr. ROGERS: This amount was asked for by the district engineer to repair and reconstruct this wharf. On October 4, 1915, he reported that this expenditure was necessary, the work to consist of cutting the piles off at water level and building a complete new superstructure.

Cobourg—repairs to east pier, $15,000.

Mr. ROGERS: This is asked for by the district engineer to make general repairs and improvements to the east pier, 200 feet in concrete. The work done during the present fiscal year consisted in the completion and the reconstruction of the centre pier, under contract with Randolph Macdonald. This pier has a length of 631 feet. The reconstruction of 320 feet of the east pier is concrete work.

Mr. GRAHAM: The car ferry goes across the lake there, does it not?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: Was there something wrong with the construction that you need repairs?

Mr. ROGERS: It is an old wharf, which is being repaired.

Mr. NESBITT: You are building it with cement now?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Grand Bend—repairs to pier, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is there any work being done at Kingston drydock in the way of repairing ships?

Mr. ROGERS: There is something being done. The Kingston Shipbuilding Company do a good deal of work there.

Mr. GRAHAM: What size of boat can they handle in that drydock?

Mr. ROGERS: I have not the size.

Mr. REID: It is larger than any of the Welland canal vessels. I know that a vessel of the full Welland canal size was in there, and there seemed to be quite a space at each end.

Mr. GRAHAM: They can handle any ship that goes through our canal.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Parry Sound—in full and final settlement of Robinson, Walton and White's claim in connection with their wharf contract, $1,500.

Mr. GRAHAM: What was the trouble there?

Mr. ROGERS: This claim was as follows: For dredging 2,500 cubic yards for crib berth, at 30 cents per cubic yard, $750; for dredging 1,000 cubic yards rock filling, at 75 cents per cubic yard, $750; total, $1,500. Owing to the fact that an error of 26 feet was made in laying out the work, the contractors were obliged to remove by dredging a portion of the filling placed by them in the approach. In a letter of May 5, 1915, Chief Engineer Lafleur stated that in view of the error he was of the opinion that the contractors should not be penalized, and that their claim amounting to $1,500 should be allowed.

Port Burwell—repairs to piers, $32,000.

Mr. NESBITT: I thought you had got through with that work?

Mr. ROGERS: This is for repairs.

Mr. NESBITT: What was the matter—was the wharf washed away?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount of $32,000 is asked for by District Engineer Merrick to make the following repairs to the piers at Port Burwell: Reconstruction of portion

of east pier in mass concrete for height of 7 feet, width 24 feet, and length 560 feet; 3,482 cubic yards concrete at $7, $24,374. Completion of renewing defective faced timbers on east side of same, cross ties and decking, 300 feet, at $4, $1,200; completion of pile work on west side of turning basin, consisting of 10 x 10 x 35 feet, sheet piling, with double waling at top and outside waling at L.W.L. anchored to old mill, 315 lineal feet, at $20 per foot, $6,300; total, $31,874.

Port Stanley—reconstruction of pier, $100,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a work which has given the Government a good deal of trouble, if I mistake not. In connection with the original construction of the work, was there not a large claim for extras which stood over for some years? Possibly it has not been settled yet. If I remember correctly, the work had been begun and partially completed, when it was washed away in a storm, or badly damaged, and had to be reconstructed. The contractor made a claim for damages some years ago.

Mr. ROGERS: I think you have Goodrich in mind.

Mr. GRAHAM: I remember the Goodrich case, but this is another one. I think it was Port Stanley.

Mr. ROGERS: This has nothing to do with that. We had an old wharf at Port Stanley, and it was proposed some years ago to widen the channel, and the outside breakwater was built up. The old breakwater is giving way, and it is necessary to build a new breakwater this year in order to save the work that has been done within the last few years. It is absolutely necessary to protect the work already done, as well as to protect and develop the harbour in such a manner as will enable ships to get in. The old breakwater and the old wharf have given way entirely on the one side, and this is to remedy this condition, and to save the new work.

Mr. GRAHAM: What railways run to Port Stanley?

Mr. ROGERS: There is the London municipal road and the Michigan Central. There is a great deal of traffic and Port Stanley is, I should think, the largest harbour in the western portion of Ontario.

Public Works—harbours and rivers—British Columbia—Fraser river improvements—further amount required, $200,000.

[Mr. Rogers.]

Mr. ROGERS: This is for the big improvements started some years ago.

Mr. GRAHAM: What strikes one as a little peculiar about such items as this is that the engineers, in making their estimates for next year, seem to have made an error of at least $200,000.

Mr. ROGERS: No, no.

Mr. GRAHAM: When the Main Estimates are being prepared the engineers are supposed to put in all the amounts required for next year. Evidently in connection with this one item a sum of $200,000 was omitted. Without wishing to censure anybody, it seems to me that it is too much the habit in the departments to make up their Main Estimates hurriedly and to take a chance, thinking there is plenty of time, in the Supplementaries, the result being that the members do not get a real grasp of what the expenditures are going to be. I have always maintained that, both in the Government and out of it. It came to pretty nearly that condition in the Railway Department. If urged, the engineers can give you pretty approximately what they require for the year in time to put the amount in the Main Estimates. That saves a lot of trouble. The Public Works Department appears to be slipping away from that, I think. There are some pretty big items in the Supplementaries this year. If the engineers could be made to understand that for a year or two they were not going to have any Supplmentary Estimates, they would get their Estimates ready for the Main Estimates.

Mr. ROGERS: That has been for many years the practice in the Public Works Department. It has been somewhat different from the practice of the Department of Railways. With reference to this particular work, this is the third unit of a very large work that was undertaken some years ago and is being completed. It is the building of a jetty on the Fraser river.

Mr. NESBITT: Is that not all the more reason why they should have had it in the Main Estimates? They must have known what was required six months ago.

Mr. ROGERS: That has not been the usual practice of the Public Works Department for many years past.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would it not be a good idea to have it that way?

Mr. ROGERS: I thought it would be when I came in, but I found it was not practicable.

Mr. GRAHAM: I could understand that it might be necessary in connection with some new work, but this work on the Fraser river has been going on for some years. The engineers knew six months ago what they intended to expend; but, knowing that the vote would be put in the Supplementaries, they did not give it to you for the Main Estimates. The difficulty is this: The members are asked to put through the Main Estimates before they see the Supplementaries. They vote amounts for certain works in the Main Estimates, but when the Supplementaries come up they find that they are really the Main Estimates so far as these works are concerned. I have no objection to the money being voted for the work; I think it is all right; but I think it would be better if we could arrive at a system by which the Main Estimates would be the Main Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates would be the Supplementaries.

Mr. ROGERS: This particular Estimate, together with the recommendation of the engineers, was in the department in time for the Main Estimates; but I had the idea that probably we could get on without spending the money this year. The engineers, however, convinced me that it was absolutely necessary to carry out that contract to save the work already done. A hundred thousand dollars has already been spent there, and this amount is necessary to enable the work to be carried to completion.

Mr. GRAHAM: That same condition arises every year, I am afraid.

Dredging — Ontario and Quebec — further amount required, $50,000.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to present to the minister a long-standing grievance. We have no details in reference to the amounts estimated to be expended in Ontario or Quebec. I understand it is left entirely to the discretion of the minister to allot the vote as he decides. We do not know where this work is to be done. Where is it proposed to expend this amount this year?

Mr. ROGERS: If the hon. gentleman will follow the Estimates closely, he will see that we have reduced the amount for dredging in the various provinces.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Reduced it, actually?

Mr. ROGERS: Very largely, yes. We reduced it so much that we find that we have to ask for an additional $50,000 here. For example, for our own dredging plant, which we already have at work both in Quebec and Ontario, there is an estimated expenditure of $417,000, and the total amount that we asked for all the dredging work for the year was $550,000, including this $50,000; so that we have very little margin with which to do any dredging outside of the dredging to be carried out by the plant under the control of the department. The work of these dredges is divided as equally as possible between Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL: I do not refer particularly to where the work is done, but I would like to know what is to be done. What work does the department intend to carry on during the present season in Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. ROGERS: It is being carried on at various points where there is necessity for it. There is a necessity for dredging this year at Three Rivers. It has been pressed for there and at similar points where navigation is affected by the filling in of silt. Dredging is necessary to provide for the accommodation of boats up and down the rivers at various points. There is no settled place.

Mr. MARCIL: The great objection is that there is nothing settled. I have referred to this especially, because some years ago some dredging was done in the channel of the Bonaventure river; the navigators appreciated very much the work that was commenced; but the unfortunate thing is that the work has remained unfinished. People ask me whether any dredging work is to be done there, and I am not in a position to say yes or no. If the minister would give the House the dredging programme for the season and a list of the places in which work is to be done, it would be a great advantage.

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be very glad to supply any details the committee may require. If my hon. friend requires any details with respect to the locality to which he has referred, we shall be very pleased to give them to him.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the minister tell me whether there will be any dredging in the Bonaventure river this year?

Mr. ROGERS: We have not laid out to do any work there. The work there will probably be more than our dredge could carry on. If we had a larger vote in the Estimates it might be possible to do some work there by contract, but, having so little, I doubt if it will be possible to do any work this year unless there is a very pressing necessity for it. If navigation were obstructed we would have to try to relieve the condition.

Mr. ROBB: Can the minister tell us if he is going to do any dredging in Valleyfield bay? His engineers have been staking out there all winter. There is considerable coal and lumber around there, and owing to the change in the water level the boats cannot get in. It was to be understood that the work was to be done this summer.

Mr. ROGERS: I cannot give my hon. friend a definite answer, as I have not the information before me. I know there has been some construction of a wharf at Valleyfield, but I do not know in what shape it stands to-day. Engineers of different power companies interested have their men down there surveying, and the men my hon. friend speaks of may not be engineers of the Public Works Department. I have no knowledge whether our engineers are down there just now.

Mr. TOBIN: Could the minister say on this item whether the public building at D'Israeli, for which there is a revote of $10,000 in the Main Estimates, will be gone on with this year, and whether the site has been purchased?

Mr. ROGERS: There will be no expenditure on that item this year.

International bridge between St. Leonard, N.B., and Van Buren, Maine—repairs, $2,000.

Mr. MARCIL: Has the minister taken any further steps with regard to the construction of an interprovincial bridge between Campbellton and the Quebec side, over the Restigouche river? The county councils of Bonaventure and Restigouche and adjoining municipalities, and several boards of trade have been after the department asking for this bridge. It was originally proposed to ask for a joint highway and railway bridge, but when this Administration came into office, the people of Campbellton, thinking the railway feature of the bridge was rather ahead of the time, consented to ask for a highway bridge only, on the understanding that the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick would give a grant towards the undertaking, and that the whole work would be done by the Department of Public Works. I am sorry to say nothing has been done yet, except making surveys, soundings, and so on. Campbellton is rapidly becoming the most important town in northern New Brunswick. As the minister knows, it is the centre of the Intercolonial railway in that district, and has large lumbering operations. Its population is increasing year by year, and the town is perhaps the most enterprising one in the whole of northern New Brunswick. Communication with the Quebec side is very difficult, being by flat-bottomed scows which can travel only at certain hours, owing to the low tide on the Restigouche river. There is great necessity for this bridge. When the Government took over the International bridge, which runs into Campbellton, we had hopes that it would also take over the Gaspé and Baie des Chaleurs railway, and that the two would be linked up by a joint railway and highway bridge. Has any action in this respect been taken by the department, or is any such action in contemplation?

Mr. ROGERS: A couple of years ago or more the importance of this work was recognized. Undoubtedly it is a very necessary work, and one in which the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec are very deeply interested. Following the recommendations, an expensive survey was made in connection with the proposed undertaking, but the estimated cost of the bridge was so heavy that we did not feel warranted in constructing it two years ago, and that is still our attitude to-day. The work, however, is very necessary, and should be carried out when conditions change; but at the present time I do not think there is any hope either of the Public Works Department or of the two provinces concerned going on with it.

Mr. MARCIL: Was the last survey for a highway bridge or joint highway and railway bridge?

Mr. ROGERS: A highway bridge.

Mr. MARCIL: What was the estimated cost?

Mr. ROGERS: I shall be glad to send a copy of the report to my hon. friend if he is interested.

Mr. MARCIL: I am greatly interested; it is a live question with us.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The minister will perhaps forgive me if I again draw his atten-

tion to what I would call the question of interprovincial bridges between Vaudreuil, Ile Perrot and Ste. Anne's. Yesterday, as I was coming up to Ottawa, I heard a remark which I hear practically every time I pass over those bridges: "What a pity," people say, " that we have no road for vehicles and pedestrians over these bridges." This difficulty may be hard to setttle, because it is in a way a provincial question, but it seems to me that the Government have now in their hands an opportunity for getting the work done. The Grand Trunk, one of the railways using the two bridges, is again asking Parliament for a loan; Parliament is not committed to it yet, but I believe that when we have the necessary information Parliament will be willing to aid the Grand Trunk—and why should the Government not arrange, when granting this loan, for the use of the piers for spans, so that vehicles and pedestrians could pass the bridge. I believe the piers could support additional spans, but at all events the engineers could easily ascertain that. I think the minister hardly realizes as much as I do, constantly travelling between Montreal and Ottawa, how inconvenient the absence of a bridge at that point is to the people, especially nowadays, when the automobile has come into its own. It takes a longer time to cross by the ferry boat than to run from Montreal, say to Coteau. It would be easy for the Government to settle the difficulty by arranging, as one of the conditions of the loan, that the Grand Trunk should allow the use of their piers, subject, of course, to the approval of the engineers. I do not think this would lessen in any way the stability of the bridge. My hon. friend is a diplomat, and it would be a great feather in his cap if he could bring this about for the people of the two provinces, for although the river Ottawa at that point is exclusively within the province of Quebec, at the same time it is the highway between the two provinces. I strongly urge my hon. friend to look into this matter and to get in touch with the Grand Trunk as soon as possible.

Mr. MARCIL: An additional reason for making a highway bridge there is that you are going to cross the canal at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, and that will mean that the Department of Railways and Canals will also be interested. I recall that the Department of Public Works some years ago utilized an old bridge on the Intercolonial to provide a bridge at Matapedia across the Restigouche river. The piers were there, and the old bridge was taken out and put alongside the railway bridge, thus making a highway bridge which has been a great benefit to the locality, enabling the people to reach a district that, up to that time, had been almost inaccessible. The minister must not forget that there are about seven hundred thousand people on the island of Montreal, and the number is rapidly increasing, so that it will be a million people before long, and these people cannot get off the island in this direction except by crossing this river. In addition to the point the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has mentioned with regard to the Grand Trunk, a similar arrangement might be made with the Canadian Northern with regard to their bridge at Isle Bizard. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) would take the same position.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The same question has come up in connection with the Railway Bill that was brought down two years ago, and that ought to be made law now. The principle is broader than any raised by the two hon. members who have spoken. The Railway Commission should be given power to order any railway to allow a municipality or province to be joint builders with them of any new bridge; and I think it ought to go even further and provide that the public, whether acting through a province or a municipality, should be able to go to the Railway Commission and have an order made that an existing bridge owned by a railway company, if it will bear the added strain, should be usable for highway purposes. In my own constituency is a wide ravine which is crossed by the Canadian Pacific. The railway company propose to rebuild that bridge, and have expressed their willingness to co-operate with the city of Toronto in the construction of a joint highway and railway bridge. That is being worked out, but as a matter of grace or concession by the railway. It seems to me high time that we should have in the general law governing railways a provision giving a municipality or a province the right to associate itself with a railway in using any bridge for highways as well as for railway purposes.

Mr. DESCARRIES: (Translation.) Mr Chairman as the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway bridges between St. Anne and Vaudreuil, just mentioned, connect with the county of Jacques Cartier,

which I have the honour to represent in this House, I feel it is my duty to say a few words in favour of the building of a structure or bridge over which vehicles and pedestrians could cross from St. Anne to Perrott island and Vaudreuil.

As was said a while ago by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) it seems to me that communication could easily be established at this spot. Between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway bridges, there is enough space to allow of a bridge to be built for the use of vehicles and pedestrians. The piers of the two bridges are placed opposite one another so that it would be a simple matter to put steel beams across on which to build the platform.

As the hon. gentlemen can see at page 11 of the Orders of the Day, I have moved a resolution which reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, a committee consisting of five members should be appointed by this Government to ascertain if it is possible, and under what conditions, carriageways and foot-paths communicating between the mainland and the Island of Montreal, on the south, the west and the north sides of the latter, might be established, by using for that purpose the bridges of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Lachine and the Caughnawaga Reserve; those of the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk railways between Ste. Anne de Bellevue and Vaudreuil; and that of the Canadian Northern Railway to the north of Isle Bizard; such committee to have power to sit during and after the present session and to report during the next session, the services of such members to be gratuitous.

According to the rules of the House, I am precluded from introducing this resolution to-day, but I hope before the close of the session to have the opportunity of putting it through.

My hon. friend from Rouville asked the minister a while ago to find the means for having this work carried out at as early a date as possible. If a committee were appointed, such as I have suggested, its members could interview those two railway companies, get all the information required, find out on what terms those bridges could be erected and whether their engineers find that the bridges could be built where I have indicated in my motion. It seems to me we must get that information as to means and terms before coming before this House or before the Quebec Legislature with a request for help. I therefore heartily endorse the suggestion made to the minister that he do his best as far as he is concerned to carry out this important work, which has been asked for many years past and is absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the great city of Montreal, the heart of the province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Aye, and of Canada.

Mr. DESCARRIES: And, as the hon. member for Rouville is stating, of all Canada. I then join with those of my hon. colleagues who are interested in that work in an endeavour to have it carried out. Thousands of dollars are being voted here and there, in many places in the different provinces, for public works of no well defined public utility. I believe no amount would be better spent than that which would go to building this bridge. I, for one, realize that there is absolute need of such a structure between St. Anne and Vaudreuil to open up communication between Quebec and Ontario. There is none other than at this point, and to-day any one going across from Montreal to Upper Canada must cross there, that is at St. Anne in an old ferry pulled by oars, to Perrot island and then take another ferry to cross from the island to Vaudreuil. I say without hesitation that such a method of travelling or transportation at this stage of our development is unworthy of Canada's progress. Any one going to the United States from Lachine or Montreal has to cross the river by way of the Victoria bridge and cover a long distance to no purpose whatever; while if the crossing could be effected from Lachine to Caughnawaga we should have the shortest possible route to the American side.

Last Sunday, intending to go to Chateauguay—I must explain that between Lachine and the south shore the river is a little over a mile across—I was forced to go to Montreal, take the Victoria bridge, circle the lake in front of Laprairie, and come back opposite Lachine. By that circuitous way I had to drive thirty miles uselessly. I may be allowed to say that when I reached the Canadian Pacific railway bridge, on the road to the reserve at Caughnawaga, my car ran into a gully, and I had to get a team of horses to pull me out. Other cars met with the same fate and have had to be pulled out by horses.

If we built a bridge between Lachine and Caughnawaga, which could be easily done, a long distance would be saved, and, moreover, there would be opened one of the most beautiful and most frequented roads, because it is current, as we know, that Montreal will build its driveways along the aque-

duct. Starting from Montreal and taking by the driveways, one would get directly to Lachine, right opposite Caughnawaga. On that side of the river, at Caughnawaga, there is the right-of-way, or roadbed, of an old railroad, which is not now in operation. That road leads from Caughnawaga to Hemmingsford, and, if I mistake not, opens a straight connection between Caughnawaga and the United States.

Hon. Mr. MARCIL: Before the hon. member proceeds any further, I would ask him if he wants a separate bridge, or what kind of a structure he proposes?

Mr. DESCARRIES: I think the same thing could be done there as with the Victoria bridge, that is, a widening of the present structure. I fail to see why the same plan could not be followed in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway bridge at that point. That bridge is quite heavy, it has even been doubled; a second bridge has been built alongside the other, so that there is a large quantity of iron in it, and the proposed road could be built without in the least straining the bridge.

My hon. friend from Bonaventure spoke about another structure, which is also mentioned in my resolution, connecting Bizard island and St. Dorothée, at the north end of the island of Montreal. At that point the river narrows considerably; there are, I believe, only two piers in deep water under the Great Northern railway bridge, so that without great expense a road could be built for the use of vehicles and pedestrians. These bridges would give easy access to Montreal from all parts of the country.

Hon. Mr. MARCIL: I may point out to my hon. friend that the late Government had required the Great Northern Railway Company to build a highway bridge on the road at the other end of the island, at Charlemagne. His proposition is on the same principle?

Mr. DESCARRIES: I was just going to mention that circumstance. I was saying that Montreal would have roads leading to it from all sides, and, as my hon. friend has just stated, there is the Laurier bridge at Charlemagne, giving access to the island at that end.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: And it is free.

Mr. DESCARRIES: Yes, the Laurier bridge is free. On the east we have the Victoria bridge, where we have to pay toll; on the south, we should then have the bridge at Lachine; on the west, the bridge at St. Anne, and on the northwest, the bridge to Bizard island.

I urge on the hon. minister and on all the members of this House who are interested in this question, to join together in common endeavour to realize those great public works which are necessary to the country's development, because obviously they would contribute to a large extent not only to the advancement of the counties which those bridges would tap, but also to the progress of Montreal, of the province of Quebec, and of the country as a whole.

Mr. MORRIS: I am very much pleased that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has brought this matter to the attention of the committee, and it gives me pleasure to back up a few of the statements that he has made. While this matter may not be looked on very seriously by many members of this House, I can assure gentlemen that it is of the most vital importance not only to the people of my county, but to the whole district, as well as to the city of Montreal. We all admit to-day that Montreal is the metropolis of Canada, and when we stop to consider that there is but one means of access to the city of Montreal by teams it certainly makes us feel that we are a little behind the times. Then there is another phase of the matter, apart from the international view that my hon. friend has taken, that is worthy of the consideration of this Parliament. I speak of the local phase of the question. My county, the county of Chateauguay, is very much interested in this measure. We have to-day throughout the greater part of Chateauguay and Huntingdon macadamized roads. In my election in 1913 the question was put to me: "Will you assist us in getting direct communication with Montreal?" I said: "Friends, I will do my duty in that respect." I have attempted to do so, I have succeeded in obtaining certain works that were necessary along that line. But this question that my hon. friend has brought is one of great importance, and I am pleased to-day to endorse what he has said, and to attempt in a feeble way to lay before this House the requirements of the southern portion of the province of Quebec. Situated as we are, as my hon. friend has said, we have to go almost around the city of Montreal in order to reach that city. We have to-day macadamized roads. Some time ago the project was mooted of establishing

a line of communication by auto trucks from my county and the county of Huntingdon direct to Montreal, but we were held up for want of direct communication. We come before this Parliament to-day asking to have this matter taken into consideration, inasmuch as it will benefit not only the southern part of the province of Quebec, but the city of Montreal as well. My county is one of the best in the whole province of Quebec for market gardening, and in that respect it could supply one of the greatest needs of the city of Montreal to-day. Hon. members are aware that the bulk of the garden stuff used in Montreal is imported from the United States. Why is that? Simply because the people in the immediate vicinity of Montreal have not free access to that city. If we had proper means of access to Montreal, the bulk of the farmers of my county would be engaged in market gardening. They have the soil for it; they have people who understand the work, but they require direct communication. I confine my remarks to this bridge between Lachine and Caughnawaga, inasmuch as it interests me and the people I represent, as well as the people to the south of us. If we had that direct communication we would, before two months, establish a line of trucks that would carry the produce of our counties direct to the city of Montreal, the farmers in Huntingdon and Chateauguay could load their produce on trucks in the early morning and place it on the Montreal market in the forenoon. This is a matter worthy of the consideration of this House, and I hope that the minister and the Government will take into consideration the appointing of such a commission as my hon. friend has asked for. Let us endeavour to do something for the southern part of the province of Quebec. As you all know, probably no other part of the province or the whole Dominion has received so little attention as the county I represent. The county of Chateauguay, as I said on a former occasion, has never come begging to this Parliament. The people of that country are independent people, and probably the necessity for Dominion Government aid has not existed in the past. But to-day the question presents itself in a light that I hope hon. members will realize. I hope they will give due consideration to this question and that before the session ends steps will be taken to give to the people of southern Quebec the accommodation which they so need. This will be in the interest not only of the counties I have mentioned but of the city of Montreal. I sincerely trust that the Government will give serious consideration to the suggestion of my hon. friend.

4 p.m.

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know that I can add very much to what I said the other evening in respect to this important matter. I quite appreciate how thoroughly the hon. members of this House, especially those from the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario, realize the importance and the necessity for a bridge at Ile Perrot. I know how insistent my hon. friend from Chateauguay has been in pressing this matter, and I am sure that his remarks to-day will tend to impress on every member of the House the pressing need of this important public work. In view of the greatly increased mileage that it is necessary to travel in order to get on the island of Montreal, it is likely that the cost of a bridge at Ile Perrot would be easily saved in the reduced consumption of gasoline in the many motors that now have to travel around in order to reach the centre of the city. The hon. member has said that he has a resolution on the Order Paper in connection with the suggestion of appointing a commission to deal with this important subject, and also with the question of the construction of a bridge between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway bridges. I have not in mind at the moment the exact distance between those two bridges, but I fancy it is not very great, although it is probably sufficient to permit the construction of a highway bridge between the two railway bridges. I do not know whether that plan would be feasible or not. I have no hesitation in saying that if there is a work in the nature of the construction of bridges in any part of Canada that it is desirable to carry out, this particular work takes first place. It is true, as the hon. member for Bonaventure has stated, that we also have to cross the canal. Of course, we can always impose on the Department of Railways and Canals the responsibility of building a bridge across a canal, whenever and wherever it is necessary to do so in the public interest. But we have the other and perhaps the larger difficulty of getting across the river before we reach the canal. This is a work which belongs to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, if we are to regard it as an inter-

provincial undertaking. I have had the pleasure of receiving large deputations from both Quebec and Ontario, who apparently have a very deep interest in the construction of this bridge. I appreciate the importance of the work for the island of Montreal. It is remarkable that that island, with its very great population of 700,000 or 800,000 people, has been able to get along so long without this communication between it and the city of Toronto. Recognizing the force of the representations made in this connection, I take pleasure in saying that if the matter should be taken up by the two provinces of Quebec and Ontario, I shall be pleased to join with them, as representing the Department of Public Works; and if we can do nothing else under our present law, we can always find some way for making grants to the provinces to assist in such an undertaking. I shall endeavour to have the matter taken up before the next session and to have it so adjusted between the two provinces and the Department of Public Works, that I shall be able to come to Parliament and ask Parliament to vote one-third of the assistance necessary to carry on, in conjunction with these two provinces, the construction of this necessary work at Ile Perrot.

Mr. MICHAUD: I am glad to hear the Minister of Public Works express his views upon the importance of interprovincial bridges. I am sure he will not forget the interprovincial bridge which is proposed between Campbellton and a point in the county of Bonaventure. No doubt my hon. friend is aware of the importance of the town of Campbellton. It is the feeder of the northern part of New Brunswick and the eastern part of the Gaspè peninsula, and the people of that town labour under great difficulties through not having communication with the surrounding country. I know that the hon. minister will take into consideration the application which will soon be made in connection with the building of this important interprovincial bridge.

While we are on this important subject, I wish to urge upon the minister the importance of international bridges. An application was made to the Department of Public Works two months ago for a grant to enable an international bridge to be built between the town of Edmunston and the state of Maine. We all recognize the importance of interprovincial bridges, and in my opinion international bridges are also important. About three years ago there was a serious accident in connection with the ferry from Edmundston and almost every year a few lives are lost in the operation of the ferry boats. The state of Maine has voted $10,000 to show their good faith in connection with the proposal to construct an international bridge. The Minister of Public Works is probably aware of the facts which I am stating, but I would emphasize the importance of building this bridge. The construction of an international bridge between Edmundston and the state of Maine would contribute greatly to the advantage of the Canadian people. Edmundston has a population of over 2,000, and they look to the Government for assistance in this matter.

Mr. ROGERS: Perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House when a few moments ago I dealt with the question of the Campbellton bridge and stated that we had made a survey, but that nothing further had been done owing to the very heavy cost involved. With regard to international bridges, we have an item of $29,000 in the Estimates to provide our share of the cost of the international bridge over the St. John river between Clair in New Brunswick and Port Kent in the state of Maine. We have had several deputations upon the subject, and we are ready to fulfil our part as soon as the state of Maine is ready to carry out theirs.

Mr. MICHAUD: There is nothing in the Estimates to provide for the bridge between Edmundston and the state of Maine.

Mr. ROGERS: No, not for that.

Mr. MICHAUD: The state of Maine has already voted $10,000 for that purpose, and there is a risk of losing that subsidy if we are not prepared to meet them half way. I called upon the minister two months ago with reference to this proposed bridge and I was informed that he would be ready to meet the Americans half way. I am sorry that he has not seen his way to make some provision because there is great risk of losing what the state of Maine has voted.

Moosejaw-Wood Mountain telegraph line—renewal of poles, $5,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: While we are on the subject of telegraph and telephone lines, has the minister inquired about the poles in the county of Charlevoix to which I referred the other day?

Mr. ROGERS: The deputy informs me that the telegraph branch of the department is making inquiry, and he expects a report

in a day or two. When I receive that report I will send my hon. friend a copy.

Mr. McKENZIE: A few evenings ago I brought up the question of the operation of the telegraph lines in the county of Victoria, and, on reading the minister's statement in Hansard, I found that he had stated that he deprecated what I had said. If I understand the meaning of the word "deprecated," it is that he did not believe what I said. I stated on that occasion that the telegraph line was improperly used during a provincial election, that it was taken charge of by the managers of the campaign, and that it was used for a whole month for election purposes without a charge of one cent being made for the use of the lines, 120 miles or 140 miles in extent, and of all the offices and branches. I stated that as a matter of fact, and I ask the minister to believe me unless he can find any evidence to the contrary. I stated on my reputation for veracity in this House that that was true. I further state that the manager of the line, and of the largest office, has since admitted upon his oath in a court of law every word I have said. That is a matter of record in the courts of the province of Nova Scotia, and if the minister deprecates what I say I want him to look up the records of the court of Mr. Justice Russell, who tried the election case and read the sworn evidence of Mr. David Dunlop, who was the superintendent of the line, and the operator, who admitted on his oath that he had taken charge of the line, that he had not collected fees, that he had not made any return to the department, and that he had never been asked to make a return. These are absolutely clear-cut facts sworn to, and upon that I say I state my reputation as a member of this House. I do not want any minister to stand up in this House and say that he deprecates the statements made by a member unless he has evidence to the contrary.

Mr. ROGERS: Before my hon. friend goes any further I would like to say that I have read the report of my remarks in Hansard, but I can assure him that what I said had not the meaning which he takes out of it. I do not know whether the word was used or not, or whether it was used in the sense in which he describes it; but whether it was used or not, I want to assure my hon. friend that I accepted his word without any question at all in my mind that he was stating exactly the facts as he found them. I wish to say to my hon. friend here that I regret very much to learn that such a state of affairs should have existed, and to assure him that I am looking into it, and I will see that it shall not occur again. It is an unfortunate position of affairs that our telegraph lines in various parts of Canada are not as secret to the users as they should be. To my knowledge that applies to the large lines in Canada as well as to the local Government lines. Every effort should be made by every member of this House, and certainly every effort will be made by myself, to correct such a condition as my hon. friend complains of, and, the facts being what they are, justly complains of. I will be glad to take every means to correct the condition and rectify it so that my hon. friend will have no cause for complaint in the future.

Mr. McKENZIE: I thought from the hon. gentleman's tone of voice that he had no belief in what I said. The acoustics of this place are wretched, and you cannot always be sure what is said across the floor, and I thought that the minister did not believe what I was saying, because the word "deprecate," as I understand it, means that you do not believe a statement that is made. If the hon. gentleman says that he deprecated the action of those who would use the telegraph lines as I have stated, that is a different proposition altogether.

Mr. ROGERS: That is right.

Vancouver Island telegraph and telephone lines—extensions, $9,000.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to ask a question or two with regard to the preceding items if I may. I notice that there is a vote of $500 for repairs and improvements to the office building at House River in connection with the Fort McMurray telegraph line. What accommodation is there at McMurray, House River, Pelican portage, and Calling River for the telegraph offices? Are they in rented buildings, or does the Government own the buildings?

Mr. ROGERS: I am afraid I have not that information. I will give my hon. friend the information that I have with regard to this particular item. This is an item of $500 for repairs and improvements to the office building at House River. District Superintendent McDonald, under date of the 21st October, 1915, writes as follows:

It has been found expedient, instead of erecting a building, to purchase from Fred Taylor,

House River, the building in which our office has been located. This action meets with approval of all the people. The building is log, 16 x 28 feet one and a half stories high and the addition thereto is 10 x 16 covered with rubberoid roofing. The price paid for the building is $500 and the expenditure of another $500 will be necessary to put it in good repair.

Mr. OLIVER: This is not a matter of importance, but I would like to be certain if the offices at Calling River and Pelican Portage are merely offices in buildings belonging to private citizens or are offices supplied by the Government as at House River. Apparently the Government is going to own the office building at House River, and I wished to know what the situation was in regard to the other two places and also at McMurray.

Mr. ROGERS: The deputy will take a note of that and give my hon. friend the information. I could not give it to him correctly.

Mr. OLIVER: At McMurray, as well as the other two places. For the office at lake Saskatoon I see there is a revote of $400. Does the Government own that office?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: That is just for repairs and improvements?

Mr. ROGERS: To complete the office building at lake Saskatoon.

Mr. OLIVER: What are the rough details of the vote of $11,000 for renewals, repairs and improvements to the Peace River line, and is it intended to make the expenditure this year?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. The $11,000 is required for renewing poles from Edmonton to Athabaska, 98 miles, at $100 per mile; for a well and repairs to the building at Grouard and for a well and repairs to the building at Peace River Crossing, $500 each.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the Government own the building at Peace River Crossing?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I revert to the desirability of the extension of the line now running from Athabaska Landing via Plamondonville to Lac la Biche and also to Lac la Biche station, which I mentioned a few days ago? Has there been any further consideration given to the suggestion?

Mr. ROGERS: When the matter was brought up on the last occasion in the House it was referred to the telegraph department, and they are getting a report. We expect to have it in a day or two.

Mr. OLIVER: I hope the department will consider the matter favourably with a view to establishing a connection this summer, because it would be a very great convenience to the public and it would really be to the benefit of the revenues of the line. The Lac la Biche station is, and will be, a town and has railway communication. There is an important hotel there; it will be connected with the boating and fishing on the lake and in every way it will be very desirable to have telegraphic communication. The railway company do not intend to put in a telegraph service as they propose operating with the telephone. If the department can look upon this matter favourably, and can carry out this extension with a reasonable amount of celerity, it will be a great convenience to the public there.

Mr. ROGERS: We sent the department a copy of the remarks made the other evening by the hon. gentleman, and asked for a report. As soon as it comes I will let my hon. friend have a copy.

Mr. OLIVER: I am under the impression that I mentioned it last year and received a somewhat similar and equally favourable reply from the minister but so far there has not been any result.

Mr. ROGERS: We will see if we cannot arrange it this year.

Lévis graving dock—further amount required, $3,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this for the old dock?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes. This amount is required for purchasing the blocks that go under the ships.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How are you getting along with the new dock?

Mr. ROGERS: Pretty well. It is hoped the work will be completed this fall, but we are not quite sure.

Prince Edward Island—Bay Fortune—breakwater extension, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend from Kings, who was obliged to leave, asked me to get some information from the minister. First of all, is this amount of $5,000 for the breakwater extension at Bay Fortune to be expended during the coming year? The vote would indicate that it is not for repairs, but for new work. If it is for an extension, I am informed that $5,000 would not go very far. Is the amount required for repairs or for extending the length of the wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: This amount is required for the construction of an extension to the breakwater at Bay Fortune. The work is required for the improvement, by securing, of a shoal sandbar at the entrance of the harbour, so as to facilitate the import of coal, lime, lumber, etc., and export of surplus farm produce from a large and rich agricultural district. During 1914-15 about $2,000 was expended in repairing and raising, for an average of 3 feet, the outer 300 feet of the old work; also placing in fenders, ties, ballast, etc., and covering the outer block. Foreman, W. Aitkens; rate of pay, $2.50 per day. The engineer evidently thinks we shall be able to do the work satisfactorily for $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is to be the total length of the wharf?

Mr. ROGERS: It does not appear to be given here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What will be the total cost?

Mr. ROGERS: It is estimated that before completion it will cost $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Another question the hon. member desires me to ask is why it is not proposed to go on with the construction of a boat harbour at North Lake, an item for which has been in the Estimates for quite a number of years, and to expend $5,000 at Bay Fortune, when the work at North Lake is more urgently required and will be much more useful than the work at Bay Fortune?

Mr. ROGERS: With regard to North Lake, we have had a great deal of difficulty in getting the people to sign for the right of way and the land required for the work. The question of damages has been in dispute for some time, and has not been settled yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister must be wrong if my information is correct, because it appears by a return, I am informed, that the matter was adjusted to the satisfaction of the Government last June when tenders were called for.

Mr. ROGERS: The deputy informs me that my statement is correct. When we called for tenders we depended upon getting a bond from some parties indemnifying us against damages and so on, but we have not received it yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member for Kings is greatly impressed with the importance of repairing the breakwater at Souris. He says that a year ago $144,000 was spent on an extension to the Souris breakwater. This, he says, is the most important public work in Prince Edward Island. A few weeks or a few months after the work was completed a storm of no more than ordinary violence made a breach in the seaward side and carried away a portion of the new work, and every storm since has widened the breach. The hon. member is much surprised that nothing has been provided for repairs this year, and alleges that if the work is allowed to stand without being repaired, great damage will be done to the breakwater, and a great deal of money which has been expended will be lost. Has the minister any report with regard to the damage done to the breakwater, and is it proposed to ask for any amount this year to make the necessary repairs?

Mr. ROGERS: The engineer does not see the necessity for an expenditure this year, but later on something will have to be done. His report is as follows:

A contract for the 400 feet breakwater extension was awarded Beazley Brothers, Limited, on 18th October, 1912, at price of their tender, $143,917. The work was constructed according to plan and specification forwarded by the then District Engineer, J. B. Hegan. In November, 1914, when the work was nearing completion, 8 tiers of face timbers of the outer block became displaced from some cause which District Engineer Hyndman stated was difficult to explain, but was probably due to settlement. Mr. Hyndman certified that the work had been done faithfully and according to plan and specification, and that the damage was due to unusual and unforeseen circumstances. In July, 1915, the breakwater was again damaged by a heavy storm after the original breach had been repaired and reinforced according to specification. Consulting Engineer Hegan was then instructed to make an examination of the work. He reported that he did not consider that the injury sustained by the work resulted from either the use of poor materials or indifferent workmanship, but simply from unavoidable causes, as, so far as he could ascertain, the requirements and conditions called for by the contract, specification and plan, were fully and faithfully carried out.

Public Works—chargeable to income—public buildings, Nova Scotia—Halifax custom house, $2,470.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the Minister of Public Works please state what progress is being made with the proposed extension to the custom house at North Sydney? Last year, I think, there was a vote to build an examining house in connection with the custom house there. I did not notice whether the work went on or not. I know that they have a place rented in connection

with the building, but if the money is available a new building would be better.

Mr. ROGERS: Nothing is being done at present in this matter, and we think that for the present we can get on as we are.

Public buildings—rents, repairs, furniture, heating, etc., $130,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Why this supplementary vote? Surely the minister knows what rents he has to pay. Why not include all in the main Estimates?

Mr. ROGERS: Since the outbreak of the war the staff has been very greatly increased, and the aggregate charge for rents is higher. But I may say, for the information of my hon. friend, in the first place, that we do not rent anything that is not absolutely necessary, and, in the second place, that when we rent we have a basis upon which the rental is fixed—we allow only enough to pay six per cent net return to the owner.

Mr. NESBITT: That would depend on who made up the estimate of cost.

Mr. ROGERS: The Deputy Minister of Public Works himself makes that up—gives special attention to it. This heavy expense for rents cannot be avoided at the present time.

Public Works—chargeable to collection of revenue—telegraph and telephone lines, Saskatchewan and Alberta—further amount required, $17,500.

Mr. OLIVER: What is this for?

Mr. ROGERS: This is to supplement an appropriation granted by Parliament last session to complete payments in connection with the working expenses of the telegraph lines in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is for the last fiscal year. Is the minister allowed so long a time to make up the accounts for the year? As I recollect it, the Auditor General allowed a certain time, but it is nearly two months since the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. ROGERS: There is no fixed time, but the direction is given by the Auditor General. We are allowed until the close of the session, I understand.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And the time is not so long as I had figured—it is only a little over one month.

Miscellaneous—Royal Mint—further amount required, $43,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the purpose of this?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Mint has been doing a great deal of work during the past year for the British Government in treating gold that has been received from Africa and other parts of the world—I am not permitted to go into details for reasons that will be obvious. This $43,000 is the estimated additional expense. The charges made will, in a large measure, if not fully, reimburse the amount expended.

National Battlefields Commission—to supplement amount now available for purchase of lands, the acquisition of which has been authorized by Parliament, a sum not exceeding $10,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is the matter to which reference has been made.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This is the matter to which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition drew attention the other day. It was in the original plan of the commission. The purpose of the appropriation is to acquire certain properties there—Wolfsfield and certain other historic lands.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has anything ever been done in connection with the lands left at the old ruins at Louisburg? An English gentleman who died there some years ago, Captain Kennedy, formerly of the British army, left some lands to be used for the purpose of commemorating the wars of Louisburg days. In his will he made certain provision that the lands were to be utilized by the Dominion Government, subject to certain conditions. I do not remember just what the conditions were, but they had regard to some action on the part of the Government of Canada to put these lands in shape and to do some work around the forts that would put them in better condition. I have not the full details of the provisions of the will, but I thought that possibly the minister might bear it in mind in connection with the operations of the National Battlefields Commission.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The matter has not been specially drawn to my attention, but the desirability of some commission being charged with the duty of preserving historic spots is a subject which has been frequently discussed in the House. I shall bear in mind what my hon. friend has said with regard to the Louisburg situation.

Mr. McKENZIE: I need not remind the minister that the Society of Colonial Wars, which is an American society, has built a monument on those grounds. It is some part of what is being done to commemorate the old days at Louisburg.

Canadian Associated Press, $8,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who is the European representative of the Canadian Association?

Mr. ROGERS: There has been no change; it is the same.

Mr. GRAHAM: Are you aware that this does not include a representative in the old land?

Mr. ROGERS: John Ross Robertson's brother used to be the representative years ago, but I do not know who has taken his place since his death.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have taken this matter up with Mr. John Ross Robertson, as President, I think, of the Canadian Associated Press. My hon. friend will recall that, under legislation which expired some two years ago, an annual grant was made to the Association from $12,000 downward; I think the last payment was in the neighbourhood of $6,000 or $7,000. Last year, instead of re-introducing the legislation—because I desired to discuss the matter with representatives of the press—I introduced an Estimate providing to continue the amount which had been paid in the preceding year. This year the matter was again drawn to my attention, and I have inserted an Estimate of $8,000, which is now before the Committee. I think that the object is one which appeals to us, especially at this time, because it is closely connected with the question of the news service from the old country. If ever there was a time when the newspapers ought to be helped by a justifiable subsidy, it is now.

Mr. GRAHAM: We agree pretty well on the necessity of this vote. There was a time when newspapers in Canada were not satisfied with the service. A great deal of our news for some length of time used to come via New York, and we discovered that that was not the most reliable kind of information to get, particularly for Canadian consumption. I am a little out of touch with it; the member for South York would know the conditions as they exist now better than I would. I know that they were unsatisfactory for a time, but from a casual observation I should think that the service is more satisfactory now than it was some years ago.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: It is very much improved.

To provide for the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916: appointments for the purpose may be made without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, $150,000.

Sir. WILFRID LAURIER: This is an important matter.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This item is to provide for the expenditure in connection with the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act which has been passed at this session of Parliament. When the matter was under discussion in the House, I explained in a general way the plan of administration which we had in view. The Act will be administered through the Finance Department. We shall have to add to the existing staff and we shall have to supplement that staff by officials in the several provinces. All business firms and corporations in Canada which have a capital of $50,000 and upwards will be liable to assessment, provided their earnings exceed 10 per cent in the case of private firms and individuals and 7 per cent in the case of corporations. The first thing to be done is to make a list from the publications of commercial agencies showing the firms which are likely to be liable to assessment. This has been done already by my department. The next step will be to notify all these firms thought to be liable to assessment requesting them to make the return called for by the Act. In order to get the administration to that stage it will be necessary that the staff of the Finance Department be considerably enlarged and that additional officials be taken on in the several provinces. After the returns come in, they will have to be scrutinised and further investigation made in many cases in order that the final assessment by the department may be made. After the final assessment is made, notices will be sent out to the various firms and companies liable to assessment informing them of the amount of their assessment. Then there will be a right of appeal in the case of any feeling themselves aggrieved to the court of revision or board of referees referred to in the Act. It is not possible at the present time to make an accurate estimate as to how much the expenditure will be in connection with the administration of the Act, but it would seem to us that $150,000 would likely more than cover it. I cannot vouch for that statement, because I do not know the facts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is easily to be understood that the matter is rather tentative, and that at the present time my hon. friend cannot be expected to have an absolutely exact plan to which he cares to give his authority. The minister must have a large clerical staff to perform the work arising from this new system of taxation. I think we should take some exception to the provision inserted, " appointments for the purpose may be made without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act." I do not think my hon. friend should take so much power as that. I am prepared to believe that some of these appointments must be technical, and that for them a technical business knowledge will be indispensable. As to these there may be special recommendations by my hon. friend under the Civil Service Act. But my hon. friend must have a large clerical staff attached to his office, and there is no reason why the provisions of the Act should not be applied. I am afraid that, under the administration of my hon. friends on the other side, the Civil Service Act is becoming largely obsolete, and that it is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Still it is a very good law and one which I think ought to be welcomed by every Government. It saves every minister a lot of trouble, and it is a better way of insuring effective service than any other. Why my hon. friend should say that all appointments, even that of the merest clerk, should be made without conforming to the Civil Service Act, to me is incomprehensible. It is a very dangerous principle.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There are some considerations in connection with this matter which have been overlooked by my right hon. friend. In the first place, the administration of this Act is for a limited period; the Act is operative only until December 31, 1917. Therefore, we shall not be making permanent appointments, but only appointments of officials for the purpose of carrying out the Act during the limited period in which it will be in operation. I gave this matter a good deal of consideration, particularly this clause to which my hon. friend has referred. The difficulty which I encountered is this. We have to appoint officials in the several provinces to assist in the administration of this Act. The type of official that we should like would be men with experience in finance, such as accountants who are familiar with joint stock companies, or have had banking experience. Under the Civil Service Act a man could not be appointed if he was over 35 years of age. It is going to be exceedingly difficult to get the right class of men to carry out this Act, especially at this
5 p.m. time, when the country is sending so many men to the front. I am faced with a very real difficulty at the present time. Therefore I do not think my right hon. friend would suggest, in view of what I have said, that we should be confined by the regulations of the Civil Service Act in appointing the officials we shall require in the several provinces to assist us in carrying out the terms of this Act. Now I come to our own office. We shall require some accountants in connection with our office, and from the difficulties I have already experienced I am not at all sure that we should be able to obtain them under the Civil Service Act. In fact, I am sure we should not be able to obtain them. So far as clerks and typewriters are concerned, the employment will be temporary. Only recently I said to my deputy that we should retain the staff which was temporarily employed in connection with the war loan, to assist us in connection with the administration of this Act. There may be further war loans later on. The situation in the Finance Department at present is that we have a considerable temporary staff, which has been engaged in connection with the war loan, the last instalment of which was only recently paid. We shall endeavour to use that staff to the extent possible in connection with the administration of this Act; but we must have accountants and those having business experience if we are to carry this out at all successfully. My right hon. friend and I do not disagree so far as principle is concerned. But in connection with this measure, it is not my view that it would be practicable to obtain the assistance that we shall require under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and consequently this proviso has been inserted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I realize that a good many of the appointments must be technical—people who have special technical knowledge of business; but I am quite positive that under the Act as it exists today, section 21, if I remember aright, my hon. friend has the right himself to appoint, without referring to the Civil Service Commission, men technically qualified. But he has the Act to guide him, and he should use it. The temporary appointments are also covered by the Act, and there is no reason why the ordinary clerks, whether

temporary or permanent, should not be appointed under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MARCIL: Will these assessments on the companies be made payable at a certain period in one lump sum?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They will be payable on November 1st in respect of the first financial period of the company or firm which is being assessed. Only one payment in one year is the principle.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister has not considered the idea of splitting these payments so as not to make them fall too heavily on those paying them?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is aware that the Act does not apply except in the case of individuals, firms, or companies having at least $50,000 capital, and I think no hardship is likely to arise under the mode of payment provided for in the Act.

Mr. NESBITT: If there is only one payment in one year it will last over until 1918?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: In case the Department suspect that a statement submitted by any company is not accurate, what do they do?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is why we have the official or officials in each province. We shall ask them to make an investigation and see the individual or firm or company in question and check up the statement to see if it is accurate.

Mr. NESBITT: After you get the statement from the corporation, you send out a statement of what you think the tax should be. Then if there is a dispute the Board of Reference comes in?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We would not necessarily accept the statement. If we had reason to believe that the statement was not accurate, it would be the duty of our officials to interview the party in question and check up the statement so made.

Mr. NESBITT: Before referring it to the Board of Referees?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Then, in the light of the statement and the checking up, an estimate would be made and notice sent to that firm: "You are assessed for so much in respect of the Business Profits War Taxation Act, 1916."

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

Mr. GRAHAM: The department does all of this through its own machinery. In municipal assessments an appeal may be taken by one individual against the assessment of some other individual. William Smith thinks it is not equitable, and he appeals against the assessment of John Brown, say. Will that sort of thing come into play or will the department take all the responsibility?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The department will take all the responsibility. I do not think it desirable that that element should be introduced. In municipalities one man can appeal against the assessment of another; but, so far as Dominion taxation is concerned, that principle has not been applied. In matters affecting customs taxation, only parties in interest are allowed to raise any question; otherwise you might have a situation which would lead to a great deal of petty controversy.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think it would be a good situation. There is nothing to hinder a man from giving information to to the department.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government and the party assessed are the only parties in interest.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the amount paid by each party be published or become known?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If Parliament desired returns as to the results of this measure, the returns would be brought down.

To defray the expenses of printing for distribution 4,000 copies of the report of the Federal Plan Commission of Ottawa and Hull, $2,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would like to know, now that we have the plan of the commission, what are the plans of the Government in regard to carrying out what is suggested by the commission.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend was not in the House the other day when the question was raised by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). I stated that I intended, as soon as the session was over, to take up the report of the commission, go over the ground, and give the matter my personal attention. I know that my right hon. friend is very much interested in this question. I believe that a committee has been appointed by the City Council for the purpose of taking it up with the Government at a convenient time. I am greatly pleased that the plans

appear to have met with the approval of the citizens of Ottawa and of the members of this House, so far as I can learn. It is generally considered that the commission has done its work well. My right hon. friend naturally asks what is the next step. So far as I am concerned, the next step will be to make myself thoroughly conversant with the recommendations of the commission, and the Government will be prepared to take up the matter with the city of Ottawa and to consider what step ought to be taken next. My right hon. friend is aware that the object of preparing this plan was that there should be a model to which the Government and the city of Ottawa, the city of Hull, and the transportation companies could work over a long course of years. It was thought that it would be of use to all the different bodies I have mentioned, and that is its chief value. But there are certain explicit recommendations which we shall have to take up with the view of seeing whether and when they should be carried out, and that is a matter to which we shall give consideration as soon as we can find time after the session is over. I have not had time during the present session, since the report was presented, more than cursorily to glance over it, much less to go over it in detail.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have looked over the report—I take some interest in this matter—and I must say that on the whole the commission has done very good work. There are some suggestions to which I will take exception—we cannot all agree—but I am satisfied to know that the minister will take up the report of the commission and study it as soon as possible. I know that he has been very busy during the session, and he cannot be expected to do more than take it up, after the session is over, with the committee of the city council. The work is very extensive; it is a work for years; and if something can be done now, it would be very advisable to do it.

To defray the expenses of the Economic and Development Commission, $25,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Will some one explain what this is?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is a commission which has been at work during the past five or six months studying economic conditions in this country, more particularly in regard to what preparation may be necessary for us in respect of the period immediately following the conclusion of the war.

Mr. NESBITT: The Prime Minister says "us"; to whom does he refer?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am speaking of the country, of course; it is very often referred to in that way. I hope my hon. friend does not take exception to it?

Mr. NESBITT: I wondered whether it meant the Government or the people.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Their interests are identical.

Mr. NESBITT: Not always.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: According to the appreciation of my hon. friend, perhaps not; according to our appreciation, they are always.

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

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The commission is under the presidency of Senator Lougheed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: A good man.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The other members are Mr. Farrell, from British Columbia; Dr. Rutherford, from Alberta; Mr. Hopkins, from Saskatchewan; Mr. William Smith, from Ontario, a member of this House; Mr. W. B. Ross, a gentleman engaged in the fruit industry in Nova Scotia, and Mr. Rolland, of Montreal. They have a considerable number of people associated with them who are carrying on a great deal of research work and investigation. They are in touch with the staffs of certain universities who are doing a certain amount of research work. Mr. William Pearce, formerly associated with the Canadian Pacific railway, has made a careful study of railway development in connection with land settlement, and has prepared plans which, I understand, are of a very important character, and which have been spoken of very highly by those who have had an opportunity of examining them. I have been asked to do so on more than one occasion, but I have not found time to avail myself of the opportunity during the present session. I understand from Senator Lougheed, who asked me to examine the work which Mr. Pearce has done, that it is of an important character. It has been submitted to the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, who thinks it is so important that he hopes it will be extended to the other provinces.

Up to the present it has been confined, I think, to the three Prairie Provinces. It is believed that the work will be of great assistance to the Board of Railway Commissioners in connection with the discharge of their duties. There have been reports made to me, sometimes written and sometimes oral, as to the work which the commission has carried on. Unfortunately, it did not occur to me that this item would come up at this moment, otherwise I would have prepared myself with some notes which are in my possession as to the really important work which the commission has carried on. I appreciate, of course, the fact that the duties entrusted to it are of so complex a character that it would be impossible in five or six months to make a careful or comprehensive survey of all that must be taken into account by the commission in the discharge of its duties. I do, however, believe that a good deal of really important and interesting work has been done. They have associated with them in their work officers of various departments of the Government. Some of the officers have been assigned to special duties in connection with the work of the commission, and have been devoting their whole time, under the direction of the commission, to the study of various subjects which the commission is called upon to investigate and report upon. The work of the commission has not been very widely advertised, but it is not on that account of less importance. I might also say that Mr. Sandford Evans, who has been studying very carefully the question of transportation and marketing in connection with his duties as a member of the commission to report upon the Georgian Bay canal, has been asked to give the benefit of his work and his study to this commission, and I understand that he is doing so.

Mr. NESBITT: Are they taking up the question of immigration as well?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: They have taken that up in connection with the Department of Immigration, and otherwise as well, and some recommendations of a tentative character have been made to me orally by the chairman of the commission. There has not been an opportunity to give them very careful consideration, but they will receive it as soon as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The names of the commissioners, speaking for myself, are not all known to the House; but I have the pleasure of knowing Senator Lougheed and Mr. Smith, a member of the House, and they are certainly very good men in their way. I am quite sure that in their hands the interests of the country will be looked after, and that the interests of the Government will not be forgotten either. If there is a non's share I have no doubt the Government will get it. But what my right hon. friend has said as to the labours of this commission is rather vague. I do not know exactly yet what is to be done, but I suppose we shall have to judge of their work by the report which they will present to the House, perhaps next session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I believe they will have a very full report before next session. I may observe that one of the most important members of the commission, and one whose work, I have no doubt, will be found very useful, is not a member of the Conservative party. He was formerly a member of this House and sat on the other side, I refer to Dr. Rutherford.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: A very good man. If they were all like him they would do good work.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know very much about the politics of the others. I am not sure whether Mr. Hopkins is a Tory or a Liberal.

Mr. GRAHAM: What about Mr. Smith?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: There is no doubt about Mr. Smith, and there is no doubt about the chairman, Senator Lougheed. I do not suppose that, if they are otherwise qualified, they are any the worse, from our standpoint at least, because they happen to be affiliated with the party of which I am a member.

Mr. GRAHAM: They may be all right notwithstanding.

Pensions on account of the Fenian raid, 1866-1870, $2,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The increase in this item is due to an increase in the pension granted to Mrs. Caroline McEachren. Formerly she received 50 cents per day. This has been increased to $1.25 on the recommendation of the Pensions Board.

Pensions payable to militiamen on account of the rebellion of 1885, and active service generally, $20,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am informed that the decrease in this vote is due to

the following reasons: The ordinary vote is $20,000. Last year, $100,000 was voted for pensions with the intention that it might be utilized for pensions to members of the overseas force. Later on it was found insufficient and a larger sum was provided. Consequently, $80,000 of the $100,000 was not used. This year the Estimate is $20,000, the usual sum granted in past years.

Mr. MARCIL: As this vote is for pensions, and as recruiting is an allied subject, I may be permitted to call the attention of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government to a paragraph in the Ottawa Evening Journal regarding the recruiting question that I brought up in the House yesterday. Perhaps the editor of the Ottawa Evening Journal did not take time to read the explanation given by me in the House before referring to the figures given by Senator Mason as to the parentages of enlistments. I will read the paragraph:

The figures which Senator Mason gave in the Upper Chamber last week of percentage of enlistment of the various classes in Canada give the following for the 320,000 men who have volunteered in this country for the war:

Enlistments.	Per cent.	Number.
English-speaking Canadian-born..	28½	91,200
French-speaking Canadian-born..	4½	14,400
British-born elsewhere than in Canada..	61	195,200
Foreign-born..	6	19,200
	100	320,000

I understand that these figures are not official, because they have been applied for at various times without result in the House. It would be unfair to judge as to the number of French Canadians who had been recruited by taking the figures merely for the province of Quebec, because French Canadians have enlisted in all the provinces of the Dominion, notably at Edmonton, in New Brunswick, and in Ontario. French Canadians are to be found in almost all the battalions from those parts of Canada. Therefore the right hon. gentleman told me yesterday that the figures were not official. I took that for granted. But there is another paragraph and this is what I take exception to. The Journal in commenting upon the figures said:

Considering the above figures, would it not be well for members of Parliament like Mr. Roch Lanctot and Mr. Marcil to prefer to preach volunteering in Quebec, rather than endeavour to cast cold water upon volunteering elsewhere? Clearly no industrial or agricultural interest in Quebec can have been hurt yet by a rush to volunteer, or seems likely to be.

As far as I am concerned, I have encouraged enlistment from the start. I have never declined a single appeal that has been made to me to attend a recruiting or any other meeting. Therefore I do not deserve to be made the subject of a criticism of that kind. I have never discouraged enlistment.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I inquired of the deputy minister whether the figures were official and he informed me that they were not.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if action will be taken this session on the report of the Pensions Committee. A special committee has been appointed by the House to deal with this matter of pensions, and I presume its report will be before us in a day or two. Does the Government intend to take action on its report?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The report has not been received. I discussed what might be done in regard to it, as I understand it has been drafted, with the chairman of the committee. It is probable it will contain a recommendation that some action shall be taken this session—perhaps not all the action which may be required, but action in connection with the formation of a Pensions Board. We propose to take whatever action may be possible at this session without unduly protracting it.

Mr. GRAHAM: It will need legislation?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it will need legislation, but probably of a character that will not delay the House very much.

Pensions—European war, $3,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: My question would come up more properly under this item.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: This is the amount that has been estimated by the department. If the report of the committee should call for a considerable increase in the pensions, I am not absolutely sure that this amount would be sufficient, but it will probably be sufficient until another session of Parliament is called.

Mr. GRAHAM: When is the report of the committee likely to be presented?

Mr. HAZEN: I hope to be able to lay it on the Table to-morrow.

Civil Government—Office of Auditor General —to provide for five clerkships in third division, subdivision B, $2,500.

Mr. NESBITT: We got a circular letter some time ago saying that these men were starving on $500 a year. Would it not be better to put on less men and pay them more money?

Mr. ROGERS: They like to divide up the work.

Mr. NESBITT: They don't do anything except stand around and look at each other.

Mr. ROGERS: You will have to take that up with the Auditor General.

High Commissioner's office, London—to provide for the transfer of Edwin McLeod, Immigration agent, Carlisle, Eng., to the second division, subdivision A, in the High Commissioner's office, London, from the September 17, 1915, at $1,800 per annum, $970.

Mr. GRAHAM: Any suggestion as to the new High Commissioner?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Not at present. This is merely for the transfer of a clerk, to be untilized in one department instead of another.

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $3,590,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: How many men are included in this army, and what is the significance of the words "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act"?

Mr. REID: There are 29,033 officers at the ports throughout the Dominion.

Mr. GRAHAM: What increase has there been in the number of employees?

Mr. REID: There has been no increase; I have been decreasing them. There is a large decrease this year as compared with last. When men have gone to the front or vacancies have occurred for other reasons we have not filled the positions unless it was absolutely necessary; 300 or 400 vacancies that have occurred since the war began have not been filled. The revenue has decreased since August, 1914, but now, at some of the ports like Montreal, business is increasing; in fact, business at that port is greater than it ever has been.

Mr. MARCIL: Are the appointments in Montreal made under the Civil Service Act?

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. REID: A man has to pass a qualifying examination before he can be appointed. Under the Civil Service Act preventive officers are exempt from passing an examination.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the significance of the words, "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act?"

Mr. REID: The men at the different ports work overtime, and under the law we should not be allowed to pay them anything extra, unless we inserted these words. Under the Civil Service Act we can pay them their salaries only, nothing for overtime.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the proper time of these employees?

Mr. REID: At Toronto, for instance, from nine in the morning until four o'clock in the afternoon. Then they could put in two or three hours' extra work a day as landing waiters, at thirty cents an hour. Nearly every port is working overtime. In the Auditor General's Report you will see several items like this: salaries, $900; overtime, $250.

Mr. MARCIL: Are the appointments at Montreal made on the recommendation of the Collector of Customs at Montreal?

Mr. REID: Every one who is appointed has to be approved by the collector and pass an examination qualifying for the position.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is one thing the minister might as well make a clean breast of now, as minister, and that is, the free importations to the port of Morrisburg which have been under discussion for some time. In the evidence it appeared that a certain letter had been written by the deputy Commissioner of Customs. But the Minister of Militia, speaking in the House the other day, said that the authority was given by the Minister of Customs himself. There are a great many conflicting statements as to what came across at Morrisburg free of duty. As a matter of fact, months before anything came up, I received several communications from citizens of Morrisburg informing me that bales upon bales of goods were coming through at Morrisburg and were being put into a building there that had been leased by a company, the name of which I forget—a new company organized, undoubtedly, for the purpose. I did not think it was my business to investigate what was being done, as I thought possibly it was for the purpose of war; but

recent events have led one to almost wonder why this was allowed to be done at all. And the information that came to me would seem to indicate now, in the light of recent events, that a very large quantity of goods had been brought in at Morrisburg free which should not have been brought in free. Some people go as far as to say that these goods were brought in and afterwards sent on as Canadian-made goods, the labels being changed at Morrisburg. For that and for other reasons our manufacturers of some of the goods identical with those imported free at Morrisburg have complained very loudly. There are conditions under which it possibly might be proper to allow such a thing, but up to date no evidence has been given to show that it was necessary nor that it was proper. The minister will see that it places the collector of Customs at Morrisburg in a very embarrassing position,—at least I know it would have put me in a very embarrassing position if I had been collector there. I know Drew, the collector there, very well, and I have not the least hesitation in saying that he would not allow anything to be done that he did not think he had the permission of the department to allow, anything that he did not think was exactly that which was desired by the department. But, here is how the matter stands. He was instructed by a letter which came from the department to do certain things, yet he was not allowed to retain that letter as his authority, and to-day he has no authority in writing for what was done. If he is accused of doing more than the department intended, even though he thought he was not exceeding his instructions, he is not able to show in his defence that he received any instructions. I think the minister owes it to the House to explain how that came to be done, and to tell us what was brought across free of duty. For the department will know these things. I do not want to interfere with any investigation that is going on—I have no reference to that. But the minister knows all about it; it was all done under his authority, according to what the Minister of Militia has told us. Will not he take us into his confidence and clean the thing up?—tell us what came over; what it was for; why the labels were changed; who brought in the goods; to whom they were sent, and all that kind of thing. It would be interesting to the country, and, perhaps, would put at rest the suspicions that have been aroused as to many of the incidents connected with that free importation.

Mr. REID: The hon. member, I take it, has read the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are not responsible to us.

Mr. REID: The Public Accounts Committee is not responsible to the House?

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister is responsible to us.

Mr. REID: Yes, I am responsible. There is nothing secret about this matter. The explanation was given in the Public Accounts Committee. Let me say at the outset that, as I stated in the Public Accounts Committee, we had to get many things for the use of the first contingent. The Minister of Militia secured many articles from the other side of the line. He had asked me to arrange to allow these goods to come in at the different ports throughout the Dominion. There was a question of them being allowed to leave the other side, and be exported through Canada to the front. I gave instructions—

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM: Would that apply to clothing?

Mr. REID: It applied to anything that was required for the troops going to the front to fight for the British Empire, no matter whether it was clothing, munitions, guns or anything else. That was the instruction that I gave—that everything that was required to be transported through Canada for our troops that were to fight for the British Empire was to come in. And of course they would come through with the knowledge of the Militia Department, and by their instructions. I gave instructions to the Commissioner of Customs to allow this wherever the Militia Department wanted it done—at any port in Canada. The Commissioner of Customs did send one of his officials to Morrisburg to give instructions to the Collector of Customs. He wrote a letter and handed it to his official who went to Morrisburg, to read to Mr. Drew. But we were not at that time keeping records of letters and so on in order that they might come out at some future time. No one knew whether there might be some question raised as to these articles being allowed to pass through Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: Was it not explained to the collector that there was only machine guns?

Mr. REID: If the hon. gentleman will have patience until after I get through I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then let the minister not raise the question about the right of Canada to allow these imports.

Mr. REID: It was raised in the press everywhere at that time, whether munitions and other articles, including machine guns, might be allowed to be brought from the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM: Let us get that cleared up. That point was as to the right of the United States to let the goods go out, but there was no question as to the right of Canada to let them come in. Those goods were for us and for the Allies.

Mr. REID: There might be a question of allowing them to go out. We did not keep record of them—did not intend to keep a record of these goods passing through in bond——

Mr. TURRIFF: Why?

Mr. REID: Why? I do not think it is fair for the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to try to drag out of me a statement of the articles which did come over which were brought here for the soldiers going to the front. The Government had reasons at that time to try to get everything that we could, in the way of machine guns, ammunition,—anything that we could not get in this country—to help the militia that we were sending overseas at that time.

Mr. TURRIFF: And the minister just opened the custom house door wide to let in anything and everything, and allowed contractors like J. W. Allison to make all kinds of money that should have gone into the treasury of Canada.

Mr. REID: It is all right for the member for Assiniboia to make that statement; but, whoever gave the hon. gentleman that information, I want to say that that information is absolutely false and untrue, every word of it. And let me say this also —that when the hon. member is outside, I will tell him to his face, if he should make that statement, that it is absolutely false and untrue. Such stuff was not brought into Canada in that way.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does the hon. minister know what was brought in?

Mr. REID: The hon. member knows well what was brought in.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does the hon. minister know?

Mr. REID: I know what was brought in; nothing was brought in except what was shipped to the Minister of Militia's Department at Ottawa, or to Valcartier camp, all of which went out of this country in the usual way. Not one single dollar's worth of goods was brought into this country except what was brought in in the legal way and shipped to the Militia Department.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend the minister has no more idea of what was brought in than any one else has. The door was wide open. The customs officer at Morrisburg said before the Public Accounts Committee that he knew absolutely nothing about what came in; that he did not know how many dozens or how many hundreds of cases came in; that they came in there and were shipped away by the scow load, thirty or forty at a time. He did not know what it was, whether machine guns, ammunition, clothing or anything else. If the customs officer at the port of entry did not know what was coming in, how does my hon. friend the minister know? The customs officer said that no records were kept of what came in. In the face of those facts, sworn to by the customs officer, how can the minister say that he knows everything that came in?

Mr. REID: The customs officer said he did not know what the contents of the cases were, because he did not open and examine them. That is absolutely correct, but the goods were shipped here to Ottawa and to Valcartier and the Militia Department have a record of everything that came in at Morrisburg, and the Valcartier Camp has the same. The Government, therefore, is in full possession of the facts in connection with everything brought in at Morrisburg. The collector of custom at Morrisburg is an old man, seventy or seventy-two years of age—a fine old man; I am not saying one word against him. Instructions were given to him to allow machine guns or any similar article to go through so long as they were shipped to the Minister of Militia or his department or to Valcartier camp. The goods that did come over came over between the time of the breaking out of war and October the 14th or 24th, just when we were getting the first contingent ready, equipping the men with machine guns and sending

them over in anticipation of their going right to the front. Was it not right and fair that we should give them the very best possible equipment? Yet because I, as Minister of Customs, assisted in getting these goods in and in having them shipped through Canada, the member for Assiniboia tries to make a mountain out of a molehill. I want to tell him and the people of Canada that any one who says that any goods were brought in at Morrisburg other than in a legal way and without the full knowledge and consent of the Department of Customs or without their knowing the contents, makes a statement that is not in accordance with the facts. I hope that the hon. member for Assiniboia will not try to mislead the people by making another statement of that kind.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister says that the instructions given to the customs officer at Morrisburg were that he should allow the goods to come in free without taking any record or notice of them provided they were addressed to the Minister of Militia or to the camp at Valcartier. The evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee did not state that. The evidence was that the instructions given Mr. Drew by letter written by the Commissioner of Customs and handed to him by an official and taken back again were that all goods addressed to a certain bunch around Morrisburg should be allowed to come in free. Nothing at all was said about shipping them to the Minister of Militia or to the camp at Valcartier. It was said that the object of these instructions was to let the Sifton machine gun battery come in. It was shown afterwards that that battery came in not by Morrisburg but at Cornwall. So I say that the door was opened wide for anything to come in. How does the Minister of Customs know what came in? How would he know?

Mr. REID: I understand the evidence was that part of the machine guns did come in at Morrisburg—all except the cars. It is true that these goods were not consigned to the Minister of Militia. They were shipped to other parties on the American side and brought to Morrisburg, not in the name of the Minister of Militia. From there they were shipped to the Minister of Militia at Ottawa or to his department or to Valcartier. The collector of customs at Morrisburg had these instructions. If he had been alert to his duty, watching the goods that came over—I think he said that he saw these goods coming across and never looked at them; if he had been attending to his duty he would have known the number of boxes and would have kept a record of them as they passed through; but he did not do it. I am not finding fault with him; I simply state that, in my opinion and in the opinion of the officials, nothing came across there in any way, shape or form except goods that came to the Militia Department. The Militia Department received every one of these articles that came across. That was not the only point of which this could be said; other places were the same. Surely the hon. member for Assiniboia will give us credit for trying to assist in every way in getting machine guns, ammunition and anything else that might be necessary to equip in the best possible way the men who were going to the front.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend says that if the customs officer there had done his duty he would have kept a record. Did my hon. friend instruct him to keep a record? His instructions, as he swore to them, were that he was to allow all these goods, shipped to certain people, to come in without taking any notice of them and without making any entries. The minister now says that he should have kept a record. Will my hon. friend bring down a copy of the instructions that were given to the customs officer? If he does not do so, the man who received the letter of instructions, read it and was asked to hand it back again, should be able to remember what those instructions were. I hope that my hon. friend will bring down a copy of the instructions that were sent to the customs officer at Morrisburg. The fact remains that the door was opened wide; anything and everything could have been brought in, and I believe no one knows just what was brought in.

Mr. GRAHAM: The customs officer was asked that very question, whether or not he suspected that any goods other than militia goods were passing through the customs at Morrisburg free, and he said he had no suspicion whatever.

Mr. TURRIFF: He said he knew nothing about them; he paid no attention.

Mr. GRAHAM: He said he had no suspicion. I put that question to him myself.

Mr. TURRIFF: He did not examine them; did not know how many.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income—Grand Trunk Pacific Company—loan not exceeding $8,000,000, repayable on demand with interest payable half-yearly at the rate of six per centum (6 per cent) per annum; to be used for expenditure made or to meet indebtedness incurred in paying interest upon securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to meet deficit in operation and for the purchase of rolling stock; said loan to be secured by mortgage upon the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company containing such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve. The disposition of the loan to be subject to the direction of the Governor in Council, $8,000,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In connection with the consideration of this item, and the succeeding item, providing for a loan of $15,000,000 to the Canadian Northern Railway Company, I desire briefly to give the House certain information which was asked for by hon. members opposite when this matter was last under discussion. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) asked me whether the certificate of the chief engineer of the Government had been given as to the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert. I find upon looking up the National Transcontinental Railway Act, and the agreement for the construction of this division of the National Transcontinental Railway, that no certificate is provided for as conclusive evidence that the road has been completed—whether or not the road has been completed is a question of fact:

> The standard of the road is not to be inferior to the main line of the Grand Trunk railway of Canada between Montreal and Toronto, so far as may be practicable in the case of a newly constructed line of railway, and the road is to be constructed according to plans and specifications to be approved by the Government.

In this connection I may refer to the report of Sir Collingwood Schreiber, the chief engineer of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway, of April 1, 1915, that is to say, a little over a year ago, in which he made this statement:

> The western division—Winnipeg to Prince Rupert—has been in successful operation throughout since September 6, 1914. A very comfortable express train service has traversed the road twice a week each way, provided with the most modern design of sleeping and dining cars, in addition to which a passenger and freight service has been given daily on the road between Winnipeg and Prince George sufficient to handle the traffic offering.

Then he goes on to set out the balance of the work remaining to be done. In a word, I may say that the standard of the Grand Trunk Pacific while undoubtedly high is not sufficiently high to comply with the requirements, that is to say, the standard of the Grand Trunk railway between Montreal and Toronto. For example, there are many trestle bridges which should be replaced by steel bridges. There are a number of structures which should undoubtedly be erected, but which are not indispensably necessary for the operation of the line. Therefore, answering generally the question of my hon. friend, I might say that, while the line is open for traffic, it is not up to the standard, nor is it likely to be for many years to come. According to the report of Sir Collingwood Schreiber, to which I have alluded, and to the facts as they exist to-day, I should say that some $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 at least would be required to bring the road measurably up to the standard to which I have referred. But on account of the financial conditions, to which I alluded in my speech, with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern Railway, it has not been possible, and I think it will not be possible for some time to come, to bring the road up to the standard required by the Act.

In connection with the Canadian Northern Railway Company's loan, I have since yesterday obtained from the Canadian Northern Railway Company a statement showing the estimated gross earnings, operating expenses, and net earnings for the years ending the 30th June, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920. As to the year 1915 and the year 1916, they bear out the statement which I made to the House yesterday, namely, that the net earnings of the Canadian Northern Railway Company for the fiscal year 1915, which ended on June 30 last, amounted to $6,623,000, whereas the estimated net earnings for the year 1916 are placed at $9,770,000. For the year 1917, Mr. Hanna estimates that the net earnings will reach $11,500,000; for 1918, $13,700,000; for 1919, $15,120,000, and for 1920, $17,700,000. Of course, these are estimates; I do not give them as my estimates, but as the estimates of the general manager of the road, made, I have no doubt, in good faith, according to the best information which he has available. I shall therefore lay them upon the table, because it would not appear to me to be necessary to delay considera-

tion of the items by printing these estimates.

Then, my hon. friend from St. John referred to the Duluth, Winnipeg and Pacific railway, questioning, as I understood him, whether it was a benefit or a detriment to the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Mr. GRAHAM: The bonds of that railway were guaranteed by the Canadian Northern.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They were guaranteed by the Canadian Northern, but I desire to say to the committee that that was one of the most profitable, if not the most profitable line of the Canadian Northern Railway system. Its earnings for the year ending June 30, 1915, were $311,000, and for the nine months ending March, 1916, they amounted to $390,000. A note attached to the statement by Mr. Hanna is to this effect:

> This company has a very heavy local traffic tributary to its own line quite apart from its great value to the Canadian Northern System as a connecting link for through business from and to the United States of America and Western Canada.
>
> This line has also proved of great advantage to the Canadian Northern in that when Port Arthur elevators were congested with grain an outlet was found at Duluth. In no case has the Canadian Northern railway ever shipped grain to Duluth when such shipments could be handled at Port Arthur.
>
> The increase in gross and net earnings for this year, compared with the previous year, is to a large extent made up from the movement of grain to Duluth during the congested periods at Port Arthur and this movement to Duluth was requested by the Board of Commissioners.

I lay this also on the Table.

My hon. friend from South Renfrew asked me with regard to the amounts due to contractors. I made inquiry of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and I have received a letter from the assistant to the vice-president as follows:

> With respect to the amount due constractors for work done, materials delivered and drawback on construction, the total of this is provided for either by cash on hand in trust accounts or securities available. We expect to largely liquidate these accounts within the next sixty or ninety days.

I may explain further to the committee that there remains in the trust account, that is to say the account in which were deposited the proceeds of the $35,000,000 of securities which were guaranteed by the Dominion upon the Canadian Northern Ontario division between Montreal and Port Arthur, a credit balance of $1,300,000, and there is also a credit balance to the amount of $4,300,000 in the account, in which was deposited the proceeds of the $45,000,000 of securities guaranteed by the Dominion two years ago. So it would appear that so far as the amounts due to contractors appearing in the statement of temporary loans and current obligations is concerned, with the measure of aid which we propose to afford, there will be funds available for their payment. I think that is substantially all that I was requested to furnish in connection with the further consideration of these two items.

Mr. GRAHAM: I notice that a considerable quantity of grain went south. I am surprised at my hon. friend boasting about that in connection with the Duluth road.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I was not boasting.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would have thought that he would consider it not a good thing for Canada that the grain should go south instead of coming east. As my hon. friend will understand, it is not an easy thing to go through these accounts and sift them. I was busy in the House last night and this afternoon, and I have not had the opportunity to digest them. I suppose it would not be out of place for me to say, regarding both of these roads, that I do not take the pessimistic view that some people take as to the outcome of the situation, so far as the railways of Canada are concerned. There is no doubt that the war has dislocated things, and the traffic of the railways fell off to such an extent at one time that the strongest transportation company in the world, to my mind, the Canadian Pacific railway, saw its stock tumble to a degree that was never anticipated. That did not mean that the stock of the Canadian Pacific railway had not an intrinsic value greater than was represented by the figures shown on the stock exchange; but it did mean that for the time being trade was so dislocated that the earnings, possibly temporary, were such that investment in the stock would not prove a paying one. But that condition has rapidly adjusted itself. True it is that the great crop in the West has helped materially, and the transportation of munitions and other things connected with the war has done a good deal to aid the companies in increasing their revenue during the past year or so. But the substantial foundation on which our transportation companies must build will be the immigration into Canada, with which must come an increase of agricultural production, the tillage of a much larger acreage, and with all that an

increased output by our industrial concerns. I am not discouraged a bit about the situation. If conditions had remained as they appeared a few years ago, if immigration had continued to pour in, to open up our western lands and increase the cultivated acreage, with all the coincident development to which I have referred, the railway companies would be pretty busy at the present time. I have no fear for the future concerning them at all. At the present time we are facing a peculiar financial situation. The companies appear to be in a worse position than some other forms of industry, because we know all about them, and because they are of more gigantic proportions than many other businesses. But, as a matter of fact, a great many of the industries of Canada were in a very precarious condition when the war broke out. Instead of it being an injury to them, the war has been a godsend to them financially; but it has not been so until recently to the transportation companies. Take the Grand Trunk Pacific. The arrangement with that company was peculiar and somewhat complex, the late Government constructing half of the main line approximately, from Moncton to Winnipeg, a distance of 1,800 miles, while the company undertook, under certain guarantees, to construct the line from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert, approximately the same distance, I think the line from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert is not quite as long as the line from Moncton to Winnipeg. In addition, the Grand Trunk Pacific had to construct the system of branch lines to which I referred the other day. They have done that to a considerable extent, but not to the extent which will be necessary in order to feed the main line and in order that goods may come in, to be shipped over these branch lines to the communities developed and yet to be developed.

The idea of building that road up to a very high standard elicited differences of opinion. I trust I shall not be breaking any rule of the committee if I deal with that for just a moment. There are two principles of railway construction. One is to build the cheapest possible road, practically placing the rails on the ties with little or no ballast, and with grades and curves of various dimensions, just so the road can begin to operate, and then, as it makes a profit, as the revenue begins to come in, it is used to improve the condition of the road and put in what we call betterments. In its former construction, the Canadian Northern adopted the latter principles, and its branch lines all over the West and in the East, I think, were built on the basis of comparatively easy construction. When the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental came to be constructed, they decided to adopt the other principle, that is, to build a road of a very high standard at once, so that when it was completed it would be able to afford the people of the country cheaper transportation than possibly could be afforded them by a road built on the lines of cheap construction. I need not argue that, it is evident. We cannot tell at the present time, it can only be told as the days go by, how much benefit that superior construction is to the people using that road. It is conceded now by every person that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental form the most perfect transcontinental railway in America. I think that nowhere in the world is there a stretch of road of such length and of such superior construction as the Transcontinental line.

It is necessary, in order to utilize such a line, and to get the benefit of the dear construction, that it shall have a lot of business to do. It can haul a bigger tonnage with the same engine. It can haul more than double the tonnage that can be hauled for an equal distance over any other road on this continent at the present time with all the improvements. It will necessitate the filling up of the West as rapidly as possible, with all the coincident development. It will require that the industries and agriculture of the East shall be developed to the fullest extent. It will bring a return benefit to them in the way of cheaper freights. The Government have proven, during the past few months, that they can afford to haul grain at a cheaper rate than it has ever been hauled for before. The rate of six cents per bushel from Armstrong, which is a point that corresponds with Port Arthur, to Quebec is a cheaper rate than was ever given before by rail, and the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) says that on that haul to Quebec a profit was made. This amply proves that the construction of a road of this character, if it has the work to do, is, for the present at least, of more benefit to the people than a line of cheaper construction.

It must be remembered too, Mr. Chairman, that ocean traffic has been greatly disturbed, and on ocean traffic, both Pacific and Atlantic, this through line depended

to a certain extent for its tonnage. But on the Pacific, as well as on the Atlantic, that traffic has been decreased to such a degree that the Grand Trunk Pacific and Transcontinental have received no benefit at all. Immigration that was flowing in by hundreds of thousands has come to a standstill. Increased acreage that, as everybody expected, would be yielding forth in abundance is not doing so, because the men are not coming in.

Then, many of our men from the West who were active in the tilling of the soil have gone to the war. In these respects conditions have altered to such a marked degree that you cannot judge at all what would have been the result if these conditions had not so changed. In the years to come—and not so many years either—I look for a vast increase in the number of people who will come to our western country; I look to a development of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, after a space of time following the war, that will astonish us all, not excluding the people who live in those provinces. Some of our friends are at the war; some have been killed and others have been wounded; others are in the thick of the fight and we do not know when we shall hear from them; others of our families are preparing to go. On account of all these things, this is a time—and I say it advisedly—when we on whose shoulders the responsibilities of government is placed have to stiffen our backs to the burden and not grow pessimistic. Canada is all right; Canada is going to be able to carry all these burdens as the years go by; and we must not on account of present surroundings and any temporary discouragements we may have let the public think we have lost confidence in the ability of our country to do what we started out to do, and that was to develop one of the greatest countries in the world. We must not lose sight of the fact that we are a young and virile people; that under normal conditions we bring to our land the best; that our development, both as a people and of our natural resources, must go on; that we have inherent qualities in ourselves and in our natural resources that will make Canada what we expect to make her, and what to-day we believe she is capable of being made, if we will only stick to the helm and be true to our convictions.

This situation with regard to the railways comes to us at a time when we seem to be carrying the last pound that we can bear; and whether we agree to aid the railways in this or in some other way, my own conviction is that we all require some of the courage and stamina our fathers had when they first came to this country to hew out homes for themselves. Those qualities must be asserted in the sons who have followed; we must remain true to what we believe to be our duty, and, that course being followed, sooner than we expect it perhaps, we shall find that Canada needs all these railways, and will be able to use them for her own advantage and for the benefit of the people at large. In the years to come, for the Grand Trunk Pacific, with its magnificent construction, I look for a great traffic beginning in the east on the Atlantic and going right across to the Pacific, and vice versa. The Canadian Pacific Railway has done a large trade in that way and has made a name for itself the world over. No matter what we may have done by the Canadian Pacific Railway in years gone by, no matter how we may have criticised certain aspects of it, the fact remains that the Canadian Pacific railway is one of the greatest advertisements that Canada has to-day. Wherever it goes its business is done in a manner that brings no discredit either to the business concerns of Canada or to the financial transactions in which that company is engaged. We have often been criticised for passing certain legislation in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway; but this much has always been in the minds of members of Parliament, namely, that the Canadian Pacific railway was a road that was creditable to the Dominion of Canada; and, whatever latitude was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway in the way of financing, whether we agreed with it or not, the company did not bring discredit on any person connected with it.

I have said these few things about the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have my own view about the way the Government has managed this end of it. But I am not going into that; I think it foreign to this discussion. I have strong views about the management of the whole Grand Trunk Pacific system as concerns Canada itself. Without saying anything imprudent, I think there are men in Canada who understand the railway situation and our transportation necessities as they cannot possibly be understood by men who do not live in Canada. Conditions here are so different, our development is so much more rapid and our territory so vast, that the circle in which we move, from a transportation point of

view, is altogether different to anything that could exist in a smaller country, with a denser population, and perhaps a more intense production per acre. Our railway system has to cover many thousands of miles; we have a scattered population; we have a country only the fringe of which has been developed; and we must accommodate our transportation facilities to those conditions. To my mind we cannot rightly invite men from other lands to bring their families and go out into our vacant lands unless we are prepared to do something for them, so that they can get the production from those lands to a market that will bring them a good return. After all, what counts is the amount of money that a man has left over every year after paying his expenses. If we do not afford these newcomers the transportation facilities that will enable them to get the best value for their product, we reduce the value of their daily labour, and offer them no encouragement. When we understand, as we do, that the progress of our entire country depends primarily—primarily, I say—upon the man who is behind the plough, and upon the product of our soil, we can more thoroughly appreciate the necessity of allowing that man to get all he can out of the soil and out of his daily product, in order that he may be happy and contented. A man so contented is the best immigration agent we could engage in any place. It is true that during the past few years the condition of the man who tills the soil, and of his family, has been greatly improved by such conveniences as the telephone, and the daily mail.

But these conveniences only come to a comparatively few on the prairies; they do not have all these advantages in the remote districts. But, for the interest of the country at large, it is the duty of this Parliament, acting through its Government to devote itself with the utmost vigour as soon as the war ceases, to bring to our country a class of immigrants that will develop the country as rapidly as possible. That will be good for our transportation facilities, good for the Dominion of Canada, and good for the Empire at large. If that is done, I have no fear—no matter what the temporary difficulties may be—of the final result to the Dominion no fear of the country's destiny. I have full faith that the Dominion will make such progress in all lines that all our railway facilities will be needed within the next few years.

Now, let us consider the Canadian Northern along the same lines. I have been criticised, and the Government of which I was a member has been criticised, about this railway. Well, you know, so many people have good hindsight, but not everybody has perfect foresight. Nobody could foresee that this war was coming, and nobody could tell what the result would be. We were all caught in a financial maelstrom. I am not discouraged with the Canadian Northern as one of our transportation companies. I did take exception with Sir William Mackenzie to some of the things he was doing—for instance, to the extension of his lines through the Rockies for the time being. But it is a condition that confronts us. I said concerning the Grand Trunk Pacific, so I say concerning the Canadian Northern—hard struggling now, but in years to come, and not so many years either, we will need the Canadian Northern to carry our traffic to and fro in the Dominion of Canada. In my opinion, the Canadian Northern west of the Great Lakes occupies the best territory of any of the railway lines running through the West, and I have been over a good portion of them all. While the system has been constructed largely on the principle I first mentioned, that of cheap construction, to begin with and improvements made as traffic increased, it has a collecting system of close upon five thousand miles in some of the best territory in our Prairie Provinces. I may not agree with some of the projects of the Canadian Northern; and I do think it is time we came to a finality about handing them out money—I express that view frankly—but as to the final result, I believe that the Canadian Northern, running as it does through the best territory in the West, whether its operation is to be by the Government or by a company, will be needed in the time to come and needed to the fullest extent.

What is to be the outcome? The Government told us—and I suppose I am in order in discussing this now because it is practically the same subject—that it is the intention to appoint a commission to investigate the railway situation. I am not so confident at the present time that very much good will come out of that. And, by the way, I am afraid the Prime Minister will soon have to give up giving names to his commissions, which are now becoming quite an army; it might be more convenient to have them numbered or labelled. I am rather inclined to think that the Govern-

ment could, by calling in the heads of these different companies, come to a solution of this problem without a highly-paid commission, and so could devote to some other purpose the $150,000 proposed to be expended on the commission. But the Government says the commission is to be appointed. Now, the outcome will depend largely, first, on the instruction given to that commission, and, second, on its personnel. If the instructions are to examine the whole situation, without any restriction whatever, with a view to making suggestions to the Government as to the advisability of a certain policy and refraining from other policies, possibly that may be all right. But the commission must be composed of men of vision. We see it stated in the press that one commissioner is to come from Europe, another from the United States, these two to select the third. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I am not sure that men so selected will have the outlook that we in Canada have upon our own country. As I have said before, the men from the old land, to my mind, cannot possibly have the vision with which we are seized concerning the future of the Dominion of Canada, with our millions of acres still untilled, our mines unexplored, our vast timber territory, our fisheries, and many other things of which he is not cognizant—in fact, his vision might be narrower than that necessary to take in the whole situation; he might be inclined to bring the matter down to the present dollars and cents without having the outlook which, I think, is requisite if we are to maintain the progress of the Dominion. The representative from the United States would be more in line with our ideas of development, I imagine, because his country has gone through what we are now going through. But it will depend altogether on the man. I submit to the Government that it is not going to be an easy matter to make this selection and to get men who will completely fill the Bill. These two, I understand, are to select the third. I would not let them do that if I were in the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is a very new idea.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is in the press. The press is energetic these days; it is getting something new, notwithstanding the occasional dullness of Parliament. Anyway, I would not allow them to do that. I do not wish to be offensive, but railway men, like all other combinations of business men, are a kind of masonic society among themselves; and while the man whom they would select would probably work in harmony with them, he might not suit the requirements which, to my mind, ought to be found in any man occupying that position. The reason I speak of this is some experience that I have had. At one time in my career I tried to choose a board of engineers to help me in connection with the Quebec bridge. I selected one; we selected another, and before we had selected the third the other two were disagreeing. For two years I lived in an attitude that was not peaceful, the trouble being not in connection with the construction or the plans of the bridge, but in keeping my board on terms of peace with one another. The Government will have difficulty in the selection of that board, and the stronger the men the more difficulty there will be in getting them to work harmoniously, unless the Government handle the selection themselves.

I want to go on record as being a man with the optimistic view, wishing to sound a note of warning in my own weak way against our allowing ourselves to be stampeded by the pessimism that is in the air. Canada is all right. She is going on to the accomplishment of her purpose with a firm tread. True, she is hesitating at the present time, but when those who come after us write the history of our country I know that there will be no reason to feel ashamed of what the people of Canada did during this time of stress and trial. In addition to the courage we are showing concerning the war, we need just as much courage in handling our own domestic affairs. I urge upon Parliament the necessity of keeping our heads uplifted, not allowing ourselves to be diverted from the purpose of developing this country, feeling assured that in the years to come every dollar we have expended will be found to have been not unwisely expended, and will bring a return to the people of Canada, thus helping to build up our country as we expect it will be built up.

So far as the discussion of this question is concerned, I suppose if there were to be a possible division it would be on concurrence—I am not sure. However, I wish to ask just a few questions as to matters of detail. There is a statement on page 13 of the information concerning the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which I do not quite understand. It refers to sundry

assets and sundry liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company on February 29, 1916. While it gives assets of the branch lines and various other items that would belong to the organization, no amount is given as an asset of the main line itself.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: These statements are referred to on the previous page.

Mr. GRAHAM: I see that each statement refers to some other statement. Take the item under assets: "London Office, $243,000." Then I find these items, "unpaid wages, $559,698; accounts payable, $3,264,063." Would the minister explain that item "London Office"? Has he the details of these two items concerning unpaid wages and accounts payable?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, I have not. I did not consider that that had any direct bearing upon the matter of this proposed loan. If my hon. friend is interested, however, I shall try to get that from Montreal. The item of accounts payable would seem to be the accounts current in connection with the railway system.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a large amount, $3,260,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In connection with a railway system, especially in such times as these, there is usually a large amount of outstanding liabilities. As to the London office, that amount might be a balance over there to their credit, or it might represent charges on account of securities that have been sold. This is mere surmise on my part, because I have not the detailed information. It occurred to me that the question would not arise; I am sure my hon. friend will understand that.

Mr. GRAHAM: As to the item "unpaid wages," perhaps the Government does not meet with this like the ordinary member, but we get letters from different people about unpaid wages. When we propose to aid any company, immediately those to whom amounts are due, particularly for labour, write to various members and urge that the Government make some statement as to the probability of these unpaid wages being paid before the taxes of the men to whom the wages are due are handed over to the company.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I should think that that would be the amount of wages unpaid at the time this statement was made, February 29, 1916. I do not think it is to be assumed that the road is in arrears as to wages. It has not been drawn to my attention that there are any unpaid wages.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is, overdue.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend has received any notification to that effect, before paying any of this money I shall be glad to make inquiries of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I am quite sure that the loan would enable them to pay up any arrears of that kind, but personally I do not believe that they are in arrears in this respect. I believe that it is a matter of bookkeeping as of February 29, 1916, to show the amount of wages unpaid—accrued, I suppose, but not yet matured due.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose I need not ask any more questions about the details of that statement, because I shall not get any particulars. It would have been better, I think, if the Grand Trunk Pacific had given the accountant of the department some details of these matters; it is almost inevitable that questions of this kind will be asked. There is another item, "advances, National Transcontinental railway contracts, $873,000." I suppose that is an interchange of work, in a way, between the Grand Trunk Pacific and contractors on the National Transcontinental railway, but it is not clear here.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is right.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then there is the item, "section 'F' accounts, to be charged to National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners." The National Transcontinental Railway Commissioners—except it be the Minister of Railways—do not exist. That is on page 13. That is not a large item, but it is just a little confusing. This would make it appear that certain accounts ought to be charged to National Transcontinental Railway construction to the extent of $10,000. That is charged to the Government, or to the Minister of Railways as the commissioner who was to finish the construction of the National Transcontinental railway. But the National Transcontinental railway is finished, the Government says, and consequently there is no commission at all.

Mr. REID: Yes, there is; there is a commissioner still.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister would be the commissioner.

Mr. REID: Yes; but the commission has not been dissolved.

Mr. GRAHAM: The commission as heretofore existing, except it be the Minister of Railways, is dissolved.

Mr. REID: The Act was changed reducing the number of commissioners from three to one, and the minister is now the commissioner.

Mr. GRAHAM: That means that the Government owe the Grand Trunk Pacific $10,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They claim it.

Mr. GRAHAM: If we are to take this statement as one on which we should base the loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific, then the Government owes the Grand Trunk Pacific $10,000, which ought to be in the Finance Minister's annual statement as one of the liabilities.

Mr. REID: Is that not a case where the Grand Trunk Pacific were contractors along the railway? My hon. friend will remember that the Grand Trunk Pacific were contractors on part of the Transcontinental, and those accounts have not yet been finally adjusted or disposed of. The Grand Trunk Pacific had quite a large claim against the Transcontinental Commission for the construction they had done, and, on the other hand, the Government had some charges against them.

Mr. NESBITT: Referring to the Grand Trunk Pacific loan, is there anything in this report to show what amount is for the deficit and what amount for the purchase of rolling stock?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That will be found on page 10, in a statement certified by the vice-president and treasurer of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. NESBITT: Why do the Grand Trunk company proper not guarantee this loan? What is the reason given for that? They guaranteed the other loans, so far as the Government is concerned.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They did not guarantee the last one.

Mr. NESBITT: Do they give any reason why they do not guarantee this one? The Grand Trunk proper had a more successful year last year than they have had for some years past. Why do they not guarantee this loan?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There are considerations affecting the credit of the Grand Trunk Company which are, of course, of great concern to its directorate.

9 p.m. My hon. friend knows that the guarantee of a company constitutes a contingent liability, and has a direct bearing upon its credit. I pointed out yesterday that the Grand Trunk had already given guarantees and made loans in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific to an amount exceeding $120,000,000. The Grand Trunk has to do considerable financing in order to provide betterments, improvements and terminal facilities in connection with its own existing system; and the Grand Trunk feels, in a word, that it is not able, without seriously impairing its credit, to give additional guarantees upon the Grand Trunk Pacific. My hon. friend is quite logical in asking why the Grand Trunk should not carry the Grand Trunk Pacific. The reason they state is that they are not able to carry the Grand Trunk Pacific any further. Mr. Smithers made that statement in his letter to the Prime Minister, which has been laid on the Table of the House and appears in this statement. It is perfectly clear that the Grand Trunk cannot, under present market conditions, finance the Grand Trunk Pacific by raising additional money upon its guarantee; and it is their view that to do so would seriously impair the credit of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and prevent it from financing the betterments, improvements and facilities it requires in connection with its own system.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to state, with the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Graham), that I also am an optimist. I have faith in my country, and I am far from being inimical to any of the railway systems. I think they have done a great deal towards the opening up and the development of this country. I cannot forget, when I was a boy attending Ottawa University, spending my evenings in the House of Commons listening to Sir Charles Tupper, Sir John Macdonald, Sir Richard Cartwright, and the other giants of those days. It was at the time of the inception of the Canadian Pacific railway. I remember Sir Charles Tupper predicting that some day the crop in the Northwest would yield 100,000,000 bushels. There was a roar in the House and in the party press over the prediction of Sir Charles. They derided him as too great an optimist; but he lived long enough to see his prediction fulfilled. My hon.

friend will remember that the Canadian Pacific was in pretty low water on a certain day. I remember that when the Hon. Frank Smith was a member of the Macdonald Government, and when the late Lord Strathcona, then plain Donald Smith, was connected with the company, together with Lord Mountstephen, they approached the Government on a very notable occasion when they were nearly bankrupt. The Government had refused to make a small advance, that is, small compared with the advances that have been made to railway companies since. They asked for $25,000,000. The history of the cabinet meeting of that day has been told by many writers, but perhaps the House will bear with me if I recall that the advance—I think it was something like $25,000,000, but perhaps my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) will be able to give the exact figure; he knows that part of Canadian history better than I do—had been refused by the Government at Ottawa. It is said that Donald Smith, afterwards Lord Strathcona, and Lord Mountstephen returned to the Russell Hotel in very low spirits. In fact, they were ruined, and their company was facing bankruptcy. But the Hon. Frank Smith—and all honour to his memory—and the late Hon. Mr. Pope, father of Senator Pope, asked Sir John Macdonald to hold another cabinet meeting to reconsider the application. It is said that at that cabinet meeting it was declared that if no advance was made the Canadian Pacific railway would go bankrupt, and that if the Canadian Pacific railway went bankrupt the credit of the country would be seriously damaged. We all know the sequel. The advance was made; the money was refunded before the day named in the contract; the line was built, the last spike was driven in near Vancouver by Sir Donald Smith himself long before the date fixed in the contract, and to-day the Canadian Pacific railway is certainly the best administered corporation on the American continent, and possibly in the world. I am bound to say that the heads of the Canadian Pacific railway have always been men of the highest merit, and the officials also have been of the very best. Having read the history of my country since Confederation and having lived since the inception of the Canadian Pacific railway and watched the course of events up to the present time, I am an optimist and believe that our National Transcontinental can certainly be saved. But it is not pessimistic to state that nationalization is ripe. I believe in nationalization, in state ownership, as regards railways. The note of pessimism comes from the Minister of Finance. It is not by listening to speeches on this side of the House that I become pessimistic; it is by listening to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. He tells us in so many words, if I mistake not, that these proposed loans of $8,000,000 and $15,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern are a stop-gap; that they are only to enable them to pass through the crisis, and that we may well expect that in the near future they will come again hat in hand to obtain new loans from the Government of this country. So that I gather from the remarks of my hon. friend that he has in mind that, as surely as day follows night, the two systems are doomed, which I do not believe. But if they are doomed, why should we make the loans to-day? Why should we increase the burden? I will give some advice to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and to my genial friend the Acting Minister of Railways, and I will charge nothing for it. The Government knows to-day that these two systems are in deep water. They have come again and again to this Parliament to obtain advances. The Government practically promised on each occasion that it would be the very last time and that their claims would not be entertained again. They come again this year, and, with this note of pessimism in the speech of the Minister of Finance, let me assure him that four out of five men on the street will tell him that the time has come for this country to get hold of these railway systems, to nationalize them. If my hon. friend will put his ear to the ground he will find out what he has to do. He will appoint this commission, he will delay the loan which he intends to make, and he will begin by putting that commission into operation. Let us prorogue this session of Parliament, let us have a session inside of four or five months, and then, if the report contains what seems to be already in the mind of the Minister of Finance, let us go in for nationalization. Otherwise, you are simply adding to the burdens of the people, you are not practically helping the two railway systems, as you will have in the end to nationalize them. I have it from the highest railway authority on the American continent—and if I were at liberty I would give the name, but I am not—that the Government must, within a very short time,

take over the transcontinental railways and have three state-owned railways.

Mr. OLIVER: When the Canadian Northern guarantee proposals were before Parliament in 1914, I took exception to the position in regard to the branch lines in the Prairie West. I would like to know what the position is, what is going to be done under this proposal now before the House in regard to these branch lines of the Canadian Northern in the Prairie West, branch lines not yet completed, although bonds guaranteed by provincial governments have been issued. In the Government's proposals of 1914 they simply ignored that condition. They counted the bonds which had been guaranteed by the provincial governments as an asset of the company upon which they took security, but they took no measures to secure the completion of the branch lines. What has the Government in mind in the proposal now before the House in regard to these branch lines?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The present proposal has no bearing on that matter at all. The question of whether the Canadian Northern will be able to complete these branch lines will depend upon its ability to finance the securities guaranteed by the provincial Governments. It is quite possible, although I am speaking without full information, that if the financial conditions permit, the Canadian Northern will be able to proceed with the lines in question; but this loan is for the purpose of meeting the current obligations of the Canadian Northern and to enable them to finance until the next session of Parliament. The company is confronted with an immediate serious situation by reason of the large amount of its unfunded debt and current obligations, and this loan is for the purpose of meeting that situation and enabling them to finance during the year. Whether the Canadian Northern will proceed with the branch lines in the West under any understanding or agreement with the provincial Governments will depend entirely on its ability to finance the requirements altogether apart from this particular loan.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think that the position taken in 1914, or the position taken just now by the Minister of Finance, is fair and reasonable or is even sound public policy.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does not my hon. friend observe that in order to provide for what he has in mind the Government would have to give an increased amount, assuming that we agree that this money is needed to keep the railway system as a growing concern? If the Government would provide an additional sum specifically for the purpose in question, that is one thing; but the Canadian Northern railway, as I stated, finds itself in such a position that it has to have this aid in connection with its current obligations and unfunded debt.

Mr. TURRIFF: What the minister says does not apply exactly, because I know that in some of the provinces the railway company has sold these bonds guaranteed by the province and that the money has been deposited in the bank and can only be drawn out on the certificate of the provincial Government's railway engineer. There are some millions of dollars, raised by the railway company from the bonds guaranteed by the province, lying in the bank, and the railway company does not complete the lines for which these bonds were issued. That was the case last year and it is the case to-day. If the Government is going to come forward like a good parent and practically finance this company, it ought to see that the company spends the money lying at its credit in the bank to complete these railways, or complete them as far as the money will go. There is no sense in the money lying there, and settlers on the prairies not being able to get the railway accommodation for which the provincial bonds were sold.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will, I am sure, realize that it is a question, from the Canadian Northern standpoint, as to whether they can build the lines that were intended. I accept the statement of my hon. friend, although I have no accurate knowledge as to the facts, that guaranteed bonds have been sold and that the money lies in trust account to the credit of the Provincial Treasurer for the purpose of constructing these lines. Let us assume that the money is not sufficient for the purpose; the Canadian Northern have to have regard to the existing financial conditions and it will be for them to say whether the money is sufficient for them to complete the line. They might say: "If we go ahead and build the line we can only build it up to a certain point, and we will have to stop there owing to existing financial conditions. We are not able to raise the additional money to build this line, nor is it desirable that under existing conditions we should incur the loss which

might result from the early operation of the line." The difficulty of this war time is that the railway companies, as well as other companies, are confronted with extraordinary financial conditions under which they are not able to do what they would gladly do if the conditions were different. If they were able to finance as they were some years ago, and if their prospects were such that they could carry on the operation of these extra lines, the situation would be entirely different. But under present conditions I can well understand any railway company, either the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Northern railway, unable as they are to market their bonds except at rates away below the price they could have got two or three years ago, proceeding with construction without the certainty that they would be able to finish the lines, or without the certainty that after the lines were finished the company would be able to bear the additional burdens until such times as the lines were remunerative.

Mr. OLIVER: Again, I say, I cannot agree with the hon. minister that the two questions are entirely dissociate. I insist that they are absolutely interlocked; that the question of what the Canadian Northern railway is doing with the money of the provinces that it has in hand, and which this Government counts as an asset——

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, it does not.

Mr. OLIVER: Under the guarantee of 1914 that money is listed as a security held by this Government on the Canadian Northern railway. Having assumed that position, this Government have a responsibility in regard to those enterprises that they cannot ignore, and which they should not ignore when there is before them a general proposition of aid to the Canadian Northern railway. This proposition of aid to the Canadian Northern railway is not confined to interest payments. It includes not only interest payments, but payments of actual expenditure. If the proposition were confined entirely to interest payments, there might be some merit in the contention of the minister. But it is not confined to interest payments; it includes payments for work done, for accounts outstanding, and other liabilities. It goes beyond the question of meeting interest payments now accruing and takes into account these other considerations, and I maintain that the question of the completion of these branch lines is not only of equal but of vastly greater importance to the well-being of the country and the success of the Canadian Northern enterprise, and the security of the money that is invested in that enterprise, than any of these other considerations. I hope I shall be excused if I speak very strongly on this point, but I do so because my constituency is very very deeply interested, as is also the adjoining constituency.

This railroad question has generally been discussed by those who see the question only from the centre outwards; I represent the people who are at the outside of the circle, and who are affected in an entirely different manner. Thousands of people have gone into the partially wooded country north of the Saskatchewan river, along surveyed routes of the Canadian Northern Railway, knowing that the bonds had been guaranteed by the provincial Government, knowing that the bonds had in many cases been sold and the money realized. They would not have gone in there and settled if they had not had the expectation that the road would be completed within a reasonable time. The company have in one case built and opened up some sixty miles of road, and graded some fifty miles more, but without the steel. In another case they have sold the bonds for a hundred miles of road, and have graded eighty-five miles, but have laid no rails at all; and people for a hundred miles beyond the extreme end of that grading have gone in and settled upon the expectation of the road being built. How the Government, holding 40 per cent of the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway—have assumed that much responsibility in regard to the company—can absolutely ignore that condition and say: We have no responsibility whatever in regard to it. We know nothing about it; it is a matter between the Canadian Northern Railway and the provincial Governments—is something I cannot understand. At the time they are saying that, they are taking the money of those very people to pay the Canadian Northern liabilities, and not liabilities merely in respect of interest accruing, but capital liabilities incurred in other localities. I have no hostility to the Canadian Northern Railway, and in this matter I do not wish to criticise the Government severely, I appreciate the difficulties that have to be faced, and am willing to assist the Government in facing those difficulties, but I certainly cannot agree without protest to a proposal that would carrry aid a certain distance and

chop it off just where it touches the people whom I represent, and who are more deeply interested in the extension of aid than any other people in the Dominion of Canada.

The idea that the Provincial Governments of the Prairie West are primarily responsible, or ought to be primarily responsible, for the railway development of that country is not a fair proposition. The land, the timber, and the minerals of the Prairie West belong to the Dominion, and are administered by this Government. The provinces do not own a foot of land, a stick of timber, a pound of coal, or a cubic foot of gas; they have no right of proprietorship in any of these things. The Dominion at large owns all these resources, and this Government administers them, derives revenue from them, and is responsible to the country for their development. In response to the demands of the people who were actually settled on the land, and who looked to the Provincial Government for means of transportation by wagon roads, it is true that the Provincial Government, considering the situation of these people and realizing that wagon roads could not possibly meet their requirements, guaranteed railway bonds for the purpose of having railroads constructed. The Provincial Governments have done everything they could; they have strained their credit to the limit for the purpose of aiding in the construction of those roads—a purpose which has had for its result the bringing into immense value of the property of the Dominion of Canada. This Government has guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway, and, the railway company having sold the bonds and having spent a large part of the proceeds, but not the whole of it, this Government takes a blanket mortgage on the very roads that the Provincial Government has guaranteed; and this Govern ment, now calling on the people of the Dominion to contribute $15,000,000 for the aid of that railway company, absolutely ignores the condition I have placed before the House, and the position in which these people are situated. I cannot agree with the Minister of Finance that this is not the concern of this Parliament or of this Government. I consider it an absolutely intimate concern of this Parliament and of this Government. Looked at only from the standpoint of the Canadian Northern Railway—if that was the only interest to be considered—the completion of these branch lines—I am not speaking, remember, of lines that have not been begun, but of lines that have actually been commenced, and which stand partially but not finally completed to-day, either for shortage of money or other reasons, I know not what—I maintain that the completion of these branch lines would be of greater material benefit to the railway company itself, in the way of building up the traffic that is necessary to its ultimate success, than any other assistance that could be given to it by this Government. I hope the Government will reconsider this view that has been expressed. When I saw this liberal amount of aid proposed for the Canadian Northern, I naturally concluded that it was intended to consider the position in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and that some adjustment would be included that would tend, at any rate, to the completion of these partially-completed enterprises.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Is the hon. member speaking of the two companies, the Canadian Northern Western and the Canadian Northern Saskatchewan?

Mr. OLIVER: I am speaking particularly of two lines in Alberta, in my own constituency and the adjoining constituency, which are under the Canadian Northern Western charter, I think; but I take it for granted that there is a similar situation in Saskatchewan, though I am not familiar with it; and I know there is a similar situation in other parts of Alberta, where the country is in occupation and is under production, and where that production is absolutely handicapped for lack of the completion of Canadian Northern lines which have been guaranteed by the provincial government,—the people have gone in and settled there in expectation of these lines being completed. I am not accusing the company of bad faith—but I am stating that there is the condition, and I say it rests upon the shoulders of this Government to see to it that that difficulty is rectified under present circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will certainly not deny that there are districts in the West which are in need of branch line construction. Furthermore, it certainly would be our duty, were it in our power, to see to it that all branch line construction now necessary in the country is completed. The hon. gentleman thinks the Government is remiss in its duty in bringing down this measure without seeing to the completion of certain lines in the province of Alberta, and complains that the matter of their com-

pletion is entirely one for which this Government is responsible. He refers to a couple of lines which, he says, are under the charter of the Canadian Northern Western, in respect to which he says the bonds have been guaranteed to the extent of $15,000 a mile by the province of Alberta, but which lines have not been completed.

Mr. OLIVER: To be exact, one is guaranteed to the extent of $20,000 a mile and the other to the extent of $18,000 a mile.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the hon. gentleman at first to say $13,000 a mile, but the extent of the guarantee of the province of Alberta, he tells us, is $20,000 a mile in one case and $18,000 in the other. These two are not the only lines in western Canada that should be completed, and that doubtless would be completed were financial conditions different from what they are. My first observation is this, that the Canadian Northern Western is a line still under provincial jurisdiction, a line in respect of which the Parliament of Canada has not declared that it is a work for the general advantage of Canada; this Parliament decided, two years ago, that during the period of construction the Canadian Northern Western should remain under the jurisdiction of the provincial Government and remain a purely provincial railway. And, I may say, it came to that conclusion at the urgent insistence of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) himself.

Mr. OLIVER: I have to protest against the conclusion of my hon. friend right there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That Parliament came to the conclusion—

Mr. OLIVER: That it came to that conclusion at my insistence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Possibly we might have come to that conclusion anyway, but we were helped to it by the arguments of my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: Not by my intention anyway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. member's intention, though he argued in favour of that, was that we should decide against it. However, we agreed with him on that occasion, and, as a consequence, the Canadian Northern Western is still under the authority of the provincial Government of Alberta.

Mr. OLIVER: I hope the hon. member will permit me to interrupt him just a moment in order to get the record right. I think Hansard will prove that I insisted, in the remarks I made, that if the Government took the steps they did at that time they should assume full responsibility for the railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But he insisted that the control of the Canadian Northern Western should rest with the province of Alberta. Perhaps he would have liked that we should assume responsibility for supplying the money; but he insisted, whether we supplied the money or not, that the Government of Alberta should have the authority.

Mr. OLIVER: I cannot agree with that statement of the case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is endeavouring to give the House the impression, if I caught his argument correctly, that the proceeds of securities guaranteed by the province of Alberta had not only not been utilized for the purpose for which they were guaranteed, namely, the completion of the construction of lines covered by that guarantee in the province, but were diverted to the payment of other debts.

Mr. OLIVER: No, I said they were listed as part of the securities over which this Government assumed control in consideration of the guarantee given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government mortgage of 1914 applied to all the properties of the Canadian Northern, or, more strictly, it did not apply on the properties, but on the stocks of the company, subject to the mortgages, and the mortgage was in favour of the Government of the province of Alberta as security for its guarantee. It would be impossible that there should be any diversion of the funds; the funds are expended on the roads, or they lie there awaiting expenditure. If they lie there, it will be for one reason, and one reason only—that they were not sufficient to construct the road. The hon. gentleman has been instrumental in seeing to it that the province of Alberta kept within itself control of that road. The province of Alberta is not without power yet, if it insists upon the completion of these lines which the proceeds of the guaranteed securities are not sufficient to complete—it is not without power to increase that guarantee and so enable the proceeds to be made sufficient to secure completion. I understand that the policy of the road has been to build such lines as were laid out at the time of the going through of the $45,000,000 mortgage of two years ago, but

not to prosecute further unless the proceeds of the securities already guaranteed were sufficient to enable them to complete; for the simple reason that it has been the practice before to realize on provincially-guaranteed securities to the fullest extent possible and then to use the proceeds of the consolidated debenture stock to complete construction.

Mr. OLIVER: It is not a question of the Canadian Northern going forward with lines not already begun in 1914; it is a question of the company completing lines then begun and partially completed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In one sense, I presume, a branch line is never completed. It may extend for ten miles, and later for another ten miles, and so on.

Mr. OLIVER: To the extent to which bonds have been issued.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To the extent to which there is money to complete. That is as far as they are able to go. The consolidated debenture stock mortgage provides that there may be a priority to it of securities to the extent of $10,000 per mile issued, or $15,000 per mile if those securities are guaranteed by a provincial or by the Dominion Government. The consolidated debenture stock securities become a second charge, subject, say, to provincially guaranteed securities to the extent of $15,000 per mile. Consequently they are able to issue that stock subject to these provincial securities. But the trouble has been that since the outbreak of war it has been impossible to sell that character of stock, so that there are no moneys that would enable them to go ahead with that construction. If the Dominion Government were to ask them to do so, the obvious answer would be: supply us with the funds, and we will. If the hon. member for Edmonton wants us to take the position that in addition to what is absolutely necessary to hold the situation we should provide the railway company with funds to prosecute new construction or to complete the prosecution of construction for which the provincially-guaranteed securities are not sufficient, then he should put that in the form of a definite resolution so that we shall know what we are asked to do. For the present it is not the intention to provide funds loaned by the Dominion of Canada to prosecute construction further. The provincial Government has it in its power to do so. We have power under the legislation of 1914 to give priority to provincial securities to a greater extent than they have already been issued, and I have no doubt that any application to give such priority to provincially-guaranteed securities would be sympathetically considered. The provincial Government has it in its power to enlarge that guarantee and to give priority to that enlarged guarantee if it so desires. So that it has the situation in its own power.

Mr. OLIVER: The minister has stated my position exactly. Under the circumstances as they exist, the Government being a part owner in the Canadian Northern and assuming to carry the Canadian Northern forward, I think that that would be an entirely proper additional expenditure on the part of this Government. I desire it to be understood exactly in the terms that my hon. friend has stated; that is exactly the position as I view it. When the Provincial Government guarantees the bonds of a branch railroad to the amount of $20,000 a mile and the company sells those bonds, no doubt at a considerable discount, and spends a part of the money—we do not know how much—the remainder of the money is to the credit of the company at the order of the provincial treasurer. My hon. friend says that if that money was sufficient to complete the road the company would complete it. It does not follow at all that the company would complete the road if that money was sufficient to complete it. It may be that the financial circumstances of the company are such that, the money being deposited in, we will say, the Bank of Commerce, the Bank of Commerce is willing to advance money to the company for other purposes while that money remains in the Bank of Commerce, a satisfactory collateral to the loan that is made for other purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman knows that it could not possibly be applied as collateral to any other loan. The trust deed would prevent it.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not follow my hon. friend's argument. I know that papers could not be drawn to that effect, but I know also that the management of the bank recognizes—$3,000,000 being there to the credit of the provincial treasurer of Alberta, which money cannot be drawn by the provincial treasurer until certain railroad construction has been done—that if they have an understanding with the railroad company that railroad construction will not be done, the money is just as safe in

the bank for other purposes as if they had all the agreements that could be put under seal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That might be, but it could not be there as collateral to the new loan.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not a banker, and I may be using the word "collateral" improperly. I am sure, however, that it is perfectly good security to the bank to enable it to advance the company money for other purposes, and I verily believe that is what has been done, not so much because the bonds did not realize enough money to enable the company to build the road as because the necessities of the company caused that money to be used in the way that I say, for purposes other than those for which it was intended and for which the provincial guarantee was given. I have taken the responsibility of bringing this condition to the attention of the Government and I say that it is a condition that demands attention at this particular time. If the Government say: "We have no interest in this matter; we care nothing about how the Canadian Northern juggles with their money or with the money that they get from the provinces; if they are able to use provincial credit for the benefit of Dominion enterprise, well, that is good business; let the provincial Government find their own remedy;—if the Government say this, I do not think it is a fair proposition. I do not think it is right; I do not think it is good business. I certainly know that it is not good for the progress of the country, nor is it good for the Canadian Northern Railway Company itself.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: One would think that if there was any such collusive agreement between the bank and the railway company within the knowledge of the provincial Government, they would simply remove the money so that it would stand to their credit in the same way in another bank.

Mr. OLIVER: That is quite an obvious conclusion, but there is this to be said: on a certain occasion not many years ago the provincial Government of Alberta undertook to do that very thing in regard to a railroad aid transaction that was not connected with the Canadian Northern in any way. The result was that the bank refused to give the money up. The case was carried to the Privy Council, and the Privy Council decided that the Government could not draw the money from the bank. Having had that experience, they are not anxious to undertake it again.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend entirely misunderstands me. I did not suggest that they should divert it to any other purpose. The Privy Council did decide that they could not divert it to any other purpose under the particular circumstances, but the Privy Council did not decide, nor did any other court decide, that the money could not be placed to the credit of the provincial government for the same purpose in another bank which had no collusive arrangement with the railway company.

Mr. OLIVER: I am not able to answer the Prime Minister; he being of the legal profession, I will have to bow to his interpretation of the Privy Council's decision. But he will pardon me if I say that I do not appreciate the condition as he has stated it. I cannot see how the question as to how the ultimate purpose for which the money was to be used came in, when the only question was: shall the Royal Bank be compelled to honour the cheque of the Provincial Treasurer of the Government of Alberta, or not? I cannot understand how the purpose for which the money was to be used came into question. At any rate, that is what occurred, and because it occurred the provincial government is not anxious to enter into litigation with any of the banks on that account. This money got into the banks before the decision of the Privy Council in the Great Waterways case was rendered, and I imagine that probably it will not occur again.

Mr. NESBITT: I am neither an optimist nor a pessimist so far as railways or anything else are concerned. I only want to see the Government doing the best that is possible under the circumstances of this difficult railway situation, and for that reason I want to get whatever information I can.

I noticed a statement in the Bureau of Railway News Statistics, Chicago, that the Government-owned railways in Canada in the last year cost $102.13 for each $100 taken in; and the private-operated cost $73.94. That is not an encouragement to me for Government-owned railways, nor will it be until we have some system of operating them to better advantage than we have had in the past.

The Canadian Northern statement does

not show in what proportion this $15,000,000 is to be divided between payment of interest upon securities of the companies included in the Canadian Northern Railway system having priority over the guaranteed securities authorized by chapter 20 of the statutes of 1914, instalment of equipment securities, and upon construction. I think it is quite material for us to know how much of this is to be used for these items; we cannot otherwise discuss it intelligently.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will find on page 13 of the Canadian Northern statement a memorandum, prepared from records of the Finance Department which I had prepared, showing the disposition of the proceeds of the $45,000,000 of guaranteed securities. I think my hon. friend may assume conclusively that the proceeds on the $45,000,000 of guaranteed securities have been paid out in accordance with the legislation of 1914 and the trust mortgage executed in accordance with its provisions. As to the proposed disposition of the $15,000,000, I draw his attention to page 8, on which appears the most important statement in this document, because it shows the immediate financial situation of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. So far as the funded debt is concerned, of course the securities have been placed, but the urgency of the situation of the Canadian Northern Company's system is shown by the statement on the lower part of page 8, that is the memorandum re liabilities, April 15, 1916. All the liabilities shown in this statement are either short date securities, one-year or two-year, or obligations current; and it is particularly to the latter that I now draw my hon. friend's attention. He will observe that apart from the London loans and the Canadian loans, and the two-year and one-year notes, representing respectively $29,400,000, $16,200,000 and $14,000,000, there are the following items:

10 p.m.

Bills payable—advances on construction of main line and branch lines..		$ 7,300,000
Temporary loans covering interest, construction, betterments and equipment..	$19,925,345	
Less receivable from proceeds of securities, etc., applicable in reduction of the above..	3,529,929	16,395,416

Then, on the top of the next page and embraced in the same statement, we have amounts owing to contractors, subcontractors, estimated, material accounts, etc., $5,912,407 and sundry accounts, capital account, coupon warrants, making an aggregate of $13,997,338. From this they deduct cash on hand, receivable, materials, supplies, etc., $10,780,389, leaving a balance of $3,216,940. Now, if my hon. friend will add together the $7,300,000 representing bills payable; the temporary loans less the amount receivable from proceeds of securities applicable in respect thereof, amounting to $16,395,416; the contractors estimates amounting to $5,912,407; and the balance of $3,216,940 in the last statement; he will find the immediate financial situation with which the Canadian Northern Railway system is confronted, aggregating $32,000,000. As I explained to the hon. member for South Renfrew—and I filed a letter in connection with this—the Canadian Northern Company have certified that, so far as the contractors' and subcontractors' estimates, monthly accounts, etc., were concerned, with the cash which remained on balance in the trust account and the financial resources which they had, apart from the $15,000,000, they would be able to meet that situation. Therefore what they are confronted with is a $7,300,000 situation and a $16,395,416 situation; in other words, $24,000,000. To put the Canadian Northern in a position in which its current obligations would be taken care of, would require, not $15,000,000, but $24,000,000.

Mr. NESBITT: Less the $10,000,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, the $10,000,000 does not entef. I am adding the $7,300,000 and the $16,395,416, making $24,000,000. That is the immediate financial situation with which, as I have stated, they are confronted. My hon. friend has asked me what are the details. So far as the $7,300,000 is concerned, that is perfectly clear, because that is represented by the balance payable by the company on account of the advances on construction of main line and branch lines. Then there are the temporary loans, aggregating $19,925,345—less receivable from the proceeds, $3,529,929; leaving $16,395,416—made up in this way: Construction—completion of main line and certain branches which were under construction, when war broke out, including interest on securities issued on same and ranking prior to the $45,000,000 guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada, $14,612,477.51; less receivable from the proceeds of securities, etc., applicable in reduction of the above, $3,529,929; leaving a balance on that account of $11,082,548.51.

The construction of terminals, grade separation, Port Kells branch, and other capital expenditure, represent $1,846,867.49; and principal of equipment notes, $3,466,000, making a total of $16,395,416, as exhibited in these statements. My hon. friend asked what securities were in priority to the Dominion $45,000,000 securities.

Mr. NESBITT: I asked what was the amount of interest due.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In reality, all the securities of the Canadian Northern Railway system, with the exception of income convertible debenture stock, rank in priority to the securities of $45,000,000 which were issued under the Dominion guarantee by virtue of the legislation of 1914. I stated the other day that the entire fixed charges of the Canadian Northern system, which would include the interest upon the $45,000,000 were about $15,000,000 in round figures. I stated further that on July 1, by reason of the interest upon the $45,000,000 securities guaranteed, and upon the $35,000,000 securities, guaranteed under the legislation of 1911, which would be assumed by the Dominion Government for a period of three years, commencing this year, and by reason of a similar agreement in British Columbia, under which the Government of that Province will pay interest for a period of three years upon the securities which it has guaranteed upon the Canadian Northern Pacific, the fixed charges, or net earnings of the Canadian Northern system would be reduced from $15,000,000 by the amount of $4,500,000. That is to say, for the coming year the fixed charge will be about $11,000,000, instead of $15,000,000, because the Dominion Government and the Government of British Columbia will be obliged to pay $4,500,000 in interest.

Mr. NESBITT: Do you defer these interest payments?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The interest payments as they come along will be taken care of by the company if they are able to take care of them; but I assume from the statement of estimated earnings, which I laid on the Table to-night, and which is certified by Mr. D. H. Hanna, the general manager of the system, that the railway company will be able to meet its fixed charges if there is taken into consideration the fact that the Dominion Government and the Government of British Columbia pay $4,500,000 a year for the next three years.

To come to the application of the $15,000,000 which we are loaning to the Canadian Northern Company, I stated that it was the minimum amount. I pointed out the fact that there were $32,000,000 of immediate obligations, not funded at all, confronting the Canadian Northern Railway Company. There are two bearings to that. In the first place, the amount is exceedingly large, and they are unable to obtain more money because they have not the securities to pledge. Further, in the renewal of their notes, one year notes and two year notes, the question will at once arise when they come to renew these notes—and they must renew part of them this year—what about your unfunded debt, what about your immediate liabilities? The first question that is asked a railway company, or indeed any company, when it comes to put out an issue of securities, whether for long or short terms, is what is your financial position? The financial position of the Canadian Northern is that it has some $32,000,000 of liabilities. It is true that it has money in trust accounts and resources which will enable it to take care of the contractors' and subcontractors' estimates; but the remaining situation, some $24,000,000 or $25,000,000, is immediate, and consequently the $15,000,000 is, in my view, and in their view, and I think it will be in the view of any man looking fairly at this statement, the minimum amount with which they can hope to finance the company. It would take at least $25,000,000 instead of $15,000,000 to clear up these current obligations which they are not able to fund, and to replace which they are not able to effect new loans because they have no securities. We are not making them as large a loan as would completely restore their financial position. We are making them the loan of $15,000,000, and we say to them: "you have got to finance with that for the coming year until we have this investigation and are able to look into the whole situation." They cannot get on with less than $15,000,000, and they have still this situation confronting them. I would like to say that the $15,000,000 which we propose to loan could be applied, under the terms of the estimate, in payment of any items to which I have referred, or partly so, namely, the temporary loans, covering interest, construction, betterments, and equipment, or to the liquidation of the balance payable in respect to advances or to the liquidation of the balance payable in respect of advances on construction on the main line and branch lines. We are not going to clear up the entire situation, but if we make them this

loan they will be able by renewing loans and replacing loans, having this situation in regard to current liabilities, to finance during the coming year. That is the position.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Does the minister propose to pay contractors who are indebted out of this money?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The contractors who are unpaid will be paid by the Canadian Northern Railway out of moneys in trust against the $35,000,000 mortgage and the $45,000,000 mortgage to which I have referred. There is a credit balance at present to the account of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company $35,000,000 mortgage trust account of $1,301,719.70.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Why is that not used to pay these unfortunate contractors?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Just one moment, please. Then, in connection with the Canadian Northern $45,000,000 mortgage of 1914, there is a credit balance as of May 1, of $4,344,761. On the statement of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, corroborated by records in my own department, there is money lying to the credit of this trust account available for payment on construction account in accordance with the terms of these mortgages. My hon. friend from Calgary asks me why the Canadian Northern Railway does not pay the contractors. Personally I am not aware of the contractors being unpaid.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: On the Canadian Northern Ontario?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not aware of it. This afternoon it was brought to my attention by a couple of sub-contractors, who said that they had not been paid by the principal contractors; but they were unable to tell me whether the Canadian Northern had paid the main contractors or not. But, as I had heard that there are accounts owing to contractors by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, I took the matter up in connection with this transaction with the Canadian Northern, and I am only repeating to my hon. friend from Calgary the assurance which has been given me, that out of the proceeds of these trust accounts and the available cash resources they would make payment of the indebtedness to the contractors. But it must be borne in mind that, although this money would be expended in that way, if there was a disputed account between a contractor and the Canadian Northern Railway Company, they said that they would not necessarily pay the contractors the full amount that he claimed. It may well be that where they are in agreement they will say: "We owe you a certain amount, and we will pay you the amount that we admit we owe you;" but if there is a disputed account I do not think it is incumbent upon me to usurp the functions of the court and say: "You must pay the contractor the full amount that he claims." If the claim is right they ought to pay it; but if there is a bona fide dispute the only way to settle it is to refer it to the arbitrament of the courts. But, in connection with this transaction which we are now considering, the Canadian Northern claim that they will be able to pay the contractors out of money and the proceeds of resources which they have available.

Mr. NESBITT: I would much rather they did the financing than I. With respect to the $15,000,000, as against $25,000,000, has the minister gone into the matter far enough to be able to say that the $15,000,000 will enable them to finance for the year?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would be disposed to agree with my hon. friend, on the statement presented, that I would much rather they did the financing than myself; in fact, I indicated that in my speech of yesterday. At the same time they believe that if they get this loan of $15,000,000 to clear up their temporary obligations they will be able to renew their short date securities and finance during the year. It is upon that understanding that we are making the advance of $15,000,000. If it were not so we should either increase the amount or decline to make the loan. But they are satisfied that they can renew existing loans or make new loans, so that they can get the situation cleared up to the extent that we propose, but it does not by any means liquidate the temporary situation.

Mr. OLIVER: I notice on page 8, under the heading of "Canadian Northern Railway System," the audited statement of:

> Bills payable—advance on construction of main line and branch lines, $7,300,000.

How far does that amount of $7,300,000 come into this transaction under consideration now, or does it come in at all.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It might, because it represents indebtedness incurred on con-

struction account. The Canadian Northern received advances with which it paid contractors who had done work upon the line or paid for material used in construction. They gave notes for that liability, but that money has all been paid to the contractors or for material, and the bills payable are outstanding and represent indebtedness.

Mr. OLIVER: What particular branch lines are those upon which this work was done?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I cannot say offhand. I may be able to find out, but I would doubt it, because I should think these advances were made probably either last year, or a year and a half ago, probably since the 1914 legislation in respect to construction, some of the accounts would be paid off, accounts would be adjusted from time to time, notes given and renewed or paid off, as the case might be. I doubt if it would be possible to say precisely with respect to what line the notes had been given, but I may be able to do it.

Mr. OLIVER: The point is that the loan going through now represents payment in some degree for work done on branch lines. It is not confined to the main line, as was the contention when the guarantee was going through two years ago. Therefore there is no question of principle that excludes from consideration the branch lines which they brought to the attention of the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I assume that in the accounting the money might be applied to the indebtedness incurred by expenditures made upon branch lines, and in such case the mortgage is to cover not only the undertaking of the Canadian Northern but to further secure the amount expended upon the branch lines. But my hon. friend will not fail to gather this from the statement, or from what I have said, that in this particular case the money has been actually expended, and the Canadian Northern is confronted with the situation that it has these outstanding bills payable in respect to construction which has been done and which it has paid for by advances for which it has given promissory notes. I entirely followed what my hon. friend said a few moments ago, but I would point out to him that if the $15,000,000 is required by virtue of the present financial situation, then the Canadian Northern would not be able to build further branch lines, or to make expenditures upon such branch lines, unless the Dominion Government gave a loan in excess of $15,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER: Quite so.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We are not proposing to do that at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER: That is what we should do.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not know about that. There is nothing to hinder the Government or Legislature of Alberta tomorrow from giving further aid to secure the prompt building of these lines by way of subsidy or guarantee. The Dominion Government has this war on its hands, and the financing of this Dominion is about the heaviest burden in this country to-day. Our banks are doing well, our financial institutions are in a stronger position than they have been for some years, the credit of the provinces is good, the credit of the municipalities is good; but the Dominion Government has to-day the burden of this war and will have it in the future. I do not say that we should not have the burden of the war; the burden of the war falls squarely where it ought to fall, that is to say, on the federal treasury.

But the point I am making is that if the construction of these roads is as urgent as my hon. friend has pointed out—and I believe he is right with regard to some of them—then it might be a proper thing for the Government of Alberta to come forward and, by granting subsidies or by giving additional securities, provide for completion of the lines. I have not answered my hon. friend, because I do not think it advisable to do so, with regard to a matter of alleged collusion which prevented these lines from being built. To me there is a very simple explanation why the Canadian Northern railway has not built these lines up to the present time, although the money to proceed with their construction lies, as stated by my hon. friend from Assiniboia, in the bank. The simplest explanation is this financial statement that I have been expounding to the House. In view of that statement, how could the Canadian Northern railway raise additional money for the purpose of constructing lines? And even if the money left lying in the bank were sufficient to construct the lines, would the Canadian Northern railway, at this particular juncture in their affairs, confronted with the situation as disclosed by this balance sheet, be justified in starting these

lines knowing that, as soon as they were completed, the company would have the burden of carrying whatever deficit there was upon their operation, until such time as they became profitable.

Mr. OLIVER: Not starting lines, but completing lines already started.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Even completing lines, and facing the deficit which they would have to meet upon them until they became profitable. I think with my hon. friend that it is very desirable that the sections he mentions should be reached. But railway companies, like individuals, have to do the best they can in the situation which confronts them, and the Canadian Northern railway, like the Grand Trunk Pacific, is to-day confronted with a situation in which they are not able to raise by the sale or pledge of securities the amount of money necessary to complete those lines. Nor are they able to face the financial situation which they would have to face by reason of the increase in their obligations due to deficits upon the operations of those lines. It seems to me that if the province of Alberta thinks it of great public interest that these lines should be completed, it might very well come to the assistance of the Canadian Northern railway. As far as the Dominion Government is concerned, I think that at this juncture, considering the obligations devolving upon us and the immense burdens of this war, increasing as they are from day to day, we are bearing all the burdens for the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern railway that we should be asked to bear. I believe these are the minimum amounts which will enable these two companies to continue solvent until we can deal in some permanent fashion with the railway situation.

Mr. OLIVER: I hope the minister will revise one phrase he used to-night. I understood him to say that although the Canadian Northern railway had money in its treasury, raised on the credit of the province, it would not be warranted in spending that money in completing the bargain it had made with the province.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I did not say that. I proceeded upon the assumption that the money is not sufficient to build and equip the lines. What I was referring to was the additional amount the Canadian Northern will have to raise in order to complete the lines.

Mr. OLIVER: I am very glad that the minister did not mean to convey the idea as I understood it, because it struck me as being a very serious statement for a Finance Minister to make. At any rate the position is this: He does justify the company in withholding from expenditure the money raised upon the credit of the province, when that expenditure is needed from every point of view. I say that that is not a desirable position, and, sorry as I should be to criticise the Finance Minister, I certainly consider his attitude very seriously open to criticism. If I may be permitted to pursue this matter further, because it is a matter of life and death to a portion of the constituency I represent, it is admitted that the Canadian Northern Railway has prosecuted work on some branch lines, and this Government is now prepared to meet the cost of that work without having had direction as to which lines the money should be expended upon. My hon. friend undertakes to draw the distinction between cases in which the company have already spent money, and cases in which the company is absolutely obligated to spend money in order to fulfil their agreements. On page 6 of the printed documents, I find in the list of securities of the Canadian Northern Railway system, under the heading "Guaranteed by Alberta Government," certain mortgage bonds and debenture stock of the Canadian Northwestern Railway—I think that means the Canadian Northern Western—showing an asset in the one case of $6,424,000, and in the other case of $2,799,997.73. If I understand this statement correctly, it is intended that a part of the $15,000,000 loan shall be used to pay the interest on these debentures. Is that right?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The purpose of this statement was to show the extent to which the Dominion and the provinces had given their guarantees. From the statement it would appear that the securities of the Canadian Northwestern Railway have been guaranteed by the province of Alberta and issued to the amount of $18,950,361.99—if the securities have been issued as stated, and I have no doubt they have. The interest would, of course, have to be paid, and to the extent that the Canadian Northern Railway was unable to pay that interest, it would be a charge ranking in priority, I think to the $45,000,000 mortgage, becauses my recollection is that under the legislation of 1914 the stock in this particular company is embraced in part of the mortgage premises.

Mr. OLIVER: As a matter of fact, we are going to vote money to pay the interest on the bonds of the Canadian Northern Western guaranteed by the provincial Government, the money realized from which is not being used to complete the roads. The roads are not completed and by reason of not being completed, are not in a position to earn the interest that would save its being paid by this Government. I think the case is clear beyond question. When this Government is paying the interest on money that was raised by that guarantee, surely, from the standpoint of the Minister of Finance himself, those roads should be completed and put in a position to earn interest, instead of this Parliament being compelled to pay that interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The position of the hon. member for Edmonton is most remarkable. He says that the Government of Alberta has guaranteed certain securities of the Canadian Northern Western railway, that the proceeds of those securities lie in the bank to the credit of the Provincial Treasurer of Alberta, that the company refuse to expend the money, and that the province of Alberta, unfortunately, is not in a position to compel the company to expend it. If that is the case, one of two things is the consequence: Either the province of Alberta made a very improvident bargain with the Canadian Northern, for which the Government of that province is responsible and should be castigated by the hon. member for Edmonton; or else it is impossible to do effective work with the proceeds of those securities; that is to say, it is impossible so to expend them as to make the road complete as to its expenditure. The hon. member for Edmonton must know that money can only be withdrawn from that account and expended provided the road advances to completion with each dollar of expenditure, at such a pace that it will be completed when all the money is gone. Consequently, unless the Canadian Northern Western has additional bonds sufficient to provide for the completion, mile by mile, there is no way by which the Canadian Northern Railway can get the money out.

Mr. OLIVER: Precisely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I suppose the hon. gentleman is arguing that, wherever a province guarantees a certain amount, the Government of this country, if it protects the underlying security, that is guaranteed, must provide sufficient money to complete the road. That would place the Dominion treasury at the mercy of a province. The province could give a small guarantee and then say to the Dominion Government: Now go ahead; we have already, by what we have done, obligated you to complete that road.

Mr. OLIVER: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By our providing money to pay this underlying interest the province of Alberta is not providing it. The province of Alberta had control of the sale of the bonds. They should not have allowed the sale of the bonds until they knew that the company was in a position to complete the road. If they find themselves responsible for interest in the meantime it is their folly, and it is to them the hon. gentleman should go with his castigation. Certain moneys were provided for certain definite purposes by the legislation of 1914. The purposes were all set out item by item —so much to such a road and so much to another; so much for improvements here, so much for improvements there. Included in that were certain appropriations for the Canadian Northern Western, notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian Northern Western, at the request of the hon. member, remained a purely provincial road and outside the jurisdiction of this Parliament. If the hon. gentleman will look at the blue-book brought in 1914 at page 19, he will see that the proceeds of these securities were to go first in payment of contractors' liabilities in the Canadian Northern, and he will find that $1,809,000 for the Canadian Northern Western was included in the $21,000,000 of contractors' liabilities. And, if he turns to the book issued this session, at page 19, he will find that $1,809,697 of that $45,000,000 was to be applied to the discharge of these contractors' liabilities. At page 19 of the blue book of 1914 you find that $310,088 was the amount that was to be expended in new construction on the Canadian Northern Western. On turning to the blue book of this year we find that the following amounts were expended on that construction: $140,042.47 and $174,444.53; total, $314,486.90, or about $4,000 more than was contemplated to be spent in new construction out of the $45,000,000, in addition to discharging the contractors' liabilities against the road. Therefore, so far as the moneys under control of this Parliament are concerned, the Canadian Northern Western get the full benefit of the legisla-

tion of 1914; and if they have not received all that we undertook to do for them, if they still find themselves straitened, their money tied up, and unable to complete their lines, the fault lies at the door of the Government of Alberta, and there is where the hon. gentleman should go with his complaint.

Mr. OLIVER: I cannot follow the hon. gentleman's argument at all. He suggests that, according to my argument, the Government of Alberta, by guaranteeing the bonds of a railway, could obligate this Government to pay interest on the bonds. I said nothing so absurd, nothing could have been further from my ideas than what the hon. gentleman has seen fit to attribute to me. The Government of Alberta has guaranteed the bonds of other companies besides the Canadian Northern. It has guaranteed the bonds of the Great Waterways railway. There is no way by which this Government can be held responsible, directly or indirectly, for that provincial guarantee of bonds. But that is a different matter altogether from the Alberta Government's guarantee of the bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway upon lines which this Government took as a security for the guarantee given by it to the Canadian Northern, assuming proprietorship to the extent of actually paying the interest on the bonds. If this Government undertakes to pay the interest on the bonds issued in respect of these partially-completed railroads, I say it is good business on the part of this Government to make such further arrangements, even if it involves the payment of money, as will secure the completion of these roads and put them on an earning basis, so that, instead of Parliament having to pay interest, the traffic of the road will pay interest. That is my argument, and I am very sorry that I am not able to get the Government to see what I regard as an eminently fair and commonsense, as well as necessary, proposition.

Mr. TURRIFF: A little while ago the Minister of Finance pointed out that the proceeds of the guarantee of 1914 had gone into the road. Has he any record or statement to show how much of the proceeds of that $45,000,000—some $36,000,000, I think—was paid to construction companies and sub-contractors that were owned and controlled by Mackenzie & Mann?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not aware of any. The Comptroller of the Railway Department conducted an audit which, in my belief, was thorough, in which all vouchers were inspected and a complete examination made before these moneys were paid over. A more complete audit I could not imagine. His instructions were to see that the money was applied in strict accordance with the terms of the Act. Personally, I am perfectly satisfied that the proceeds of this $45,000,000 loan, paid over on the certificate of Major Bell, who is here to-night, and who did his work, in my judgment, most carefully and thoroughly, were properly paid out under the terms of the legislation of 1914 and the trust mortgage. It was pointed out in 1914 that Mackenzie & Mann were the contracting agents for the Canadian Northern, that they made contracts with sub-contractors and purchased materials, and they built the line; and it was the accounts of the sub-contractors and for the materials which went into the line that were audited by Major Bell. Major Bell tells me that in this matter he went below Mackenzie & Mann, acting as the construction department of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and inspected and audited the vouchers representing payments made to sub-contractors and for materials. Personally, I have not the slightest doubt that the money was properly applied.

Mr. TURRIFF: That statement does not answer my question. All through the construction of the Canadian Northern from beginning to end this Government and the previous also, so far as I know, have handed over to Mackenzie and Mann, or the Canadian Northern Railway, millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars by way of bonuses and guarantees, and no proper care has been taken to see that the money went into the railroads.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does my hon. friend say that this Government took no proper care in that respect?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, that is exactly what I say.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What more proper care could have been taken than to provide by legislation that the money should be disposed of in a certain way and for certain specific purposes, and then to have a very competent official of the Railway Department audit and investigate all accounts and payments made before paying over the money? I have been familiar with the payment out of money on construction account for very many years in connection with business, and I do not

know any more strict system of supervision than is exercised by the Railway Department and the Finance Department in the payment of money under the provision of trust deeds securing mortgage issues of railway companies guaranteed by the Dominion Government. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying here to-night that I believe every cent of the money that was provided under the guarantee of 1911 under the late Government and of the $45,000,000 guaranteed under this Government has been properly applied for the purposes for which these moneys were designated by Parliament. The payment out of the money under the $45,000,000 mortgage has been precisely on the same principle as the money was paid out under the $35,000,000 mortgage for which my hon. friend the member for South Renfrew was responsible as Minister of Railways in the late Government.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not doubt it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will not be able to say that any different principle has been applied, nor will the hon. member for South Renfrew, I am sure, admit that the provision which he made under the mortgage relating to the $35,000,000 guarantee upon the Canadian Northern Railway Company in 1911 was inadequate to protect the public which it was his duty to protect.

Mr. TURRIFF: All I can say is this: That practically from the beginning to the end of the construction of the Canadian Northern railway the contractors for construction were Mackenzie and Mann, who let the work out to sub-contractors. Is there any hon. member on either side of the House who does not believe that Mackenzie and Mann as contractors took many millions of dollars out of the moneys proceeding from the securities disposed of on account of the subsidies and guarantees by the provinces and by the Dominion? If the money received from the securities issued on these railroads to the Canadian Northern Railway Company had all gone into the railroads, the company would not be here to-day asking for more aid, because the money would have completed the roads and put them in proper shape. My hon. friend talks about the wonderful audit made by the Railway Department. Well, I am not much of a hand at auditing, but I notice that while the agreement was made in the middle of July, 1914, on September 12, less than a month afterwards, a certificate was given for $12,500,000. I do not think that any audit worth talking about could have been made in that time of an expenditure of $12,500,000 in the construction of a railway. The certificates follow in order one after another, so that I do not pay very much attention to an office audit of that kind. It may be all right, but it is more likely to be all wrong. I understand that the proceeds of the $45,000,000 were only some $36,000,000. Am I correct in that?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: $36,000,000 odd.

Mr. TURRIFF: Here we have bonds guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada that are worth only a trifle over 80 cents on the dollar. There must be something wrong in that. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has been borrowing money at 5 per cent. Of course, these bonds were at 4 per cent; that would make some difference. At all events, they realized a very poor percentage, and I think if we knew exactly what became of that $36,000,000 we would find that Mackenzie and Mann got a big percentage of it for their purposes. That has been their history from the beginning; to get guarantees and subsidies to build railroads. I will acknowledge that their main line is a pretty fair line.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What beginning does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. TURRIFF: Although my hon. friend is a very young man, he is old enough to know when Mackenzie and Mann began to build railroads.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In 1896.

Mr. TURRIFF: From the beginning to the end, that has been their practice; to get bonuses and guarantees and then issue, to any one who would purchase their bonds securities for a great deal more than ever went into the road. As I was about to say, the main line is not a bad road; I have been over it. But so far as the branch lines are concerned, I know that the proceeds of the bonds they sold, which were guaranteed by the provinces, let alone any other securities they issued on these roads, were far more than enough to build the class of road that they have built. Although they have milked the money out of these railroads and put it in outside private interests, when my hon. friend gave the guarantee of $45,000,000 in 1914 and took a mortgage the outside securities were not put in at all. On that occasion the railway company ap-

peared to satisfy this Government that the $45,000,000 would see them through. That was the argument two years ago; what is the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and of the Solicitor General to-night? They bring down a statement and they show that $15,000,000 is the lowest amount that they can get through with. I think the Minister of Finance is right, because here is $92,000,000 of short date indebtedness. In the name of common sense, if this company is $92,000,000 behind, over and above all the securities that they have issued, what is the use of this Government pouring more money into it, especially when we do not know that all this money is going into the railroad? Although we are responsible to-day for the $45,000,000 guarantee that was given two years ago, of which it is said that $36,000,000 has gone into the road, I doubt if more than $25,0000,000 has gone into the road.

My hon. friend comes forward to-day with a proposition to hand them out another $15,000,000. But if I understand anything about the figures put in our hands, that will not be all we will have to pay this year. Am I right in figuring from this point that in addition to this $15,000,000 we will have to pay interest on that $45,000,000?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, and upon the $35,000,000 guarantee which my hon. friend voted for in 1911.

Mr TURRIFF: $80,000,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF: So that, in addition to the $15,000,000 loan, we will have to pay the interest on the $80,000,000 guaranteed in 1911 and 1914, which will be about $3,000,000. So that this year we will have to pay out $15,000,000 plus $3,000,000, that is, $18,000,000 to the Canadian Northern Railway. We know where the $3,000,000 for interest will go of the $15,000,000; but we do not know where all of it will go. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance may be a clever man at handling money, and I give him credit for his ability; but I want to tell him he is not clever enough for the job he has in hand, to see that all that money goes through the hands of Mackenzie and Mann and gets to the right spot, and that none of it is diverted to their own purposes, on any of their side issues.

Mr. BENNETT: They will not get their hands on it.

Mr. TURRIFF: If my hon. friend can do that and can show us that he has done so at the next session, I will give him more credit than I give him to-night, much as I respect his financial ability.

Where is this going to end? The company, according to their own showing, have $92,000,000 of present liabilities. And they are not satisfied with these present liabilities. These men are never satisfied unless they are branching out in all directions. During this session, as you know, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Blain), as chairman of the railway committee, we spent weeks and weeks up there fighting—why? Because 11 p.m. this same railway company, in spite of their bankrupt condition, were bound to get their grip over the western part of Ontario and insisted on building lines there that the Government of the province of Ontario wanted to attend to. And their representative, I think the general manager and third vice-president, insisted that they had the money to build these roads. If they had the money to build these roads in Ontario that would cost tens of millions of dollars, why should they come to this Government and get $15,000,000 and $3,000,000 from the Prime Minister? That is something that has not been answered yet. There is something wrong somewhere, when they have millions of dollars to invest in Ontario, against the wishes of the people of Ontario to build roads which the people of Ontario want to build, and they have not a dollar to pay their debts, and they come to this Government to get this money, and this Government proposes to hand it over to them and get nothing at all for it. They are taking a mortgage. Well, I do not know what good a second, or third, or fourth, or fifth mortgage may be. I would not consider that that $15,000,000 mortgage, when it is completed and registered, would be worth $5. I would not give $5 for it, because in my time or in my children's time it will not be worth a $5 bill, with the interest.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The autograph signature of William Mackenzie would be worth that.

Mr. TURRIFF: That would be the only thing I would value the mortgage for, the autograph signature of William Mackenzie. I would not mind this so much if I could see any end to it; but just as long as this Government or any other Government of Canada will hand out money to Mackenzie & Mann every time they ask for it, so long will they come here demanding that money,

and you may as well face the music to-day as at any other time. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has told us what this war has cost us and what it is going to cost us, and we all know that this war will last for some time. Will we be in a better position to deal with this matter a year from now, or two years from now, than we are to-day, after handing over this money and thus adding to the road's liabilities and not adding much to its value? To my mind it is a case that calls for courage and skillful handling; and you are not going to better the condition by putting off the evil day. If I thought so I would offer no objection to this loan. But it seems to me that we are just going deeper and deeper into the mud, and we shall ultimately have to take the road over; there is no question about that. I venture the assertion that the statement presented to us does not begin to represent the condition of the road, and that if this road should go into the hands of a receiver, and the receiver's auditors went through the company's books and found out the exact position of the road, a very different state of affairs would be disclosed. That is the objection I make to pouring this money into the pockets of the road when we do not know anything, or at least very little, about its true condition. An hon. member asked where we would be in the course of a few years if things took a turn for the good. We might get our money back. In the meantime the Government has 40 per cent of the common stock of the road, and I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and the Solicitor General that on this occasion, when we are coming to the rescue of the Government—

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is scarcely that.

Mr. TURRIFF: Almost that, for in my judgment the Government is in just about as precarious a position as the Canadian Northern Railway is in. I meant to say that now that the Government is coming to the rescue of the Canadian Northern Railway, I ask the ministers if they are taking the precaution to make the Canadian Northern hand over their common stock—not that it is worth anything in the meantime in the way of cash value. But I ask if they are taking the precaution to make the road hand over a least a controlling interest in that common stock, so that when they come to deal with the road in the future, they will not be dictated to in the way the Canadian Northern is able to dictate to this or any other Government that may be in power, under present conditions. Now is the opportunity to do it. Is my hon. friend going to do anything of that kind? The Government can get that common stock if they insist on it. It is not, as I said, worth anything in cash to-day, but it would give the Government of Canada, after putting up this extra $15,000,000, control of the road whenever they wanted to take it, and it might save a great deal of trouble in the very near future If $92,000,000 of debt is standing against the road, short date debts, and the company ran behind to the extent of $10,000,000 last year—

Mr. MEIGHEN: $6,000,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: — if the company ran behind to that extent last year, when we had a most phenomenal crop, and when the Canadian Northern handled a very large percentage of that crop, how can the Government expect better things next year or the following year? It is altogether unlikely that we shall have such a crop as that of last year during the next five years. This year the acreage is very much less, and even supposing you were to have a yield—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman forgets that last year, so far as the railway company is concerned, ended in June, 1915, and there could not be very much of the crop shipped at that time.

Mr. TURRIFF: In that case they would not have the benefit of the large crop, and that benefit will come within the present financial year. But I think I heard the Minister of Finance give an estimate which did not show that the company were likely to be in a very fine position even with the handling of that crop. I asked the Minister of Finance yesterday if he could give any information as to what it would cost to complete the road, that is to put the branch lines in shape so that they could do business profitably. Many of the branch lines cannot do business in the winter time, and cannot earn profits in the condition in which they are. A railway company cannot make profits on a road that is tied up by snow and frost for weeks and months at a time. I agree with what my hon. friend from Edmonton has said. I will not speak for many of the provinces except Saskatchewan, but I venture the assertion that there is not a branch line of the Canadian Northern in Saskatchewan which, if completed, and put in anything like decent shape, will not earn operating expenses and

interest on the cost of the road—I will not say interest on the securities that have been issued against the road, but interest on every dollar that went into the building and equipment of the road.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why do the Grand Trunk branch lines not pay interest?

Mr. TURRIFF: I think that their branch lines in Saskatchewan will pay interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not one of them.

Mr. TURRIFF: They will earn operating expenses and interest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Only two of them earn operating expenses the rest show a deficit in that respect, and not one of them pays interest.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend is probably taking only what the branch line itself earns, but he probably knows enough about railway matters, since he has been a pupil of the Canadian Northern for two or three years, to know that a branch line is entitled to a certain amount more than is earned on the line itself, because it supplies traffic to the main line.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then how is it that the main line is losing and is not paying operating expenses?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Grand Trunk Pacific statement shows earnings amounting to $600,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On one part. But there is a deficit on the other part, and there is a net deficit of $200,000, or a deficit of $500 a day for every day of operation, without a cent for interest. I am taking it altogether. Even on the prairie division the earnings are a small fraction.

Mr. PUGSLEY: $600,000 is not a small fraction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a very small fraction of the debt. Will the hon. gentleman fit that into his argument?

Mr. TURRIFF: There is not branch of the Canadian Northern railway in the province of Saskatchewan that I have been over, and I have been over a great many, that will not earn operating expenses and interest, and that will not earn interest on every dollar that went into the building of the road. I do not say that they will earn interest on all the securities that are charged up against them, because when you charge up $20,000 of securities a mile on branch lines on the prairie and you only put in from $10,000 to $12,000, or perhaps $15,000 a mile—

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the case of the Grand Trunk it is $42,000 a mile.

Mr. TURRIFF: That may be, but the branch lines of the Grand Trunk are very different from the branch lines of the Canadian Northern. In most cases the Canadian Northern branch lines are very cheaply built, and they are charged up with securities to the extent of from $20,000 to $25,000 a mile.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not quite.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, $20,000 a mile. There was a railroad built by the city of Winnipeg from Winnipeg east within the last couple of years, and the only difference between the construction of that road and the construction of the branch lines on the prairie by the Canadian Northern is that the rails are somewhat lighter. They have a 60-pound rail, and in some cases the branch lines may have rails over 60 pounds. That road was built and equipped, as far as was necessary, for $12,000 a mile, or about half of what is charged up on the Canadian Northern, proving what I say that the money that this Government and the local Governments have advanced, as well as the proceeds of securities not guaranteed by either, has been switched from the Canadian Northern altogether, and put into concerns in Mexico, Toronto and elsewhere, and has gone into the pockets of the promoters of these enterprises. Now they come forward, and they do not put up one cent of their money. They did not put up anything two years ago when they came and asked for a guarantee. The Government gave that guarantee, and took no precautions to see that the money all went into the road, and now the company comes forward again and says: You must give us more money or we will throw the road on your hands. They came and held the Government up, and now the Government says: Well, we will give you $15,000,000 more and pay $3,000,000 of interest. That is the position of affairs to-day, and next year it will be just as bad, and perhaps worse. What are you going to do about it? Why not face the music like men? The war is not going to be over next year; certainly our war expenditure will not be over, and what better position can we expect to be in? We will have $300,000,000 or perhaps $400,000,000 more of debt than we have to-day, and we will be

in a worse position to deal with this question. It is a most serious matter. Inside of five years Canada will have from one and a half billions to two billion dollars of debt to face. These two railroads will have to be looked after in some way, and if the Government takes them over, or keeps on fathering them, we will be liable for the whole business; and we will have from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 of fixed charges and interest to pay every year. The situation will be worse if you let Mackenzie & Mann handle the Canadian Northern. If you are going to give them the money, why not give it in such a manner that you will have some control. I do not like the idea of Government ownership; I have no use for it if it can be avoided; but there may be a worse thing than Government ownership. According to my idea, it is a worse thing to pour money in and let somebody else handle it just as it suits him while you take the liability, and while you are not sure that all the money goes into the road. That is the position we are in to-day, and I think the Government ought to reconsider their attitude in regard to the matter. There might be some excuse for going to the rescue of these two roads because the Dominion and the provinces have so much in them, but what excuse is there for voting millions, either money or guaranteed bonds, to take over two roads in Quebec and to add to the Intercolonial that is losing money every year, simply to help out a political friend at a time when Canada cannot afford to put $1,000,000, or $4,000,000, in cash or securities into these roads? It is bad enough to help out the roads that the Government has some liability for, but to shoulder new liabilities where the Government has no responsibility whatever is one of the most criminal things that a government could do considering the financial position that Canada is in to-day.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11.20.

Wednesday, May 10, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PRIVATE BILL.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILL.

Bill No. 102, for the relief of Martha Isabella Kenny.—Mr. Nickle.

[Mr. Turriff.]

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

EMPLOYEES IN DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. How many employees were there in the following departments, on the first of July, 1895: Public Works, Interior, Finance, Post Office, Justice, Agriculture, Marine and Fisheries, Mines, Customs, Railways and Canals, Public Printing and Inland Revenue?

2. How many employees were there in the said departments on the first of October, 1911?

Mr. BLONDIN:

Public Works: 1. 1,587—2. 4,690.

Interior: 1. 279—2. 1,893.

Finance: 1. Inside service, 33; outside service, 27; temporary employees, 11, total, 71—2. Inside service, 83; outside service, 29; temporary employees, 8, total, 120.

Post Office: 1. Inside service, 285; outside service, 1,726, total, 2,011—2. Inside service, 549; outside service, 4,342, total, 4,891.

Justice: 1. 345. 2. 519.

Agriculture: 1. 172. 2. 807.

Marine: 1. 2,609. 2. 7,269.

Mines: Geological Survey Department: 1. Permanent, 32; temporary, 16, total, 48—Mines Department: 2. Permanent, 118; temporary, 39, total, 157. The Department of Mines (Geological Survey and Mines Branch) was created April 27, chap. 29, 6-7 Edward VII.

Customs: 1. Outside service, 1,313; inside service, 33, total, 1,346—2. Outside service, 2,265; inside service, 206, total, 2,471.

Railways and Canals: 1. 6,726—2. 14,082.

Printing Bureau: 1. 431—2. 865.

Inland Revenue: 1. 479—2. 671.

SAGUENAY RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What has been the total cost of improving the channels from Point Roches, River Saguenay, to Chicoutimi, and during what years were such operations carried on?

2. Is it a fact that the resident engineer at Chicoutimi reports the least depth of water in the channel at low water spring tide is now 14 feet?

3. Has any official chart been published or issued of the said channel?

4. Has any official notice been issued to mariners as to the depth of water in the said channels?

5. Is it a fact that in the case of a Quebec pilot, whose license also takes in the Saguenay, that his duties cease on arrival at the anchorage of Point Roches, eight miles from Chicoutimi, when inward bound to that port, and do not commence until the vessel has reached the same place, outward bound from Chicoutimi?

6. Is it a fact that the reason the pilots

give for such action is that the channel has not been declared officially opened?

7. Do the steamers of the Canada Steamship Company refuse to recognize the channels as other than Half Tide channels, on the ground that the depth in said channels has not been officially declared?

8. Will the channels be officially declared open this season? If not, why not?

Mr. BLONDIN:

Fiscal year.	Cu. yd.	Price.	amount.
1907-08..	8	$2 65	
	41,054	34	$14,070 78
1908-09..	64,615	32½	22,851 17
1909-10..	112,609	32½	37,410 93
1910-11..	152,875	21¾	33,329 10
1911-12..	184,022	32½	
	165	2 50	60,292 41
1912-13..	17	2 50	
	249,425	32½	81,741 21
1913-14..	30,600	32½	*9,769 50
	34,300	32½	11,147 50
1914-15..	6,006	32½	1,951 95
Total..			$272,564 55

*Chicoutimi wharf.

Departmental Dredging Plant.

Fiscal year.	Dredge.	Cu. yd.	Cost.
1904-05.. ..	No. 110	1,500	$ 172 50
	Lady Minto, etc.	141,100	31,094 78
1905-06.. ..	No. 110	62,500	27,125 00
1906-07.. ..	No. 116	37,800	9,639 00
1907-08	No. 116	101,800	29,861 04
1914-15	No. 116	45,840	20,406 92
Total			$108,299 24
Grand total			$380,863 79

2. The district engineer at Chicoutimi reports that least depth below extreme low water is 10 feet.

3. The British Admiralty have published chart No. 1370 of the Saguenay river and approaches. This chart may be purchased from the Admiralty or Admiralty agents. A Canadian chart covering area from St. Fulgence to Chipshaw on the Saguenay river is under preparation by the Department of the Naval Service, and will be published in a few months. This chart may, upon publication, be purchased from the Department of Naval Service, or from the agents of the Marine Department.

4. No.

5. The Pilotage Regulations provide for pilotage on the Saguenay river from Tadoussac at the mouth of the Saguenay, to Chicoutimi, and from Chicoutimi to Tadoussac, and the fact that the department pays the pilots' board at Chicoutimi and did so off and on all last season would indicate that the pilots do go to Chicoutimi. The department has no information that the pilotage of vessels outward bound is undertaken by the pilots only at Point Roches, eight miles from Chicoutimi.

6, 7, and 8. No information.

CLAIM OF REV. D. R. MACDONALD.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Is the Rev. D. R. Macdonald still endeavouring to secure the sum of three thousand dollars, or any sum, for ballot used by the Dominion Government, claiming it is his design?

2. Has the Government paid this, or any sum, to Rev Mr. Macdonald for ballot?

3. If not, does the Government intend to pay this or any other sum to Rev. Mr. Macdonald on account of ballot?

4. Has Rev. Mr. Macdonald received any sum in the past, on account of ballot?

5. If so, how much, and when?

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. The Reverend D. R. Macdonald contends that certain devices covered by a patent issued to him, applicable to ballots used in elections, have been appropriated under the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, 63-64 Victoria, Chapter 12, and the Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, 1 Edward VII, Chapter 16, and that under the provisions of the Patent Act, Chapter 69 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, Section 52, he is entitled to compensation therefor.

2. The Dominion Government paid to the Reverend D. R. Macdonald the sum of $333 in the year 1902, which was not accepted in satisfaction of the above claim.

3. The Government will pay any legal claim which may be established under the Patent Act above referred to.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 2.

MANITOBA SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. CRUISE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to sell any school lands in the province of Manitoba during the year 1916?

2. Are school lands ever sold by private sale?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. It is contemplated holding some auction sales of school lands in the province of Manitoba during the present year, but no definite arrangements have so far been made.

2. School lands are only sold by private sale to railway companies for right of way, station grounds, and other purposes of the railway under the provisions of the Railway Act, to Boards of School Trustees for school sites under the provisions of sub-section 2 of section 39 of the Dominion Lands Act, and for the right of way of pipe lines and reservoirs in connection with irrigation works under the provisions of the Irrigation Act.

WAR SUPPLIES—TRANSPORT TRUCKS.

Mr. McMILLAN:

1. On what date was the contract let for the 300 transport trucks for which the manufacturers were asked to quote prices on February 10?
2. Who were the manufacturers who received the orders and what was the price paid?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. February 12, 1916.
2. Petrolia Wagon Co., Petrolia, Ont., 150 wagons at $118 each; Adams Wagon Co., Brantford, Ont., 150 wagons at $118 each.

OKANAGAN INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER:

What are the names of the Indians of the Okanagan Indian reserve to whom money was paid out of the amount received for right of way from the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and the amount paid to each?

Mr. ROCHE: Herman Gregoire, $752.50; Joseph Jimmy, $703.19; Alexander Chelahitsa, $2,763.50.

STEAMSHIP BALEINE.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Who are the owners of the SS. Baleine, the name of which appears on page ZZ-119, Auditor General's Report?
2. How long has she been in the service of the Government and at what rate per month?
3. What is the size of the ship and what is her port of registry?
4. Of what horse-power are her engines?
5. What amount has been paid to the owners of the said ship from the date of hire to date.
6. Is the said ship still in the service of the Government?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The Lockeport Cold Storage Company.
2. From the 1st Feb., 1915, to date; $3,500 per month, the owners to pay the wages and board of the captain and crew, also provide and pay for engine room and deck stores and oils; time lost from break-down of machinery or hull due to their defectiveness for periods over 24 hours, to be deducted from the amount of hire, the owners to secure and pay for ordinary marine insurance.
3. Length, 159.3 feet; breadth, 26.2 feet; depth, 13.7 feet; St. John's, Newfoundland.
4. 98 nominal.
5. $52,548.93.
6. Yes.

INQUIRIES FOR PAPERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GRAHAM: A few days ago the House passed a motion for the production of a copy of the lease of certain property in North Bay. I think the return has not yet been brought down. It is a small matter, just a copy of the lease. It refers to the Militia Department.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall direct attention to it.

THE BILINGUAL QUESTION.

On the motion of Sir Robert Borden for Committee of Supply:

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, I desire to move the amendment that is in your hands:

That all the words after "that" in the main motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"It has long been the settled policy of Great Britain whenever a country passed under the sovereignty of the Crown by treaty or otherwise, to respect the religion, usages and language of the inhabitants who thus become British subjects;

"That His Majesty's subjects of French origin in the province of Ontario complain that by recent legislation they have been to a large extent deprived of the privilege which they and their fathers have always enjoyed since Canada passed under the sovereignty of the British Crown, of having their children taught in French;

"That this House, especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with."

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion of the hon. member for Kamouraska is an amendment to the motion that I do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply. This amendment contains certain declarations in the nature of a preamble, and asks the House, for certain reasons, to respectfully suggest to a Provincial Legislative Assembly the wisdom of a course of action recommended by the general tenor of the amendment. A point of order has been raised that this amendment is not in order because the subject matter of the amendment is not within the jurisdiction of this Parliament.

It is the duty of your Speaker to enforce, and, subject to your instructions, to administer and interpret the rules and practice enacted and prescribed by your House for the orderly conduct of its business and debates; but the privileges, powers and jurisdiction of the House are matters of the very greatest importance and must be determined by the House itself.

A motion to go into Committee of Supply is parliamentarily of a different nature from other motions in that debate upon it need not be relevant to the motion before the House. Almost any matter can be discussed on the main motion itself. There are, indeed, a few limitations of a strictly technical nature which need not be referred to here (See Bourinot, 3rd ed., p. 585). The present amendment is one asking for an expression of opinion on the part of the House upon a matter of general public interest and need not be relevant nor upon a subject within the legislative powers of this House. As to the nature of amendments which may be made at such a time, May (5th ed., p. 554) says:

> The ancient constitutional doctrine, that the redress of grievances is to be considered before the granting of Supply, is now represented by the practice of permitting every description of amendment to be moved on the question for the Speaker leaving the Chair before going into the Committee of Supply. Upon other orders of the day such amendments must be relevant, but here they are permitted to relate to every question upon which any member may desire to offer a motion.

Bourinot, 3rd ed., on page 583, quotes these observations with approval, and adds:

> The same practice is now followed very extensively in the Canadian Commons.

He cites in support of this statement many pages of the Journals of the House. Bourinot refers to certain limitations of this right, such as that only one amendment may be moved at a time, but he nowhere suggests that such an amendment would be inadmissible because the subject matter was beyond the legislative jurisdiction of the House.

The Journals are replete with instances of amendments of almost every description on going into Supply. These have been debated and voted upon without objection on the grounds either of relevancy or want of jurisdiction.

Members of this House, being here to act in the interest of all Canada, I think it is proper that any of them may bring before it, on the motion to go into Supply, any matter which in his opinion may be detrimental or advantageous to any section of the population.

In my opinion, the point of order is not well taken. By ruling that this amendment is in order, I mean that this House has the right to discuss it, not with the view of depriving a province of what may have been enacted by its legislature, but merely with the view of allowing the House to express its opinion.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings) appealed from the ruling of Mr. Speaker.

The House divided on the question: Shall the ruling of the Speaker be confirmed? And the same was confirmed on the following division:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Achim,	Macdonell,
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Maclean (Halifax),
Armstrong (Lambton),	McCoig,
Armstrong (York, O.),	McCraney,
Arthurs,	McCrea,
Ball,	McCurdy,
Barnard,	McKenzie,
Barrette,	McLean
Bennett (Calgary),	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Bennett (Simcoe),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Best,	Marcile (Bagot),
Blain,	Marshall,
Blondin,	Meighen,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Merner,
Bourassa,	Michaud,
Bowman,	Middlebro,
Brabazon,	Mondou,
Broder,	Morphy,
Bureau,	Morrison,
Burnham,	Munson,
Cardin,	Nesbitt,
Casgrain,	Nicholson,
Charlton,	Nickle,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Pacaud,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Papineau,
Clark (Bruce),	Paquet,
Clarke (Wellington),	Pardee,
Clements,	Patenaude,
Cockshutt,	Paul,
Cromwell,	Proulx,
Crothers,	Pugsley,
Currie,	Rainville,
Davidson,	Reid,
Delisle,	Rhodes,
Demers,	Robb,
Descarries,	Robidoux,
Devlin,	Roche,
Doherty,	Rogers,
Edwards,	Ross,
Elliott,	Schaffner,
Ethier,	Scott,
Fisher,	Seguin,
Fortier,	Sexsmith,
Foster (Sir George),	Sinclair,
Gauthier	Smyth,
(St. Hyacinthe),	Steele,
Gauvreau,	Stevens,
Girard,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Glass,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Graham,	Sutherland,
Gray,	Thoburn,
Green,	Thompson (Yukon),
Guthrie,	Thornton,
Hanna,	Tobin,
Hazen,	Truax,
Henderson,	Turgeon,
Jameson,	Turriff,
Kemp,	Verville,
Lachance,	Walker,
Lafortune,	Wallace,
Lalor,	Warnock,
Lamarche,	Webster,
Lanctot,	Weichel,
Lapointe	White (Sir Thomas),
(Kamourska),	Wilcox,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wilson (Laval),

Lemieux, Loggie, Macdonald, Wilson (Wentworth), Wright—134.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Buchanan, Clark (Red Deer), Cruise, Douglas, Knowles, MacNutt, Northrup, Oliver, Thompson (Qu'Appelle)—9.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, I feel it to be my imperative duty to move this resolution and to invite the discussion of this subject, which is of the utmost importance for the welfare of this country. I assure the right hon. the Prime Minister, for whom I have the greatest respect, that, previous to his appeal of yesterday, I had given to this matter the most earnest and serious consideration. I knew that the course which I had adopted would be disagreeable to many and that I would receive remonstrances and even castigations. For the last few weeks we have been cautioned and warned against approaching this subject in the Dominion Parliament on account of its extreme gravity, lest it should lead to further and more acute dissension between the two great races which compose the majority of the Canadian people. But ignoring difficulties, ignoring problems, is not solving them. On the contrary, I believe it is our duty, as the national representatives of the whole of Canada, to deal with the subject which is embodied in the resolution which I have the honour to move. This question, from its nature, has become a national question. We cannot ignore it. We have to treat it courageously and patriotically. There is no question which affects vitally one section of this country which does not affect the others; especially is that the case when it relates to the language which one-third of the population of this country claim as their birthright.

I earnestly hope that this discussion, instead of being a cause of discord, will promote a better understanding and a closer union between the two races. I do not want to create any ill-feeling, although unfortunately that exists at the present time. I do not want to accentuate any ill-feeling that exists; my purpose is to dispel it. During the last two years Mr. Lloyd George has pleaded in Great Britain for peace at home. That is what we need in Canada also.

It is a coincidence of good omen that this House should be the first assembly in the British Empire to be called upon to endorse and give effect in some way to the wish formulated in the resolution adopted unanimously on the 10th of April last by the British and French inter-parliamentary delegates at the meeting held in London on that date. The resolution, which I have taken from the London Times, reads:

> Believing that the alliance between the French and English peoples will be cemented by a more thorough knowledge on the part of each people of the mind and the literature of the other, the Franco-British Interparliamentary Committee expresses its conviction that the teaching and spelling of the French and the English languages respectively should be, as far as possible, encouraged and developed in both countries, and it commends this subject to the prompt and earnest consideration of the educational authorities and of the teachers in France and in the United Kingdom.

The mover of this resolution, Mr. Franklin Bouillon, gave an interview to the Daily Chronicle, and I take it from the edition of that newspaper of April 11, 1916:

> We think that no solid union can be built up except by the mutual interpretation of mind, said Mr. Franklin Bouillon, referring to the question of the teaching of the English and Franch languages which he had introduced at the conference. That was the only way to bind the two peoples together. The feeling of the whole conference was that such a consummation was absolutely to be desired, and our duty, after what we had learned, was that we the dominions and countries united, should be prepared to make an arrangement in future so that we should be perfectly independent economically just as we have been and would remain politically.

Lord Bryce was the president of the conference, and the resolution, which was carried unanimously, was moved by Mr. Franklin Bouillon and seconded by Sir Henry Craik, M.P.

I said that it was a rather fortunate circumstance that this Canadian Parliament should be the first to be called upon to endorse this resolution of the representatives of the Allied countries, and it is quite appropriate that such should be the case. This Parliament is the greatest bilingual institution in the British Empire, and it is but natural that we should view with favour and approval this new and most fortunate course adopted by the representative leaders of our two great mother countries.

The Canadian Confederation was a compromise. It is certainly to be regretted that periodically questions arise that endanger the work of unity and national harmony which is so essential to the building up and development of a great country. Such questions cannot be avoided;

but it is the duty of Canadian public men to approach and to deal with them in a spirit of tolerance, justice, and liberty. It is impossible to prevent those troublesome questions from being thrown into the political arena; but surely, after fifty years of Confederation, the two branches of the Canadian family must have come of age; they must be able to put aside the fanatics and the demagogues; they must be able to adjust their difficulties and to settle their controversies in that most commendable spirit described by Lincoln: "With malice toward none; with charity for all." Our social fabric is based entirely upon the mutual respect of the rights of the two great Canadian races. This principle is at the very root of our constitution. It is necessary for those who are not familiar with the history of this country that they should be made acquainted with that fact. There is no place in Canada for narrowness of mind or prejudice; indeed, there should be no place for them in any country in the world. Moderation, tolerance, and charity must be the governing principles of all creeds, races, and colours, and the Golden Rule should apply to all.

I do not purpose dealing with the legal and constitutional aspect of the question, although I may refer to it incidentally for the purpose of my argument. This resolution does not recommend the disallowance of any of the provincial laws of Ontario. It does not imply any blame or censure upon the course adopted by the Government in dealing with the petitions praying for the disallowance of that legislation. Indeed, I personally believe that disallowance would have been unwise; the remedy might, perhaps, have increased the disease. Coercion of any kind will not settle the difficulties. I am a true Liberal and a believer in provincial rights. I will go so far as to admit that to be effective and successful any final settlement of this question must be made in Ontario and by Ontario herself. But, Sir, is it not the right of this Parliament, while declining to interfere with the provincial legislation of Ontario by the exercise of the power of disallowance or otherwise, to appeal to the rulers of that province for a generous and peaceful settlement of this disturbing question and for a redress of the grievances of the minority? If the majority would not accept coercion on the part of this Parliament with regard to what they consider to be their provincial rights, how can they expect that the minority will tamely submit to coercion on the part of the provincial Legislature with regard to what the members of the minority also consider to be their most sacred and inalienable rights? Is it not our duty as representatives of the great Canadian family to plead with this member of that family, to ask him who is the big brother to be fair to his little and weaker brother, to be generous with him, to help him along in his struggles and not to quarrel with him? Surely, this is not coercion.

Sir, the French Canadians of Ontario love their language. We all love it. We love it because it is our own language. Let any hon. gentleman, let any man, consult his own personal feeling; let him consult his own heart and he will realize how great is his affection for the language that he learned to speak on the knees of his mother. But we love the French language also because we sincerely feel that it is the sweetest and purest and noblest language which has ever been spoken by human lips. We love it because of its great literature. We love it for its glorious history. We love it because of its clearness, which is so great that a German author is reported to have said: "I am anxious to have my book translated into French in order to understand it better." French, in the words of John Quincy Adams, is the acknowledged neutral language of all refined society; it is the language of diplomacy; its influence is world-wide. The reports of French literary statistics show that one-half of every edition of a French novel is sold outside of France, and that two-thirds of the more serious works are sold in foreign countries. Take the case of my hon. friend the member for Wright (Mr. E. B. Devlin), the seconder of this resolution. My hon. friend is an Irishman who has not a drop of French blood in his veins. Where did he acquire that knowledge and mastery of the French language which he possesses? He acquired it in a college in Great Britain. Let me give an illustration of the real status of the French language in the world. I will quote an article entitled, "French spoken in Berlin," from La Gazette de Lausanne:

3 p.m.

While Berlin is zealously striving to expunge from the German language all those grossly deformed and mutilated terms which they had originally borrowed from ours, French victoriously makes its entry into the capital of the Empire via Constantinople. A Bernese newspaperman who is a friend of ours, returning from a trip to Germany, states

that never was there so much French spoken in the streets and hotels of Berlin. The alliance with Turkey, followed by the Balkan campaign and the revival of intercourse between Berlin and Constantinople, has had the effect of bringing to the capital of Prussia a large number of Orientals entrusted with political and business missions of a more or less definite character. All those people have not as yet had time to learn German, and considering that, since the outbreak of the holy war, the Germans have been rather too hard pressed to study the Turkish language, it has been found indispensable on both sides to become proficient in the use of French and thus to pay homage to that western civilization which for centuries has been the only one to exert an influence in the Orient.

"The novelty consists in the emigration of the French language from the shores of the Bosphorous to Berlin. It is a known fact that, during the agitation which preceded the entry of Turkey into the conflict, it was in French that the crowd was addressed in front of the German embassy in Constantinople by a diplomatic agent of that country, and it was also in French that the Austrian ambassador, the marquess of Pallavicini, expressed his wishes of success to the Turkish delegates. As an anti-French manifestation it must have seemed rather odd.

The French Canadians of Ontario are proud of their language. They claim that they have the right to speak it in this country; they intend to speak it, and they want their children to enjoy the same privilege after them. I would like every member of this House to realize that these citizens are the descendants of the discoverers of the province. Their forefathers were the first settlers; they are not intruders or trespassers in any part of its territory. Seven or eight generations of men of their flesh and blood have contributed to the development of that country. They are a group of 250,000 people, and they constitute, with their brethren of the other provinces, one-third of the population of Canada. Talleyrand said once, very properly: "It is absurd to get angry about a fact." Those who do not like the condition of things that I have just described should remember the undeniable wisdom of that saying. I believe they will be wiser if they look at the matter in the same light as did that clever journalist who said the other day: "I think it quite likely that Providence was mistaken in creating so many Frenchmen, but what can you do against Providence? You must get along as best you can with it, and you had better decide that it is an easier job to get along with Jean Baptiste than to exterminate him."

I quite understand the feeling, and I respect the opinion of those who think that for the good of the country there ought to be only one race in Canada. I respect their opinion, although I entirely differ from it. I enjoy so much the right and the pleasure of expressing my own opinion—even after a point of order has been taken to prevent me from doing so, that I should not seek to deny to any man the privilege of doing his utmost to have his ideals prevail. But when that man strives to defend and to propagate his ideas there is a limit which he must not overstep, and that limit is my rights and my liberties and the rights and liberties of other people as well. It is against such interference that the French Canadians of Ontario are now protesting. As is stated in the resolution which I have the honour to move, it has always been the policy of Britain to recognize and protect the language of the subjects of all territories coming under the sovereignty of the Crown. In doing so the statesmen of Britain have only given effect to the principles of international law; and, by the carrying on of that policy, they have succeeded in creating the great Empire of which we are so proud to be a part. The last instance in which the principle was given effect to was when the South African Union was organized and was granted responsible government. Let me quote to you the words of one of the British statesmen who were responsible for the granting of the constitution of South Africa. In a speech delivered in the British House of Commons on that subject, the Right Hon. Winston Churchill spoke as follows:

In dealing with nationalities, nothing is more fatal than a dodge. Wrongs will be forgiven, sufferings and losses will be forgiven or forgotten, battles will be remembered only as they recall the martial virtues of the combatants; but anything like chicanery, anything like a trick, will always rankle. The Government are concerned in South Africa not only to do what is fair—

I draw the attention of the House to these words:

—not only to do what is fair, but to do what South Africa will accept as fair. They are concerned not merely to choose a balance which will deal evenly between the races, but one which will secure the acceptance of both races ... we do not seek to pit one race against the other in the hope of profiting from the quarrel. We hope to build upon the reconciliation and not upon the rivalry of races. We hope that it may be our fortune so to dispose of affairs that these two valiant, strong races may dwell together side by side in peace and amity under the shelter of an equal flag.

In another speech, on the Transvaal constitution, the same gentleman said in the House of Commons:

> Now let me come to the question of language.... The recognition of their language is precious to a small people. I have never been able to work myself into a passion because there are in parts of South Africa Dutch people who wish to have Dutch teachers to teach Dutch children Dutch. I have not so poor an opinion of the English language with its priceless literary treasures and its world-wide business connections, as not to believe that it can safely be exposed to the open competition of a dialect like the Taal. We believe that the only sure way to preserve in the years that are to come such a language as the Taal would be to make it a proscribed language, which would be spoken by the people with deliberation and malice, as a protest against what they regarded and would rightly regard as an act of intolerance.

Let me quote also the following words of Sir C. P. Lucas, in a lecture on the influence of science on Empire (King's College lectures on Colonial Problems, page 136):

> Self-government has distinctly not fused races, but what it has done is to enable different races, while remaining different to live in friendly co-operation side by side... I look to a future of the Empire in which there will be different groups of races, forming in the main large units, all on an equal level, not aiming at fusion but agreeing to differ, and yet not the less citizens under one sovereign, sitting side by side in an Empire Parliament, as French and English in Canada, Dutch and English in South Africa, etc.

Sir, the same underlying principle of generous treatment and British fair-play can be traced and discerned in all the legislation and the constitutional enactments concerning Canada from the Quebec Act of 1774 down to our own day. In 1841, however, the British Parliament, deceived by the clamours of the then bureaucracy, enacted a law proscribing the use of the French language in the Canadian Parliament of that day; but, through the efforts of Lord Elgin, that un-British law was repealed after a very short existence. Let me remind you that a great Canadian, one of the fathers of responsible government in this country, Louis Hypolite Lafontaine, made it his duty to violate the law of 1841; and it was in French that he delivered his first speech in the Canadian Assembly after the enactment of that law. Still, Lafontaine is rightly considered as one of our great nation-builders, and is in no way branded as an agitator. The British North America Act recognized the French language as an official language in this country; and, if you desire to know in an unmistakable way what were the intentions and the meanings of the fathers of Confederation, listen to these words of the great statesman under whose leadership Confederation was achieved. Sir John A. Macdonald, in the House of Commons of Canada, used the following language:

> I have no accord with the desire expressed in some quarters that by any mode whatever there should be an attempt made to oppress the one language or to render it inferior to the other; I believe that would be impossible if it were tried and it would be foolish and wicked if it were possible. The statement that has been made so often that this is a conquered country is "à propos de rien." Whether it was conquered or ceded, we have a constitution under which all British subjects are in a position of absolute equality, having rights of every kind, of language, of religion, of property and of person. There is no paramount race in this country, there is no conquered race in this country, we are all British subjects, and those who are not English are none the less British subjects on that account.

This Parliament has always respected the intentions of the framers of our constitution. A Bill cannot pass its second reading in this House without being printed in French. Why, as late as two years ago, at the instigation of the present Government, a Bill was adopted by this Parliament, the Naturalization Act of 1915, the statute, 5 George V, chapter 44, of which subsection b of section 2 requires of the applicant for naturalization that he shall be of good character, and shall have an adequate knowledge of either the English or French language. Is this not again a formal recognition of the official and national status of the French language in this country? Am I not entitled to say that its status is different from that of the various European or other foreign dialects —the editors of the Toronto News and the Ottawa Evening Journal to the contrary notwithstanding? To say that the French language is a national language in Canada, and to contend in the same breath that it is a foreign language in the Canadian provinces, is utter nonsense. Everything which in the Confederation has a national character must at least have a standing in the different parts of that Confederation. That which has a right in the whole must have some privileges in the different parts of that whole. In Ontario, the capital of Canada is situated; the Parliament of Canada sits in the province of Ontario; the various services of the national Administration are in the province of Ontario, and the French language is official in every one of them. Take the case of the hon. junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot), or of the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx); both are French-Canadians; both live in Ontario and represent Ontario constituencies. Both are members of the Par-

liament of Canada and are entitled as a right to stand up in this Parliament and address you, Mr. Speaker, in the French language. It is not fair to contend that in order to exercise what is their right, they must have the privilege of receiving in the schools of the country, which they maintain with their own money, the education which will enable them to do so. But the advocates of By-law 17 claim that they do not want to prevent the teaching of the French language, that their only purpose is to improve the methods and quality of bilingual education, and that their regulations have been enacted for the advantage and benefit of the French-speaking children. Sir, the sense of fairness is so deeply rooted in the mind of the average English-speaking Canadian that to induce him to accept a wrong or an injustice, some moral excuse or justification must be given for that wrong. The wolf will always find some pretence to justify his eating of the lamb. I assure you that this sort of benevolent despotism does not appeal to me. I acknowledge the good faith of many of those who support and defend these regulations. I believe that the greater number of them would refuse to endorse the proscription of the language which is the pride of so many of their fellow citizens. But there is not the slightest doubt in my mind, and there is not the slightest doubt in the mind of any one who has received even a smattering of French education that these regulations, although they proceed more slowly, proceed obliquely, and more insidiously perhaps, but with no less certainty to the same end, namely, the strangling of the French tongue.

The time at my disposal does not permit me to analyse any of these regulations, nor do I think that this is the proper place to do so. Allow me to point out, however, that what is left of the study of French can only be made in the schools which were in operation and in which French was a subject of study previous to 1912. Does not that seem an unpatriotic reservation? It is inflicting a penalty upon the French-Canadians for being guilty of observing too well the law of multiplication prescribed by the Almighty. It is an inducement to race suicide. I believe, however, that the moral character and temperament of my countrymen will successfully resist any such unpatriotic design.

Another feature of the regulations which is also absolutely unacceptable is that no teaching of French shall be given in any manner except with the consent and on the approval of the inspector, from whose decision there is no appeal. I cannot understand why such a condition of things should receive the approval of any fair-minded man. My idea of what constitutes liberty precludes me from admitting that it can be sufficiently preserved when the citizen must depend upon the benevolence, the whim, or, in some cases, perhaps upon the prejudices of a minister, or any of his servants. Surely that is not liberty. For my part I cannot help thinking that these regulations were an unfortunate wounding of the French Canadians of Ontario in their deepest and most permanent susceptibilities. They have resented it, and their countrymen of the same race and language have resented it as well, and we have been passing through a serious crisis which threatens to become still more acute. But what to my mind is the most deplorable feature of the situation is not the agitation which has developed; there is something graver than the abuses and violences of language. What is peculiarly painful is that this unholy war is being waged at the expense of the most sacred and innocent victim; at the expense of the child. The Canadian children ought to ignore our conflicts and our rivalries. They ought to live in an atmosphere of peace and order. Is it not to be regretted that in the blood of these children should be instilled the poison of old hatreds and antipathies. We need greater things in this country. As to the proscription of the French language in Ontario, I have no fear whatever. A coercive policy will never assimilate a race, nor proscribe a language. That is a truism of sociology which all the governments of the world ought to remember. Will you permit me to read in that connection an article by Emile Faguet, a member of the French Academy, on the recent proscription of the French language in Bulgaria, after that country had joined Germany against the Allies:

> The Czar Ferdinand of Bulgaria has just forbidden in his kingdom the use of the French language. The fact strikes one as strange, even in a period of extraordinary happenings.
>
> What can be the matter with that czar? As far as blood goes, he is a half-Frenchman. He is a grandson of the first and last "king of the French." He has received a French education. What then ails him, and, as the poet said: Against all his past history turns him on a sudden?
>
> What harm has the French language done him? It is up to this day the instrument of diplomacy, and should we infer that the Czar Ferdinand has made up his mind that none of his subjects will take up the profession in which Talleyrand made a name for himself?

That would be taking a rather narrow view of the situation.

However, if such is not his purpose, such is the direct outcome of his action. A queer departure, indeed.

Would it be, perchance, that the French language is tainted and carries with it some deadly germ which it transmits to whoever uses it or tries to learn it? I wonder what it can be. It supplies a clear, systematic, direct means of expression, which enables one to speak to the point, without circumlocutions or roundabout verbosity; besides, a straightforward means of expression, which to those who make use of it can impart nothing but a liking for loyalty and honesty. Who is it fears such an infection? Who will acknowledge that he fears it? Who will allow such a suspicion to rest on himself? No living man. Well, then, why does the Czar of Bulgaria act as if he feared the natural play of the use of that tongue on those who make use of it? That is absolutely beyond comprehension.

There is no one—and that is a fact more especially as regards rulers of people—who is not desirous that his subordinates, his dependents, his subjects, should be above all true and honest. All then should see to it that those over whom they hold sway learn French with all their heart and speak it fluently. The following anecdote is familiar to a good many: Louis the Fourteenth advised one of his courtiers to learn Spanish, and the latter, surmising that the king destined him to be ambassador at the court of Spain, forthwith set himself to the task but was sorely disappointed when on returning to the king with the news that he could now speak the Spanish language, was simply told: Very well, then I think you would enjoy reading Don Quixote in the original. Similarly, instead of a ruler forbidding the use of French by his people, I would fancy one inquiring from some of his courtiers: Do you know French?—No.—Well, learn it, that will impart to you notions of righteousness in every form.

Ferdinand of Bulgaria is doing exactly the opposite. It cannot be gainsaid, he acts strangely. He has reasons with very little reason in them, and which, besides, are not prompted by any kindheartedness.

I can perceive only one motive which may have had some bearing on the resolve taken by the Czar of Bulgaria. He has been jeered and to a certain extent discussed in French. It must be admitted that he has been somewhat ill-used in French. But, your Majesty, is that a reason? Is there any sense in prohibiting the use of a whole literature from Villon to Rostand, just because some of those who speak the language have used it to banter you? That is trying to get even with a vengeance.

How touchy the victim, and how magnifying and long-armed his desire for revenge! What! shall a language be proscribed as a whole on account of a few words in that language which have displeased you, and which, I aver, had not been said for the purpose of conciliating you. A whole tongue put under ban on account of a few sounds which have grated on yours ears! That is exactly the stand taken by Aman in Racine's play, Esther:

"Un seul osa d'Aman attirer le courroux:
Aussitôt de la terre ils disparurent tous."

And that stand has always been held to smack of megalomania. A language as a whole cannot be proscribed, not any more than a people as a whole. Of course, that may be done theoretically, but by no means actually. Bulgarians will continue to learn French, with this added peculiarity that henceforth that tongue will have the further allurement of the forbidden fruit. Czar Ferdinand, in emitting that decree, has simply conferred on the French language a wider popularity, and that popularity will only increase in range and intensity as generations go by. Nothing is as effective as proscription towards furthering that end. Young Bulgarians will say to one another: "You know, that is the language which Czar Ferdinand intended to behead."

Sir, the present time is one when all sources of trouble and division ought to be removed. Canada is in urgent need of the union of her citizens. All moderate and well-meaning men of the country must regard it as a pity that the schools of the capital city of Ottawa should be closed, and that thousands of school children should parade the streets while the fathers and brothers of many of them are fighting and dying for liberty in the trenches of France and Belgium. Is it not to be deplored that such a fight about the French language should take place when France and Britain have formed a glorious and indissoluble union for the good of the world and the great cause of civilization? There is no longer a channel between the peoples of Great Britain and of France. Why should there be one in this country between their descendants? I have referred to the resolution adopted by the Franco-British parliamentary delegates on the 10th April last. Those delegates met first in France, at Paris and at Bordeaux. The first conference was presided over by Mr. George Clemenceau, a former Prime Minister of France, and he was entrusted with the agreeable duty of welcoming the British delegates. I happened one afternoon, in the reading room of this House, to read some beautiful and inspiring extracts from his speech. I fear that I have already detained the House too long, but if the House will bear with me I will give a few passages from this speech, which, as hon. gentlemen will perceive, are of a high literary order:

To the members of the British committee:

Gentlemen, we wish you a hearty welcome; and may the man who owes it to his advancing years to address you in the name of his colleagues of the French parliamentary committee, be allowed to tell you that, even in the darkest days, he never despaired of the concluding of an entente which appeared to him bound to materialize some day, though he had lost hope of seeing it effected during his lifetime.

Yes, gentlemen, I have been expecting you for endless centuries; and historians, who too often are out of touch with those undercurrents

of love and hatred which alternate in the lives of people, may express surprise at the length of time it took for us to join hands across such a narrow expanse of sea; an impassable barrier, if viewed in the light of so many adventurous war undertakings, but which is now in our eyes a great highway open to all who are worthy of comprehending and practising the future true brotherhood of nations, founded on a recognition of the equal rights of all and the proper consideration of the right of every one.

Yes, I repeat it, I have been expecting you since Hastings, since the days of the Black Prince. You may judge how persistent I am. I was awaiting you, and you have come, and here you are the representatives of the English people who, of your own impulse, have crossed the Channel, not to conclude a political agreement—our respective governments will see to that, neither is it to investigate military tactics, a subject which is necessarily outside our purview.

No, your visit is something like the forecasted crowning of all these labours. We are meeting simply for the purpose of seeing one another, of understanding one another, and of finding ourselves capable of loving one another. The present time requires action, and civilians as well as the military, on both sides of the Channel are engaged in action and will remain so, whatever the outcome, until the end. Until the end, do you catch my meaning?

With all the authority with which he is clothed, Lord Desart made that final statement. Our minds are made up, our purpose is set, our honour is pledged. We are giving our children, we will give our wealth, everything, everything, and such is the reward that may be expected from the triumph of the lofty cause of the independence of nations and the dignity of man, that despite the most heart-rending sacrifices, we shall never complain that we had to give too much.

Such is the great international secret which has led you across the seas to come to us. . .

True it is that to the war is due the miracle of a deep mutual understanding, which now could not be broken without calamity to civilization. We did not seek war, neither your nation nor our nation, and now we are both bent on having it, and so our good allies; and we are earnest about it, and we will have it as long as may be necessary to reach a complete victory-complete, do you hear?—that will repay us and repay our brave sons for those torrents of blood, such torrents as have never drenched any country in history. . . Heart to heart, as our soldiers are doing side by side, we shall live in a great bond of union, that no frenzy of hatred must ever tear asunder, and together we shall have accomplished something which short-sighted minds will perhaps deem insignificant because made without any display of pomp, but which nevertheless will mark an epoch in the forward march of humanity.

M. Paul Deschanel, President of the Chamber of Deputies in France, said:

Never was bond more necessary. The genius of Great Britain and that of France complete, impregnate and magnetize each other. Both bend themselves with a remarkable suppleness to the unforeseen exigencies of the most terrible of all wars. Together they come to the rescue of civilization now threatened with a frightful return to savagery; together, alongside our dear and brave allies, they will save the honour of mankind. Long live England and long live France, forever united in the triumph of justice.

But, Sir, immediately after having read these fine words, expressive of union and amity, my attention was called to an article published in an important newspaper of Ontario, the London Free Press, on March 4, 1916, and entitled "A Quebec Plot," I quote the following sentence from it:

The Liberal leader in Ontario must cease this practice of speaking to French audiences in Ontario in the French tongue.

This sentence would have made a most painful impression on me if I had not believed then, as I believe now, that this newspaper was not representing the true sentiments of my English-speaking fellow citizens.

In closing my remarks, I trust that in dealing with this delicate subject I have not offended the feelings of any hon. gentleman in this House. I have only done what I deemed to be my imperative duty. My most earnest desire is that this resolution and this debate, instead of driving our two great races further asunder, will contribute to weld them more indissolubly together in the defence of liberty under the law. I ask my fellow members to proclaim with Gladstone, the equality of the weak with the strong. It is our most difficult task to unite and reconcile the nation. We must inspire Canadian public life with a lofty and courageous spirit; we must protect the equal rights of all the citizens; and above all, erect in this Canadian land a strong and solid wall against the mad blows of violence and prejudice. To reach that end, we must ask our fellow-citizens to make concessions, to be compliant, to bear with each other and respect each other's opinions. I hope that in this way we shall succeed in creating that harmony which is as necessary to the welfare of the State as it is to the welfare of individuals.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, listening to the prayer with which we open our daily proceedings in this House, the words "May peace and harmony always reign among us," appealed to me as they always have since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, and I trust that the temper and spirit of my words this afternoon will not in any way be in discord with that pious supplication. The resolution which is now

before the House is divided into three distinct parts. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that it is a great pity that this resolution ever came up in this House. Might I say at once that I have that feeling myself. I think it is unfortunate that legislation should be passed by any province which would so affect the sensibilities of a great minority in this country as to force them to apply to this House for redress. Nevertheless, certain legislation, to which I shall refer, has been passed by the Legislature of Ontario. Petitions have come to this House, applications have been made to the representatives of the people to bring this question before the Canadian public through the Federal Parliament; speeches have been delivered from the public platform; I take it that all these are an appeal on behalf of the French minority in this country, not for the disallowance of any Act which has been passed by the Ontario or any other Legislature, but an appeal to the intelligence, to the judgment, and to the generosity of the Canadian people. I am a Canadian. I believe in the most absolute freedom and liberty for the people of all races and of all creeds in this country. Whenever I hear or read noble sentiments appealing to the generosity of the people of my country, I am forced to applaud. When I read a short time ago the speeches delivered by the right hon. the Prime Minister of this country in England, I felt that he was representing the true sentiments of the Canadian people. Will you, Sir, allow me to quote some words which the right hon. gentleman uttered in a speech at the town hall in Bristol, England, on August 10, 1915:

> Throughout this Empire we have many races and many creeds; but all united by a single purpose at this juncture. So we in Canada are not all of one race. Those who came first to the soil of Canada were of a great nation, now happily an Ally of ours, the great French nation. There are to-day within these islands, at Shorncliffe, several regiments whose mother-tongue is French, and not English, who have come from Canada to do their part in the great struggle. In the development of constitutional government in Canada—which has indeed proceeded very much on the same lines as with you—Canadians of French descent have laboured harmoniously and effectively with us whose forefathers came from these islands. And no better exponents of the cause of constitutional government and liberty in Canada have been found than these descended from the first pioneer race of Canda, the French race. We in Canada find the need, realized everywhere throughout the Empire, that we should know and understand each other a little better. In a vast country like ours, with scattered communities, diverse in race, diverse in creed, and sometimes in ideal and apparent interest, there is the greatest need of mutual understanding and comprehension. And as we have come to know ourselves better during the past twenty-five or fifty years, so the national spirit of Canada has been awakened, and has become strong and vigorous.

Those sentiments ought to be applauded throughout Canada as I feel they must have been applauded in Great Britain. Might I be allowed to make a further quotation from another speech of the right hon. the Prime Minister, delivered in the Guild Hall, London, England, on July 29, 1915:

> While it may not be fitting that one of our kindred should speak of the British people as a great race, nevertheless, I may at least say that it has wrought great things. And the greatest of all its achievements is the upbuilding of an Empire sustained by ties such as those which unite ours. In the beginning, the founding of a nation within these islands, and the consequent necessity of orderly government, compelled a system autocratic in its character and methods. Then came the great charters of freedom and the will of the people to make their own laws and govern themselves. Orderly government on the one hand; individual liberty on the other; justice, the equality of all men before the law—upon these secure foundations the fabric of the national life was built; and in these later years there has come the not less noble ideal of a democracy founded upon equality of opportunity for all the people. . .
>
> And why are the descendants in Canada of those who fought under Wolfe and of those who fought under Montcalm when contending for the possession of the northern half of the American continent, why are they now standing together in the Empire's battle line? To speak of later events, why do we find beyond the channel, in France or in Belgium, the grandson of a Durham and the grandson of a Papineau standing side by side in this struggle? When the historian of the future comes to analyse the events of this war, he will realize that some great overmastering impulse contributed mainly to this wonderful result. One such impulse is to be found in the love of liberty, the ideals of democracy, and the spirit of unity founded thereon, which make the whole Empire one in aim and purpose.

When I first read those words, my thoughts reverted at once to the celebration in 1908 of the Tercentenary of the foundation of Quebec and of the marvellous gathering of representatives of the component parts of the British Empire, and to the expressions, uttered in the presence of His Majesty the King, by eminent men of our Dominion, of their profound loyalty and attachment to the Throne, the flag and the free institutions governing this country and the Empire. Those sentiments were echoed by every one in every province in Canada. Canada was there represented as a Dominion; the narrow confines of provincialism

were forgotten, and men of the French race and men of the English race, grouped around the monument of Samuel de Champlain, seemed to form a new monument—a monument to the greatness of the unity of the people of Canada. There were expressions by eminent men of this Dominion as to the unity of the races in this country, as to the ideals which governed us in Canada. Some of those men have passed away; some are still living. Let me refer you, Sir, to the opening remarks of the mayor of the city of Quebec at that time, Sir George Garneau:

> The French-Canadians experience an inexpressible feeling of patriotic pride and gratitude towards the two great nations who have in turn presided over our destinies: France, always beloved, to whom they owe their life and noble traditions; England, who left them free to grow up keeping their faith, their language and their institutions, and who endowed them with a constitutional government based upon the largest amount of liberties, and which is undeniably the noblest and most perfect in the world.

Therein, in my humble judgment, is the real feeling of a French Canadian. He is attached to France because from France he got life; from France he got his great traditions. He is attached to England because England has allowed him to grow up in his faith, in his language, and in his institutions, and because England has given to this country a constitutional Government founded upon the greatest sum of liberty, which is, as Sir George Garneau puts it, "the best and most perfect in the world."

The only other expression which I would like to give to the House is of one who has passed away, Sir James Whitney, who, speaking upon the same occasion, said:

> We, Sir, of the other provinces, respect and love our fellow subjects of Quebec for their intrinsic worth and for their attitude and aid in times of stress and peril. We cannot forget the answer sent when they were urged to join hands with a foreign power against the British Empire.
>
> We cannot forget Chateauguay, where the gallant de Salaberry performed the most scientific military feat of the war of 1812.
>
> Sir, within a mile of my birthplace, on the historic field of Chrysler's farm, was done what Sir Nigel Loring would term a "comfortable feat of arms."
>
> And we cannot forget that there and then a company of French Canadian voltigeurs reddened the soil of Upper Canada with their blood in defence of British institutions and British connections.
>
> Nor can we forget the memorable words of Sir Etienne Taché, when he declared that "the last shot fired in Canada in defence of British connections will be fired by a French Canadian."

> Sir, we could not forget these things if we would, and on behalf of the provinces, I make bold to say also that we would not forget them if we could. We revere the memories of the great men of Quebec, of Taché and Lafontaine, of Morin and Cartier, Chapleau and Dorion, among the dead and offer our tribute of respect and honour to Laurier among the living.

Those are the words which have been uttered by some of the great men of this country; those are the sentiments which I understand actuate every true Canadian, and in harmony with those sentiments I shall briefly deal with the resolution which I have had the honour of seconding. The first part of the resolution reads:

> It has long been the settled policy of Great Britain whenever a country passed under the sovereignty of the Crown by treaty or otherwise, to respect the religion, the usages and the language of the inhabitants who thus become British subjects.

Referring solely to our own country, we find that that was exactly the policy which was carried out by Great Britain, because, if you refer to the third article of the Capitulation of this country, you will find:

> That the inhabitants shall be preserved in the possession of their houses, goods, effects and privileges.

That article was granted upon the condition of the inhabitants laying down their arms. Later on in 1774, Sir James Marriott, then Advocate General, was asked to report to the King upon certain conditions existing in this country, and, amongst other things, upon that very article, and his report is contained in the following words:

> The treaty made with the sovereign power of France, which, without taking notice of the capitulation transfers its subjects pleno jure, does not supersede the capitulation made with the inhabitants; because I consider capitulations, in the eye of the law of nations, to be not only as national, but personal compacts, and made with the inhabitants themselves, for the consideration of their ceasing their existence. It is consistent with the honour and interests of this Kingdom, that they should be religiously observed, and that the condition of the grantee should be rendered substantially better, rather than worse, so far as any person or persons are capable of taking benefit of the grant.

Since that time there have been several Acts passed by the Imperial Government concerning the constitution of our country. There was the Quebec Act of 1774, in which the principle was again laid down; there was the Constitutional Act of 1791; there was the Union Act of 1840, none of which Acts affected the use of the French language throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Again, there was the Confederation Act of 1867. The only section of that Act which deals with the use of the French language is section 133, which places both languages on the same footing in this Parliament, in the courts of this Dominion, and in the courts and legislature of the province of Quebec. Since the legislation of 1867 permits the French language to be an official language of this country—and you cannot in this Parliament or in any legislature take away that right—is it the part of wisdom to allow the children to use that language on the streets of any village, town or city in Ontario, or in any part of that or any other province, and yet not give them the right to learn how to speak that language correctly? I may be wrong, but in my humble judgment, Sir, it is elementary logic that if by your legislation you provide that a language shall be official in your country, it naturally follows that you must give to the users of that language the opportunity of learning it.

The principle of the recognition by Great Britain of the right to the use of other languages than the English language has been referred to by the hon. member for Kamouraska. I find also that under the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act of 1914, persons naturalized prior to January 1, 1915, may after that date apply for a fresh certificate of naturalization under new conditions; and, in order to be eligible for such certificate in the United Kingdom an alien must amongst other things be of good character and have an adequate knowledge of the English language. It does not say that he must have a thorough possession of the English language, that he must know the English language and that only; it says that he must have an adequate knowledge of the English language. In our country, by our Naturalization Act, he may know either the French or the English language. That law, passed by this Parliament quite recently, gives every French Canadian in this country, no matter into what province he wants to go, the right to use only the French language if he will. If the law is good, if it is sound, if it is based upon logic, is it the part of wisdom to prevent the children of these people, coming into this country and having the right to the use of that language, from learning how to speak the French language correctly?

The second part of the resolution is:

> That His Majesty's subjects of French origin in the province of Ontario complain that by recent legislation they have been to a large extent deprived of the privileges which they and their fathers have always enjoyed since Canada passed under the sovereignty of the British Crown, of having their children taught in French.

The French Canadians of the province of Ontario claim that they have a grievance. They have, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, petitioned the Government; they have through their press and from the public platform told us that they have a grievance. They ask us as their representatives to bring that grievance before the Canadian Parliament, and to appeal to its judgment and its intelligence. For a moment I should like to put before the House what the status of the French Canadians was prior to and since Confederation, and I want to do it, not in my own language, but in the language of a gentleman who has written a work entitled: "Legislation and History of Separate Schools in Upper Canada, 1841 to 1876," who cannot be said to have any prejudice whatever in the matter. I refer to the work of Mr. George Hodgins, M.A., LL.D., F.R.G.S., barrister-at-law, Librarian of the Education Department for Ontario, and editor of the Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada. The chapter is 33; it is somewhat lengthy, but for the purpose of the argument which I intend making, I should like to read the whole chapter. Mr. Hodgins says:

4 p.m.

> There was one class of separate schools which gave the chief superintendent very little trouble. These were the French and German schools—chiefly Roman Catholic—which were scattered here and there throughout Upper Canada. All that had to be done in their case was to give them such teaching facilities as enabled them to go into operation under teachers who could speak the language of the ratepayers concerned, and that language only. Happily that faculty could be given under the general, not the separate school law, and that with the sanction of the chief superintendent.

There were two principles which Dr. Ryerson laid down at an early period in his administration of the Education Department. The first was that whenever he could meet special cases by a liberal, and often, with the sanction of the Government, a generous interpretation of his powers under the Schools Acts, and in terms of his commission as chief superintendent of education, it was his duty to give that interpretation in cases not specifically provided for—except by analogy—in the school law. The second principle which Dr. Ryerson laid down, and which he generally adhered to, was not to propose too frequent legislation with a view to meet special cases,

but only to seek such legislation at intervals of from five to ten years. Fortunately I was familiar with Dr. Ryerson's views as expressed in the first of the foregoing principles which he had laid down for his guidance, when the first application was made in 1851 to grant a certificate of qualification to a French teacher in the county of Essex, which had been largely settled by French Canadians. At the time that this application reached me from the Board of Public Instruction for the county of Essex, Dr. Ryerson was absent in England and I had charge of the department as acting chief superintendent. I therefore submitted the application, which had been received, to the Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada, with the recommendation that it be granted. This was concurred in by the Council of Public Instruction, and I was therefore, enabled to inform the Essex County Board, that:

The Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada has sanctioned a liberal construction of the programme to which you refer, making the term "English" convertible into the term "French" where it occurs, and when applied to French candidates for examination before the County Board of Public Instruction. The certificate should, of course, be expressly limited to teaching in the French language.

A copy of this intimation was also sent to the then local superintendent of education at Sandwich, with the following addition:

The School Act expressly authorizes trustees to employ any qualified teacher they please; should, therefore, the one to whom you refer obtain a certificate from the County Board, the trustees can engage his services, and no board or school officer can prevent them as has been assumed in a memorial transmitted to me by the secretary of the County Board of Public Instruction, from certain inhabitants of School Section No. 6, Sandwich.

In 1858, a partial extension of the principle here laid down was applied to German teachers, and to meet the case a knowledge of the German grammar was by the Council of Public Instruction substituted in the programme of examination for a knowledge of the English grammar. (Reading):

In 1871 a further difficulty arose owing to a delay of the Council of Public Instruction, to provide fully for the examination and licensing of German teachers in the German settlements of Upper Canada. To meet a special case, which occurred in the county of Waterloo, I told the local Superintendent, who had called upon me, in Dr. Ryerson's absence:

To grant six months' certificates to such German candidates as would present themselves for examination in July; and I said that, by giving the department early notice of the real requirements in the case, attention would be given to the matter by the Council of Public Instruction, and every provision made for the examination of such candidates, at all future examinations.

This was confirmed by Dr. Ryerson; and he informed the local Superintendent of the county, that examination papers in German reading, spelling, etymology and grammar might be prepared by members of the County Board, and that the other ordinary examination papers could be used in the case of teachers who could read English.

Similar applications, made in 1872 and 1875, were dealt with in the same spirit; and, in this way, every facility was given by the Education Department for the successful operation of French and German public and separate schools in the French and German settlements of Upper Canada.

That is further confirmed by a letter which Dr. Ryerson wrote on the 24th of April, 1857, which reads as follows:

Gentlemen:

I have the honour to state in reply to your letter of the 16th instant that, as the French is the recognized language of the country, as well as the English, it is quite proper and lawful for the trustees to allow both languages to be taught in their schools to children whose parents may desire them to learn both.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
E. Ryerson.

Therefore, according to Dr. Ryerson's opinion, it was not only proper but lawful for the French language to be taught in the schools of Ontario prior to Confederation. Since Confederation the same right existed down to what is known as Regulation 17. I should like to call attention to a letter which was written by Mr. Colquhoun, Deputy Minister of Education, on the 24th July, 1911, in which I find these words:

I am directed by the Prime Minister, Sir James Whitney, to acknowledge your letter of the 21st, and to state that no change has been made in the school law of the department regulations affecting the study of the French language in the schools. I am directed to point out that the question is one entirely under the control of the Board of Trustees.

(Sgd.) A. H. U. Colquhoun.

The only provision respecting education which I find in the British North America Act is the provision contained in section 93, which reads as follows:

In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the Union.

Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the Legislature of the province, an Appeal shall lie to the Governor-General in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affect-

ing any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Thus, so far, we find that the French language has been tolerated, has been allowed, and has been sanctioned by the laws passed in the province of Ontario. The French Canadians apparently had no grievance whatever until the passing of Regulation 17. But prior to the passing of Regulation 17 another regulation was passed by the Ontario Board which reads as follows:

In school sections where the French or German language prevails, the trustees may, in addition to the course of study prescribed for public schools, require instruction to be given in reading, grammar and composition to such pupils as are directed by their parents or guardians to study either of these languages, and in all such cases the authorized text books in French or German shall be used.

So that by Regulation 15, in the province of Ontario, the French language was sanctioned by the law and the German language was also sanctioned by the law. There was a subsequent resolution passed, regulation 17, which has been greatly spoken of in this country, and under which the French-Canadians feel that that they were aggrieved. Regulation 17, in effect proscribes certain privileges which have been accorded to the French Canadians in the use of their language as the language of instruction in their schools. The French Canadians feel that if the Germans are not proscribed in the right to their language in the Ontario schools, the French Canadians should not have their privileges limited. Before Confederation, according to Dr. Ryerson and according to Mr. Hodgins, the Germans and the French Canadians had their full privileges in Ontario. As late as Regulation 15 those privileges were continued and confirmed. By Regulation 17 the language of instruction during the first two years of their instruction may be the French language; but the idea and the spirit and the letter of the law is that the moment they have a sufficient knowledge of the English language, then the French language must be set aside entirely, and their whole education must be conducted along the lines of the English language. The French Canadians claim that they have a grievance. I feel, in my humble judgment, that their grievance is well founded; and, as a Canadian, wishing to see equal justice given to all classes in this community, wishing to see the same justice meted out to the French Canadians as I would want to see meted out to the English-speaking people, I feel that the second part of this resolution is thoroughly applicable to the circumstances, and therefore I have absolutely no hesitation in agreeing to every letter of it.

The third part of the resolution reads:

That this House especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with.

I would not like to give my own appreciation only of that portion of the resolution which I have seconded, and I would not like the House to be guided solely by my opinion. I refer the House to other opinions to which they might attach, and I have no doubt will attach, a great deal more weight, the opinion of Sir Oliver Mowat, for instance, in a speech made at Woodstock on December 3, 1889, when he said:

French-Canadians cherish their own language lovingly.

Will you permit me, Mr. Speaker, to interject a remark and to affirm, as one who knows the French-Canadian people that their language is part of their soul. They are attached to their language just as they are attached to their faith, to the traditions of this country, and to the British Crown. There is something in their love of their language which may be incomprehensible to those who have not had to do with the French-Canadians, who have not lived among the French-Canadians, and who are not intimately acquainted with them. Sir Oliver Mowat apparently had a thorough appreciation of the French Canadian when he used that language. He goes on:

They wish their children to love it and be educated in it; but they know it will be for their interest to be familiar with English also, and to be educated in English, as well as French. Proscribe French, their mother tongue, and they will hate you and have nothing to do with your schools. Permit their own language to receive attention, and they are glad to have their children learn English also as soon and as fast as it can be imparted. Such was the view of the commissioners as to the proper policy; it is the view of this Government; and it is the view of all intelligent men, except our political opponents. It was the view of Dr. Ryerson and his Council of Public Instruction, even to the extent of putting no pressure whatever on French or German schools, and of awaiting their own spontaneous action as to English and other matters.

There you have the opinion of an English Canadian speaking in the province of On-

tario. Will you let me quote the opinion of an English Canadian speaking in the province of Quebec only a few days ago before the Canadian Club, the opinion of a man who for years had a seat in the Legislature of Quebec, who has always lived among the French Canadian people, who later became the representative of the English minority in the province of Quebec in the provincial Cabinet, and who later was appointed a judge. I refer to Mr. Justice McCorkill, and I think his words express in better language than I could use the real feeling that animates the province of Quebec in this matter. Speaking on March 28, 1916, he said:

> I need not tell you that I have been a student of Canadian history from the very earliest days. I have read with the greatest interest the history of the old regime, the opening up of the country, and then of the abandonment of the people by their country, so to speak, and of the tremendous efforts they made to keep the country for themselves. I have read the history of the country under the British regime, and how they have fallen in so well with the administration of justice, the administration in our Legislatures and municipalities under the British system. I believe that a certain French-Canadian at Ottawa is one of the greatest parliamentarians under the British Constitution that we have in any part of the Empire.
>
> They have adopted our system, but there are two things they have clung to, their religion and their language. I believe that their national sentiment is even stronger than their religious sentiment—I really believe so. The national feeling among them is intensely strong, but I would ask you English, Irish and Scotch descendants born in this country, and brought up here, supposing a regulation similar to No. 17 were passed in the province of Quebec, what do you think our duty towards it would be? Supposing Sir Lomer Gouin—I cannot imagine it—but supposing he did have the courage, or the nerve, so to speak, to pass a regulation of that kind. There would be a rebellion in this province, I think. And here we have our French-Canadian brethren in the sister province who by constitutional means are trying to obtain the repeal or the modification of the regulation, or some other settlement of the question which would be satisfactory to all concerned.

I do not wish, Sir, to delay the business of this House. I have put as concisely as I conveniently can my sentiments upon this question, and have explained why I feel it an honour to second the resolution which was proposed by the hon. member for Kamouraska. Will you let me say in conclusion that I would hope to see this vexed question settled. Our population is made up of several races true to the institutions of this land and of our great Empire. My trust is that in this moment of great crisis Ontario will send out the message that the word "liberty" is emblazoned upon its shield. My trust is that Ontario, living up to the principles of its statesmen of the past, will prove that the same unity of intent and purpose exists at home as that which has guided and is guiding the courage, the valour, and the heroism of Canadian sons upon the blood-stained battlefields of Flanders. The Empire's dominions are out to uphold nationalization and constitutional principles. Our sons have crossed the seas to fight for the oppressed, consecrating with their blood the principles so dear to us, the protection of the smaller nations, the rights and privileges of Belgium and of Servia, the solidarity of the Empire, the reign of justice and freedom. Such are also the underlying principles of this resolution submitted in the most respectful manner in favour of a race that has no superior in generosity, in liberality, in advancement and in education.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I desire in the first place to assure my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe) that there was not the slightest intention on my part to attempt to administer to him any castigation. His speech was couched in very moderate and courteous terms. His reference to the attachment of French Canadians to their language was touching, and his allusion to the union of our Empire with the French Republic in this war was eloquent. In all he said in both these references I heartily concur. It did not seem to me, however, that any considerable portion of his speech was especially relevant to the resolution he has introduced. But in so far as it was relevant, it would have been an appropriate speech to address to the proper forum—that is, the Legislature of Ontario.

This motion is addressed to Parliament rather than to the Government; it does not call for any governmental action. Nevertheless, I conceive it my duty, holding the position of leader of the Government, to make my attitude clear in regard to the motion. Notwithstanding what has been urged by my hon. friend from Kamouraska and by my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin), I still adhere to the opinion which I ventured to express yesterday that this motion cannot result in any good and that it may result in much harm. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, I cannot see my way for one moment to support it.

One would have supposed that there

would have been some effort on the part of the hon. gentleman who proposed the motion to examine the legislation and the regulations which he has called in question by the terms of this motion, and as to which he desires this House to admonish the Legislature of Ontario and that he would have endeavoured to show in what respect those regulations and the legislation upon which they are founded result in any unfairness or injustice to the French Canadian population of the province of Ontario. Indeed, the fact that my hon. friend has made so little attempt in that regard seems to me a very good reason why this motion should not be accepted by the House if there were no other, and more conclusive, reasons to that effect.

How many hon. members in the House would be prepared to pass an examination upon the effect of the legislation and the regulations of the province in regard to the subject under discussion? Yet, without any inquiry proposed—and the very idea of an inquiry suggests the unfortunate character of the proposed resolution—without any inquiry, with only the discussion that can take place in one debate, and without hon. members having before them for their consideration the legislation and the regulations in question, we are asked by this resolution to convey an admonition, to tender advice, to the Legislature of Ontario upon a subject that has been debated and considered most thoroughly and exhaustively in that legislature on many occasions. If we really propose to give advice to the Legislature of Ontario, if a resolution for that purpose could properly be introduced in this Parliament, would it not be reasonable in the first instance to refer the matter to a committee of this House for the purpose of inquiry and report? Every hon. gentleman realizes that if a proposal for any such inquiry were made, this House would be embarking on a most dangerous and unfortunate course in entertaining it. Yet, without that inquiry, without even an attempt at perusal of the legislation and the regulations in question, we are invited to inform the Legislature of Ontario that the policy they have announced and put into effect, under the legislation which they have passed and under the regulations which they have enacted, is not in accord with right and justice and that they should take our advice upon the question and amend their ways in that respect. It seems to me that the proposition needs only to be stated to this House in order to make us realize how impossible of acceptance is the proposal which my hon. friend from Kamouraska and my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) have submitted for the approval of the House.

Reference was made by my hon. friend from Wright to an alleged interference with, and reference was made by my hon. friend from Kamouraska to an alleged attempt to proscribe, the French language in Ontario. I do not propose to examine that question. It is not the duty, as I understand it, of a member of this House to examine and pass upon legislation and regulations which are entirely within the control and jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature and the Provincial Government; but I may remark in passing that I have given some consideration to this subject. I have tried to understand it, conceiving it to be my duty, that I should make myself acquainted with a matter which has aroused a certain feeling, a certain controversy, not only in the province of Quebec but in other parts of this country. I have been told by those who are in a position to be informed on the subject that the province of Ontario maintains a number of schools for the training of bilingual teachers; that it provides travelling expenses for teachers whose mother tongue is French in order that they may receive necessary training and acquire proficiency in both languages; that it provides their board and their expenses while receiving this training; that it provides tuition free; and that finally a special grant is made to bilingual schools in order that teachers so trained may be employed in such schools. It does not appear to me that a policy which produces such results can be fairly described as intended to proscribe the French language in Ontario.

As far as the general nature of the regulations is concerned, I do not feel called upon to discuss them, but I will invite the attention of the House to certain considerations which in my judgment make it undesirable that we should accept the motion of my hon. friend from Kamouraska. I thoroughly understand and entirely appreciate the natural attachment of the people of French origin in this country to their own language. I realize also that this attachment was taken into consideration by the Fathers of Confederation and as a result section 133 of the British North America

Act was incorporated in our Constitutional Act, and it is in these terms:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the courts of Quebec.
>
> The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

That is the only provision of the Constitutional Act so far as language is concerned; and it is my understanding that it gives the French and English languages the status of official languages in federal affairs and in the public affairs of the province of Quebec, that is to say, in the federal parliament, in the federal courts, in the Quebec legislature and in the Quebec courts.

Subject to that provision, I would understand, so far as my knowledge extends, that the provinces of Canada have plenary power to deal with the question of language within their territorial limits. That is my comprehension of the provisions of the constitution of Canada as it is embodied in the Constitutional Act.

I realize that in Federal affairs both these languages occupy an official status, and when I entered public life in this country, and more especially when I became the leader of one of its great political parties, I conceived it my duty, so far as the demands upon my time and energy would permit, to improve my knowledge of the French language and my acquaintance with it. It seemed to me no more than my duty that I should do that, in order that I might converse with and write to persons of French origin in their own language, and might address public gatherings of my fellow-citizens of French origin, for a few moments at least, in their mother tongue. And I, for one, would resist with the utmost determination any attempt emanating from any quarter to interfere with the status of the French language as it is fixed in the Constitutional Act of our country. No one of my fellow-citizens of the province of Quebec could be animated with a more intense determination to uphold the rights of the French language in this country, as they are fixed by the Constitutional Act, than I would be if any attempt were made to assail those rights. But I have a great respect for the Constitution, and I think that until that Constitution is altered in the regular and approved manner, and by approved and constitutional methods, it is our duty to respect and observe it; and it is for this reason that I consider the motion which my hon. friend has proposed to the House to-day as not in the best interests of this country. I will go further, and say that in my judgment it is absolutely opposed to the best interests of the province of Quebec itself.

Section 91 of the British North America Act sets forth the powers and authorities which are possessed and shall be exercised by the Parliament of Canada. Section 92 of the same Act sets forth the powers and authorities which are possessed and may be exercised by the several provinces of Canada. Section 93 of the British North America Act contains certain provisions with regard to educational matters which confide the subject of education generally to the provinces, with certain limitations in respect of rights which were possessed at the time of the entrance of the several provinces into Confederation, and in respect also of rights subsequently acquired. My hon. friend the member for Kamouraska says that this motion does not call for the disallowance of any Ontario Act. He is absolutely correct in that. He would have been more within his constitutional rights if he had come forward with a motion in that regard, because that question was constitutionally before the Government of Canada and had to be dealt with; and for the reason that it was before the Government of Canada, the Parliament of Canada would have had a much better right to discuss that subject for the guidance and information of the Government, than to discuss and consider the question which is now proposed.

Let me point out for one moment the language of a great Liberal of bygone days with regard to that particular provision. I am alluding to the speech of the Hon. Edward Blake in the House of Commons on the 29th of April, 1890. He was not then leader of the Liberal party, but he had held that position, and he occupied a great place in the ranks of the party at the time he uttered these words (Hansard, p. 4086):

> I regard it as settled, for myself at any rate, first of all, that, as a question of policy, there shall be no disallowance of educational legislation, for the mere reason, that, in the opinion of this Parliament, some other or different policy than that which the province has thought

fit to adopt would be a better policy. I hold it to be settled, in the second place, that no address to the Crown shall be passed by this Parliament asking for a change of the constitutional Act as effecting any province at any rate against the will of that province, in this particular.

First, that Parliament, because it disapproved of provincial legislation in educational matters, should not seek to have that legislation disallowed merely for the reason that Parliament might think a better policy could be adopted; and, secondly, that without the consent of any province of Canada no change should be made in the Constitutional Act so far as such change might affect that province. No appeal is before Parliament at the present time, from the minority either in Ontario or in Manitoba; no question of disallowance is raised by the resolution; and therefore I venture to submit to the House with a great deal of confidence that there is no constitutional sanction under which we can be called upon to advise, or admonish or rebuke the Legislature of Ontario upon a subject entirely within the jurisdiction of that province.

What was the record in 1896, when the subject was constitutionally before Parliament? The result of the attempt then made to carry out the provisions of section 93 was not a very encouraging one, and I think with that opinion my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, who opposed interference at that time, will entirely agree. Let us remember that, subject to the provisions of section 93 and subject to the provisions for disallowance of provincial legislation, the provinces of Canada are as sovereign and supreme in their sphere as is the Parliament of Canada in its own sphere. That principle has been established and laid down by the courts. No man who has given the subject any consideration can gainsay what I have just now affirmed. If I desire to give an authority which I think will appeal to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, I might quote his own language. In 1896, when he moved the six months' hoist to the Remedial Bill, so-called, he said:

> The Imperial Parliament has the power of disallowance, of supervision over the Acts of these colonial legislative bodies. This may be easily understood because colonies are dependencies. But the relations between the Dominion and the provinces are not the same.
>
> Between these there is no superiority and no inferiority, all are equal, with this exception, that the Dominion Parliament is invested with larger powers, that is, powers of a more extended and more important character than the local legislature. Indeed, it must be accepted and accepted as a truism that under popular government the majority must rule.

A little further on he said:

> The remedy of the minority under a free government is to agitate and endeavour to bring over a majority to their way of thinking. This is the rule under free government.

He spoke of a supposed power of the Imperial Parliament to supervise the Acts of Colonial Legislative bodies, and then he went on to declare that, even if that power were possessed by the Imperial Parliament, no such power exists in the Parliament of Canada to supervise the legislation enacted by the Provincial Legislatures. If the principle embodied in this resolution is not an attempt to supervise the legislation of the province of Ontario, I do not know how to characterize it. We are called upon to consider legislation which is not before us, to take into account regulations with which we are not familiar, and then we are invited to give to the Legislature of the province of Ontario an admonition which cannot fail to be understood by that Legislature as a reflection upon the policy which it has approved and upon the legislation which it has enacted. That was not my right hon. friend's view in 1896, because when the question was then constitutionally before the Parliament of Canada, it was his view that there should be no interference. When the question is not constitutionally before the Parliament of Canada, why then should there be interference? He denounced the attempt of Sir Charles Tupper's Government to proceed with the Remedial Bill because, he said, there had not been sufficient inquiry. How does he reconcile that with his proposal to-day to consider and to cast reflection upon legislation of the province of Ontario without any inquiry at all?

He put forth views in even more distinct terms in the same debate, in a quotation which I shall now give:

> For, Sir, experience has taught us that this remedy of interference with local legislation has never been applied and probably never can be applied without friction, disturbance and discontent; that you cannot apply that remedy without causing as much dissatisfaction as satisfaction.

If we are to accept my right hon. friend's words in the spirit in which they were uttered, and to give them all the effect which he intended, that quotation alone ought to be regarded by the House as a just reason for rejecting the motion of my hon. friend from Kamouraska.

Let us for a moment examine this resolution and see what it really contains and what is proposed. It contains much matter to which no exception can be taken. It does not, however, necessarily follow that the House should adopt it. Some hon. member might bring in a resolution upholding the principles embodied in the Ten Commandments and commending them to the consideration of a provincial legislature with the suggestion that they should observe them better in the future than in the past. It would not follow that the House ought to adopt such a resolution. The hon. gentleman's motion is as follows:

> It has long been the settled policy of Great Britain whenever a country passed under the sovereignty of the Crown by treaty or otherwise, to respect the religion, usages and language of the inhabitants who thus become British subjects;
>
> That His Majesty's subjects of French origin in the province of Ontario complain that by recent legislation they have been to a large extent deprived of the privilege which they and their fathers have always enjoyed since Canada passed under the sovereignty of the British Crown, of having their children taught in French.
>
> That this House, especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with.

In the first place, it might be inquired why my hon. friend from Kamouraska, at a time when, as he describes it, all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, should see fit to introduce such a motion in a parliament which cannot possibly exercise any legislative control over the subject with which it deals.

Mr. MEDERIC MARTIN: Take your responsibilities.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think my hon. friend's interruption is very relevant.

I would also suggest to my hon. friend from Kamouraska that if he desired to admonish the legislature of Ontario as to the policy which it should adopt, and if he expected that admonition to serve any good purpose, it seems particularly unfortunate that he should have waited until about a week after that legislature had prorogued. If his admonition was designed to have any good purpose, it would have been far preferable to address it to the legislature while it was in session and when it could take the admonition into consideration. As he let that opportunity pass, one might have expected that, at a time when all the energies of this country should be concentrated on the winning of the war, he would wait until another session when the legislature of Ontario would have been convoked and when this Parliament would also be in session. I do not know whether there are any incidents of a concurrent date which may have any bearing upon his course. I do not suggest anything with regard to that—but I do venture to remark on the extraordinary course adopted by my hon. friend in leaving this resolution to the particular date which he has selected.

Another remarkable feature about the resolution is that it omits any reference to the province of Manitoba. I would assume from this very significant omission that the situation in Manitoba, so far as this question is concerned, must be entirely satisfactory to my hon. friend from Kamouraska.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: I thought—and I think I have a fair ground for that opinion—that the question of the recent Manitoba legislation was not in the federal arena. No petition that I know of has been sent with regard to that legislation asking for its disallowance or otherwise, and I therefore did not think it was our duty to say anything about the Manitoba legislation. If my right hon. friend wants to know my opinion, I have no objection to telling him that I do not approve of injustice in Manitoba any more than I do of injustice in Ontario, and I shall have an opportunity of saying so on another occasion.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I accept entirely the explanation which my hon. friend has given, but I would point out that inasmuch as the question of disallowance has been dealt with by this Government without any motion from my hon. friend, and without any objection from him, the Ontario question is no more before this Parliament than is the Manitoba question. I challenge any contradiction of that assertion; neither one nor the other is before this Parliament for this purpose. The Manitoba legislation may be before us later for the purpose of having the question determined as to its disallowance. I infer from what my hon. friend has said that he intends, at the

proper time, to make a motion asking the Government to disallow it, for only in that way can I accept his statement as an adequate explanation. Even so, I do not regard it as giving a very satisfactory reason why Manitoba should be omitted and why Ontario should be included in this motion. The provisions of the Manitoba Act are well known; they have been known to my hon. friend for weeks, or even months. Yet he ventures to challenge in this Parliament the legislation of Ontario, and has not seen fit to challenge the legislation of Manitoba, which, if I am correctly informed, absolutely sets at defiance the principles which he advocates because it absolutely deprives children of French origin of the privilege of being taught in their own language.

The resolution then proceeds, as I have said, to advise and admonish the Legislature of Ontario. Is this Parliament to undertake the duty of tendering advice and admonition and rebuke to the legislature of every province of Canada that ventures to adopt a policy which may not be in accordance with the opinion of the majority in this House? Let me take an illustration. I understand that certain legislation was passed at the last session of the Legislature of Quebec, to which some portion of the people of Ontario take exception. Would my hon. friend say that if a resolution were introduced into this House commenting upon that legislation and recommending to the Legislature of Quebec that it should not continue or persevere in such a policy, we should adopt it? If he is right in the position which he takes, it would be perfectly proper for a majority of this House to give that admonition to the Legislature of Quebec. So far as I am concerned, if any such resolution were introduced into this Parliament for the purpose of conveying admonition or rebuke to the Legislature of Quebec, I would resist it as strenuously as I resist the motion of my hon. friend on this occasion. As long as these various legislative bodies are supreme within their own sphere, no good purpose can ever be attained by having any of them cast reflections upon the legislation or policy of the other. Let each keep within its own jurisdiction; let each deal with the matters that are confided to it by the constitution. Have we not in this Parliament, especially at the present time, a sufficiency of important subjects to engage our full energies and all our available wisdom without trenching upon matters of purely provincial concern? If we give advice on questions of language, why should we not undertake to give advice upon questions of education generally? If the province of Ontario, the province of Manitoba, or the province of Quebec sees fit to adopt an educational policy which does not commend itself to the majority in this House, we should logically proceed, if we accept the motion of the hon. member for Kamouraska, to convey advice and admonition to all these legislatures and invite them to give better consideration to the matters with which they alone are concerned and to change the policy which they in their wisdom may have fixed upon.

5 p.m.

The resolution of my hon. friend in its concluding words is of a significance which I do not fully comprehend. I had the privilege of looking at the original resolution which was presented to his honour the Speaker, and I observed that the word "is" in the last line was changed to the word "be." The change seems to give a somewhat different purport to the resolution. As it stood at first, before the change was made, it read in this way:

> That this House especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue is not interfered with.

The purport of the resolution as it stood at first was a suggestion that the Legislature of Ontario should make it clear that the privilege of being taught in French is not interefered with; that is to say, they should make the effect of their existing policy perfectly plain. But as altered, the suggestion is that the privilege of being taught in French shall not be interfered with. Although the words are perfectly courteous; although the language is respectful, that is a suggestion—more than that, a dictation—to the province of Ontario as to what its future policy in that regard should be. I repeat that no good purpose can be served, in respect of matters entirely within provincial jurisdiction, by any attempt of this Parliament to examine, to consider, to advise or to dictate to any province.

My right hon. friend, speaking on this subject yesterday, in the course of the brief discussion that we had in the House, said:

> Let us discuss it; let us hear both sides of it; and then, Sir, I believe that from this dis-

cussion we shall rise wiser and better men, knowing better what our position is, knowing better what the rights of the minority are; and I venture to say that when the question has been settled, as it ought to be settled, the minority will accept the situation whatever it may be.

I am not quite clear as to what my right hon. friend intended by that suggestion. If he means the legal rights as established by the constitution, then I would respectfully suggest to him that it is not the function of this Parliament to settle or determine them. That is the function of the constituted courts of this country which have been established for that purpose. They alone can deal with such questions, subject to a final appeal to His Majesty in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But my right hon. friend may mean something more than that. He may mean that we are to settle in this Parliament the question as to whether there should be some amendment to the British North America Act by which the rights of the provinces in respect of language or otherwise should be cut down and the constitution amended in that respect.

I point to the opinion of the Hon. Edward Blake, which I read a moment ago, and which, in a few words, is this, that no change of the constitutional Act as affecting any province can be made against the will of that province. Surely it is not suggested by my right hon. friend that the Parliament of Canada, without any consultation with the provinces, against the consent of the provinces, can pass or ought to pass an address to His Majesty for the purpose of so amending the British North America Act that the rights of the provinces of Canada shall be cut down and limited. Is there any hon. gentleman in this House who will uphold a proposal of that kind? I venture to think that the view which the Hon. Edward Blake in 1890 announced is not only in the interests of this Dominion as a whole, not only in the interests of all the provinces, but eminently in the interests of the province of Quebec. It is, I repeat, eminently in the interests of the province of Quebec itself. If it were possible for this Parliament, without the consent of the provinces affected, to pass a resolution upon which should be founded an amendment to the British North America Act cutting down provincial rights, no province in Canada would be in a more unfortunate situation than Quebec. We know that for this very reason, because Quebec desired to maintain control of her own provincial affairs, Quebec was not willing to accept the legislative union which Sir John A. Macdonald desired. As a result we have a Federal constitution and not a legislative union. But if the proposal suggested by my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should be adopted, then any province of Canada, without its consent, without any consultation with it and against its will, might find its provincial powers cut down and limited by virtue of a resolution passed in this Parliament of Canada. If my right hon. friend does not suggest that by the language which he used yesterday, I should like to know what he does suggest, and perhaps he will inform us when he comes to address the House. If it is possible for this Parliament by a resolution to interfere with the autonomy of the English-speaking provinces in respect of their control of language, it is equally possible for the Parliament of Canada to interfere in the same way with the control of the language or education by the province of Quebec. I venture to think that the resolution which my hon. friend from Kamouraska has proposed, if it is to be read in the light of the observations of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition as I interpret them, is the very last step which any hon. member from the province of Quebec ought to advocate in this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend has no warrant to interpret my words in that way.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Then my right hon. friend, when he comes to speak, will be good enough to explain to the House what he does intend. I will read his language again:

Let us discuss it; let us hear both sides of it; and then, Sir, I believe that from this discussion we shall rise wiser and better men, knowing better what our position is, knowing better what the rights of the minority are; and I venture to say that when the question has been settled, as it ought to be settled, the minority will accept the situation whatever it may be.

I understand my right hon. friend to say that this motion has been brought into this House for the purpose of settling that question. If his words do not mean that, they mean nothing. He is to have a discussion and he is to have the question settled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I repeat what I said a moment ago, that so far as the legal question is concerned, he will not affirm that this Parliament can settle it. Does my right hon. friend affirm that this Parliament can settle the legal question to which I have alluded? He will not affirm that; he cannot maintain it before this House or elsewhere. Then what did he allude to? He alluded evidently to the question of policy, to the question of having some amendment to the British North America Act by which the undoubted rights of the provinces of Canada in this respect should be modified in some way. I say that this cannot be done, that it ought not to be done, without consultation with the provinces or without their consent; and I say that no province in Canada is more vitally interested in the principle which I have just enunciated than the province of Quebec itself. Therefore, when a suggestion such as that is made, pointing unmistakeably to action by this Parliament along that line, I say it is unfortunate, and particularly unfortunate from the standpoint of the province of Quebec. What is the purpose of this resolution? What object is to be attained by it? Suppose the province of Ontario and the province of Manitoba treat this resolution, if it should pass, with the scornful indifference which is indicated by the leading Liberal organ in the West of Canada. Parliament having given that admonition and that advice is to do what? To take the rebuke of that scornful indifference, or to proceed further? What is the purpose of the resolution? What do my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) and the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition expect from it? If they intend any action afterwards in case that scornful indifference should be encountered, what is the action which they propose? And if we are right in believing, as the leading Liberal organ in the West has told us, that any such suggestion by this Parliament will meet with that reception, what purpose is there in passing this resolution? Why not leave this question to the forum to which the constitution of Canada has assigned it, and in which forum such questions have been dealt with ever since the Confederation Act was passed in 1867?

For these reasons I regard this motion as unfortunate. I regard it as especially unfortunate from the standpoint of the province of Quebec. I cannot conceive of any possible good that it can do. I can conceive that it may do a great deal of mischief; because it can hardly fail to intensify feelings already sufficiently aroused, and to strain the relations between the two great races in this country. No one is more anxious than I am that these good relations should be maintained and improved.

In the proper forum this subject is proper matter for discussion. In this forum I see no good reason why it should be discussed. So, for the reasons which I have assigned to the House, I for one, without the slightest hesitation, in the interests of this Dominion, in the interests of every province of Canada, and especially in the interests of the great province of Quebec, shall record my vote against this resolution.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe). I approach the subject, however, in a very different spirit from the spirit which has been indicated by the observations of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. I rise for the purpose of speaking with as much moderation as I can, and to appeal, not to passion or prejudice, but to the sober reasoning and judgment of my fellow countrymen of all origins. I discard at once all reference to constitutional arguments. I do not here and now bring within the purview of this discussion the British North America Act. I do not here and now invoke the cold letter of any positive law. Still less do I question the paramount power of the Legislature of Ontario to finally pass judgment upon this question and record the final verdict of its people. I rise, sir, not for the purpose of giving advice or admonition to the province of Ontario. I rise to plead before the people of Ontario, in behalf of His Majesty's subjects of French origin in that province, who complain that, by reason of a statute passed by the province, they have been deprived of rights, in matters of education, which they have enjoyed, themselves and their forefathers before them, ever since Canada became a possession of the British Crown.

And if I take this course, I am impelled to do it by reasons which, in my judgment, are stronger than any that are contained within the four corners of the statute complained of. If there be those—and, if I am right, my right hon. friend is one of them—who tell me that I have no right to come

before this Parliament to plead the cause which I am now pleading, that I am debarred from pleading it, and that the only forum before which it can be pleaded is the Legislature of Ontario, I tell my right hon. friend, and his friends beside him, that it was only four or five weeks ago that I was appealed to by an important organ of an important section of the province of Ontario—I mean the Orange Sentinel—under the signature of its editor, Mr. Hocken, to interfere in this matter, to give my views to my fellow countrymen and endeavour to put an end to the unfortunate agitation that is now going on. Sir, there have been amongst my friends those who resented that interference of the Orange Sentinel, who called it an impertinent letter, I do not share that view. I have no fault to find with the Orange Sentinel for thus appealing to me, I stand here in Parliament, and hold myself accountable to every citizen of Canada who temperately addresses me, as I was then addressed, to give my views upon every question which concerns the peace, good order and good government of this country. The very fact that I was thus appealed to shows that in the language of its editor, at all events, if I understand the English language aright, the question is not confined to the province of Ontario, but has gradually extended beyond its boundaries. Therefore, if I have to accept the invitation which was extended to me, I want to know if there is any other place where I could answer it than here from my place in the Parliament of Canada.

In the letter which was addressed to me there are statements of fact and expressions of opinion to which it is my duty respectfully to take exception. In the first place, I take exception to the manner in which I am addressed. I am addressed by the Sentinel as the leader of the French race in Canada. Here are the words of the Sentinel:

> Do you not see that you have surrendered the leadership of the French race in Canada to the Editor of the Le Droit? Are you content to have him supplant you as the political hero of your people? Do you think it will add to their happiness and prosperity, or advance the cause of Canadian unity, for which you have expressed a strong desire?

Let me say at once that when I am addressed as the leader of the French race in Canada I have to disclaim that proud title. I never had that title; I surrendered nothing to Mr. Bourassa. Mr. Bourassa and I have been on many questions at the very antipodes; indeed, in recent events he has been far nearer to the friends of the Orange Sentinel than to my own. I have simply this to say, that, while I do not claim ever to have been the leader of the French race in Canada it has been my honour for the last twenty-eight years to be accepted as the leader of Liberal Canadians—Canadians of all origins, Canadians by birth and Canadians by adoption; of all those Canadians who find their ideals expressed in those principles of British liberalism advocated in their time by Fox, by O'Connell, and by Gladstone, and cardinal among which was the protection of minorities. For those twenty-eight years I have been at the head of the Liberals of Canada. I have been at their head in good report and ill report; in victory and in defeat, and in many an arduous agitation, but I think I can affirm here, where my record is open to discussion, that at no time in any of those discussions, in any of those agitations, have I appealed either to race or to creed. I have endeavoured on every occasion to find a solution by appealing to the consciences of all men who love freedom, justice, and tolerance. That is the position which I take to-day upon this question which is now before the Canadian Parliament. Let me say that, whilst I have been the leader of the Liberal party in Canada, I am of French origin, and perhaps my judgment may be biassed, though I do not think it is. But I ask no man on this question to follow me; I want no man to vote with me unless he thinks in his conscience that the cause which I am now advocating is a right cause.

Sir, now that I have laid down the ground upon which I propose to proceed, let me try, if possible, to lay before Parliament the genesis of the agitation which, unfortunately, is now raging in the country. I thank Providence that I have lived long enough to see the old enmity of France and England at last at an end and replaced by feelings of cordial and mutual respect and good will towards one another. I thank Providence that I have seen the present alliance of England and France, consecrated as it is by the blood of the two nations, shed as we know for this most sacred of all causes. I thank Providence that I have seen this alliance which gives evidence of being the dawn of eternal friendship between those two nations, an alliance so lofty in purpose that already it is looked upon as one that must last forever—a war between England and France to-day would be just as criminal as a civil war in either of those nations; an alliance

which has received its last consecration in the resolution adopted by the inter-parliamentary committee of France and England, suggesting to both nations that the study of their language should be made compulsory in all the schools of Great Britain and France.

Well, Sir, unfortunately it has not always been so. England and France, as we know only too well, have filled the modern era with the history of their wars. They have fought in Europe, and they not only fought in Europe, but carried their quarrels and their wars to the virgin wilderness of this vast continent. The virgin wilderness of this continent resounded with the clash of their arms, and the war between them only ended with the final defeat of France. That defeat, however, was not on the plains of Abraham, which witnessed the victory of Wolfe over Montcalm; for, immediately after the defeat, the French army was rallied by the Chevalier de Levis, who for one year maintained the unequal contest, until, in the month of September, 1760, when the French army found itself between the army of General Murray and the approaching army of General Amherst, he surrendered, and that was the finish forever of the dream of a French Empire on the banks of the St. Lawrence. But there were 60,000 colonists who were then to become British subjects, and whose fate was a cause of anxiety to General de Levis. In the articles of surrender, he asked the victorious general that these 60,000 colonists should be granted their civil rights and the freedom of their religion. The articles were at once conceded by the generous victor, and when he had doubts he wrote: "they became subjects of the King", implying that in that fact there was ample protection.

I am a descendant of those colonists, and I am bound to say, what I have repeated many times but never with more pleasure than on the present occasion, that my fellow countrymen under the British Crown have found ample justice and liberty. But, at the same time, no one can deny that there have been jarrings and quarrels between the different elements. We should not be surprised at that, because we have the testimony of history that race quarrels are very persistent and will continue sometimes long after the cause which brought them about has disappeared. However, with all the jarrings and all the quarrels that we have had, there is one thing upon which, for more than 150 years, there never was any friction whatever, and that is the subject of education. From the day that Canada became an English possession, and when the French settlements, extended all along the St. Lawrence from Gaspè up to the Detroit river, from that day in 1760 down to about 1885, there never was the slightest friction upon the matter of education.

The French colonists were allowed, in Ontario as everywhere else, to have their schools and to teach their language to their children. So it was so long as Canada remained a Crown colony; so it was after the two provinces of Upper and Lower Canada had been separated and given an embryo constitutional Government; so it was after Canada had been reunited and given responsible Government; and so it was after Confederation and down to the year 1885, when the rights of the French people with regard to education were first challenged. That was in the province of Ontario. That was under the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat, and the old veteran, to his credit be it ever said, rose up to the highest possible notch of magnanimity in standing for the rights of the French minority. He established, or rather he reorganized, the bilingual schools, and these schools gave satisfaction to the minority for many years and to the majority as well, until at last, six or seven years ago, it was complained that they had become inefficient. As to that I have no opinion to express. I grant that the schools may have become inefficient; but, if the schools had become inefficient it was not because the system was defective, but it was because the system was not properly enforced; and in my judgment the efficient remedy would have been to have had this system of schools carried out as it was conceived. But, instead of that, the Board of Education first, and the Legislature of Ontario afterwards, passed regulations which it is claimed by the French minority in Ontario interfered seriously with their efficiency and made them almost nugatory and barren of results. The French people have accepted the situation everywhere except in the city of Ottawa. They have accepted these regulations but under protest. They have appealed to the courts against them. and the appeal is still pending before the courts. They have been unsuccessful before the courts of the province, but they have carried their rights to the

foot of the Throne, to the Privy Council, and there the matter rests at the present time.

In addition, they have asked for disallowance of this legislation. The Government have refused the petition for disallowance, and as to that I have no fault to find. I have no quarrel with the Government. I do not know that they could have taken any other course. The remedy by disallowance is very illusory. It is not a positive remedy; it is a negative remedy; the Government can annul a law, but it cannot do any more than that. Our experience for many years has been that disallowance—and I have no word to change in what was quoted of some of my former utterances a moment ago by my right hon. friend—has not given satisfaction. Instead of giving satisfaction, it has been the cause of many of the agitations which we have had in this country. If the statute were disallowed what would be the result? The result would be that at the ensuing session the same law would be passed by the same legislature. I have no doubt whatever that many of the signers of the petition, and there were thousands of them, thought that by signing this petition and having the law disallowed, that would be the end of it, and that the Legislature of Ontario could thereby have its power curtailed and could not re-enact such a law. But that is a mistake; there is no such thing. If the law had been disallowed, there was nothing to prevent it from being re-enacted, and again re-enacted it would certainly have been.

But, while I do not blame the Government of Canada for having refused to disallow the law of Ontario, I am sorry that I have to express my regret that the Government did not think it advisable, as they had the power to do, to call the attention of the Legislature and Government of Ontario to the complaints of the minority and ask them to give them favourable consideration. My right hon. friend knows—everybody knows—that time and again, under Liberal Administrations and under Conservative Administrations as well, the Government, while refusing to disallow a law, would call the attention of the Government of the province to the fact that there were complaints against that legislation, and suggest to them that it would be wise to give heed to them and try to meet those complaints. Sometimes these remonstrances have been accepted, sometimes they have not been accepted; but I claim that it would have been a wise action on the part of the Government of the day to have made at least to the Government of Ontario some representation in that behalf.

Now, the matter rests. The only remedy is the remedy in the courts. For my part, I look upon the remedy in the courts under the present circumstances as a very illusory one. There has been, and there is at the present time, an agitation going on that has involved a great deal of bitterness and antagonism which no judicial decision can allay. We have had the experience of the last fifty years that when rights are vehemently asserted on the one hand and haughtily denied on the other, a judicial decision, while it may enforce, on one side or the other a grudging assent, will not promote harmony, will not create good-will—and harmony and good-will are the considerations which are to be sought first, last, and all the time.

And now, Sir, if my right hon. friend wants to know why I support this motion, as I do, it is not that we wish to force upon the people of Ontario our way of thinking, or compel them to a course they do not want; we have no right to do that. But it is to ask them to consider the situation in the light of the present agitation, and to investigate the claims which, in their opinion, may or may not be well founded but for which, at all events, I would ask respectful consideration. My right hon. friend asked me what I meant yesterday when I said I hoped the matter would be discussed here. I want to have the matter discussed here so that on all sides we may frankly approach the subject from the basis of our common Canadian nationality, and, if possible, find a meeting ground where we shall be able to say to the minority: "You shall not go further than that," and to the majority, "You should grant what is reasonable; you should, at all events, make some concession." I ask no more than that. I read a few days ago in a paper of this city the following statement, to which I ask the consideration of the House:

> The position of English-speaking Ontario is this—and let any Canadian who has any sense of national responsibility, be he French-speaking or English-speaking, try to understand it and use his influence accordingly before the racial fanatics of this city get their compatriots into fatal trouble. Ontario proposes to remain an English-speaking province in so far as the wishes of her present English-speaking people can prevail constitutionally.

I could quote hundreds of articles of the same nature, in which it is asserted, and again asserted, that Ontario is an English-speaking province, and will remain an English-speaking province. Who asks for anything else? There is an impression, I know, among some of my fellow countrymen whom I see on the other side of the House that the French Canadian has some sinister motive behind this agitation, that in some way he wants to get control of the province of Ontario. Sir, the idea would be ridiculous if it were not so serious as it is. But we know there are extremists everywhere; there are extremists who are to-day using language which I reprove as much as does any man of English origin. I am not asking anything at the present time for my French-speaking countrymen of the province of Ontario, except the privilege of having their children taught in the French language untrammelled—a privilege they have had for at least one hundred and fifty years. Will any one tell me that if the French Canadians of the province of Ontario are allowed to have their children taught in a language which is so dear to them—the French language at that, one of the noblest on earth—that Ontario will be less British than it is to-day? Will any one tell me that, if the people of Wales are deprived of the schools they have a right to, and of the use of their language in those schools in order that their children may acquire it, Wales will be less British than it is at the present moment or has been ever since it was joined to the British Crown? These are some considerations which I wish to place before my fellow-countrymen. Yesterday, when I stated upon the floor of the House that I wanted to have this question discussed, it was in the hope that discussion of it would make us wiser and better men, and that we should understand exactly where we were. There never is harm to be apprehended from a free discussion, and I hoped for a great deal of good. I meant nothing more than that.

Before I go further let me again refer to the open letter which the Orange Sentinel addresssed to me, urging me to interfere in this matter. Addressing itself to me it says:

> Settle the bilingual controversy by convincing your people that they have no rights in Ontario, and we may look for a better recruiting record in Quebec.

Sir, I am not prepared to say that my fellow-countrymen of French origin have no rights in Ontario; but I am prepared to say this, and I want my words to be heard throughout the length and breadth of this land: whether my fellow-countrymen have rights or no rights in Ontario, whether those rights are granted or denied, these considerations are no bar to the duty which the French-Canadians owe to themselves and to the honour of their race to come forward in their fullest numbers and take part in the great struggle that is going on to-day in the land of their ancestors for the cause of freedom, and of the civilization of mankind.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was speaking of the rights of the French minority in the province of Ontario. I stated that I was not prepared to say that the minority had no rights; on the contrary, I would be prepared to argue that under section 93 of the British North America Act the minority has rights which can be enforced in the courts of law. But I repeat what I said previously in the debate, that I do not approach this question upon the cold letter of the positive law. My aim and purpose in approving of the resolution of my hon. friend from Kamouraska is rather to appeal to the sense of justice of the province of Ontario—justice between man and man, justice not according to the letter of the statute, but justice according to the conscience of every living man, no matter what his nationality may be.

I will now put forward the view which I intend to present to the House upon this aspect of the question. I referred this afternoon to the capitulation of Levis to the forces of General Amherst in the year 1760. In those Articles of Capitulation no mention is made of language; neither is any mention made of language in the Treaty of Paris which confirmed the terms of the capitulation of Montreal. The only things which are referred to in the Articles of Capitulation and in the Treaty of Paris, are religious freedom and civil rights. There are, however, jurists of eminence who hold it as a canon of the law of nations that civil rights carry with them as a corollary the rights of language. I will not say that the opinion is unanimous, but it is held by authorities of the most eminent reputation. But

canons of the law of nations have no sanction. They are binding on conscience; they are binding on honour; but they have no other sanction. Nations can ignore them or nations can respect them. Nations there are which ignore them; nations there are which respect them. Germany is one of the nations which ignores the canons of the law of nations. She has given in the present war example after example of that contemptuous unconcern, not only in this war, but even in times of peace, and in the events which followed war. The last instance that we have had of the policy followed by Germany is the case of Alsace-Lorraine after the Franco-Prussian war. By the treaty of Frankfort the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine were detached from France and annexed to Germany. She ignored all the canons of the law of nations and planted her brutal heel upon those two provinces, ignoring the rights and privileges which, under another regime, the population of those provinces would have had a right to expect. She subjected the French language to many cruel restrictions and indignities. But England, I am proud to say, has always respected the canons of the law of nations. Wherever England has planted her colours by conquest, by treaty, or in any other manner, she has always respected the laws, the language and the religion of her new subjects. The last instance of that is South Africa. She acted in that manner in Canada; she did it in India; she did it in Mauritius; she did it in Malta; she did it in the West Indies. Wherever she planted her flag the law of nations was observed, and the language of her new subjects was so well respected that no one would have suspected that there had been a change of allegiance. How many years have elapsed since we were at war with South Africa? Hardly fourteen years. But I am proud, as a British subject, to say that to-day the Dutchman of South Africa is just as free to speak his language and to have his children educated in his language as he was before the South African war. All that I have to ask my fellow-Canadians of the province of Ontario is; which example are we going to follow? Which is the best polity for Canada? Is it the German polity? No one will say that. Well, then, will it not be the British polity, which for two centuries or more has been invariably followed in every part of the globe? I could follow the whole circle of the earth and everywhere I would find the same story repeated by every British subject, no matter what his origin, whether he is in Malta, where he speaks the Italian language, or in St. Lucia, in the West Indies, where he speaks the French language, or in South Africa, where he speaks the Dutch language, nay, even whether in India, where he speaks languages almost without number. The same story is repeated everywhere, and what I have to propose to my fellow countrymen in the province of Ontario is that we should follow the example of England in the polity she has adopted in all parts of the world. All I ask is that in the province of Ontario, and also in the province of Manitoba, our children should be allowed to be taught in the language of our ancestors: in Ontario, because the language was preserved by the Crown itself; in Manitoba, because, when that province was created, the French language was introduced therein by the deliberate will and action of this Parliament.

Speaking of Manitoba, I was more sorry than surprised at the language of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, as his statements in regard to that province added neither strength nor dignity to his argument. He endeavoured to compare my conduct of to-day with my conduct of 1896. Is there any parity or disparity between my conduct of to-day and my conduct of 1896? What was the situation in 1896? This Canadian Parliament undertook to pass a law of education for the province of Manitoba over the heads of the Legislature of Manitoba. Did I and my friends undertake to do anything of this kind? Did we attempt to force upon the people by the will of this Parliament a law which would be repugnant to the majority of Manitoba? The law which was introduced by the Government of 1896 was obnoxious to the great majority of the people of Manitoba. Sir, is it not a fact that the Legislature of Manitoba, having behind it almost the whole of the people of the province, had put an end to a system of education which they found obnoxious to them? Is it not also a fact that the Canadian Government of that day undertook to put a law upon the statute-book, by the power of the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada, which a large majority of the people of Manitoba resented? Well, Sir, I would not submit to that; I fought that proposed legislation. Is that all that I did? No, I did something else. I did then the very thing that I am doing to-day. I appealed to the

Government of Manitoba, to the legislature and to the people of that province, saying: "Here is a grievance. I do not care whether it is debated or not; I ask you to be generous to the majority and to correct the evil which you have created". I am glad to say that my appeal was heeded. The Legislature of Manitoba, in response to my appeal, undertook to amend the Act which was agreeable to the majority but obnoxious to the minority, so as to remedy to a considerable extent the grievance of the minority.

My right hon. friend alluded to-day to the fact that that law has just been repealed. Under the remedy which was enacted in the session of 1897 by the Legislature of Manitoba, the minority were allowed to have religious teaching in their schools and the privileges of a French education. As was stated this afternoon by the Prime Minister, the Legislature of Manitoba has repealed the concession which it made in 1897 so far as the French language is concerned. That is true—only too true.

The right hon. Prime Minister reproached us because the hon. member for Kamouraska did not include an appeal to Manitoba in the resolution of this day. I ask if he was very sincere in his regrets? I thought his regrets were more like crocodile's tears than anything else. I understood what was at the bottom of his speech, I had only to look at the face of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) when the Prime Minister uttered those words. I saw an expression of glee on the face of the Postmaster General; he thought it would be a good argument in the province of Quebec. Let me say to my hon. friend the Postmaster General that I do not speak especially for the province of Quebec; I speak for the people of Canada as a whole. This language I shall hold in every part of Canada, whether it be Quebec, Ontario or any other province. In this resolution we did not include the grievance of the minority of the people of Manitoba; the remedy for that will be sought in another way. I will give my hon. friend another reason. So far as I am concerned, if I have advice to give to my fellow-countrymen of French origin I will tell them not to be hasty, not to be premature, to take their time, to consider what course they should follow. We have not yet heard the voice of the people of Manitoba at the bar of the House of Commons or at the door of the legislature of that province. There is time enough for all this; the situation will be canvassed at the proper time. But, Sir, I resent that in a matter of so great moment an attempt should be made to mix up situations which ought not to be mixed up. I resent any attempt to look at this question from any standpoint except the broad basis of what is reasonable, right, just and fair.

I now come back to the province of Ontario. I have stated that I want to appeal to the sense of justice and fair play of the people of Ontario and to their appreciation of British institutions—no more. Even if I am in the wrong—and I hope I am not—I am sure that a frank understanding between the majority and the minority in the province of Ontario, between the two great elements which compose the Canadian people, may force a solution of this troublesome question. Every man in the province of Ontario, every man in this room who comes from the province of Ontario, whether he sits on that side or on this side, is determined that every child in the province of Ontario shall receive an English education. To that, Sir, I give my fullest assent. I want every child in the province of Ontario to receive the benefit of an English education. Wherever he may go on this continent I want him to be able to speak the language of the great majority of the people on this continent. I want it, I say, not only because it is the law of the province, but because of merely utilitarian considerations. No man on this continent is equipped for the battle of life unless he has an English education. I, if I may be permitted to make a personal allusion to myself, I am of French origin, but every day of my life I have occasion to bless my father for sending me when eleven years of age to an English school. The benefits which I received there I have carried with me up to the present time. I want every child, therefore, to have an English education. Now I come to the point where I want to speak of my fellow-countrymen in the province of Ontario. When I ask that every child of my own race should receive an English education, will you refuse us the privilege of education also in the language of our mothers and our fathers? That is all that I ask to-day; I ask nothing more than that. I simply ask you, my fellow-countrymen, British subjects like myself, if, when we say that we must have an English education, you will say: "You shall have an English education and nothing else." There are men who say that in the schools of Ontario and Manitoba there should be no

other language than the English language. But, Sir, when I ask that we should have also the benefit of a French education, will you refuse us that benefit? Is that an unnatural demand? Is that an obnoxious demand? Will the concession of it do any harm to anybody? And will it be said that in the great province of Ontario there is a disposition to put a bar on knowledge and to stretch every child in the schools of Ontario upon a Procrustean bed and say that they shall all be measured alike, that no one shall have the privilege of a second education in a second language? I do not believe it; and if we discuss this question with frankness, as between man and man, in my humble opinion, it can yet be settled by an appeal to the people of Ontario. I do not believe that any man will refuse us the benefit of a French education.

Then, in the newspapers, not all, but many of them, of both parties, I have seen the statement made that there is no disposition to curtail the teaching of the French language, and that it is already provided for. Well, sir, I welcome this generous indignation; and, if it be so, as I think I can show, that the teaching of French, which was organized by Sir Oliver Mowat between the years 1880 and 1890, has been very much restricted by Regulation 17, perhaps then we can come to a satisfactory conclusion that will be acceptable to both sides. Sir, I have seen it stated, and it is argued, that Regulation 17 has put no bar to the teaching of the French language. Before reading Regulation 17, may I read Regulation 15? Regulation 15 is as follows:

> In school sections where the French or German language prevails, the board may, in addition to the courses of study prescribed herein, require instruction to be given in French or German, reading, grammar and composition, to such pupils as are directed by their parents or guardians to study either of these languages.

It is stated that this regulation is still in force, and so it is. It is very plain in its wording. It means this, that in all sections where the German element or the French element prevails, this element can ask the privilege of having its education in either the German or the French language. I repeat that this section is still in force. But it has been modified by Regulation 17, which is in these words:

> Section 4. In schools where French has hitherto been a subject of study, the Public or Separate School Board, as the case may be, may provide, under the following conditions, for instruction in French reading, grammar and composition, in Forms I to IV, in addition to the subjects prescribed for the Public and Separate Schools.

Mark the words, "in schools where French has hitherto been a subject of study." What is the meaning of the word "hitherto" here, and why has it been introduced? Instead of one condition, which you had previously, you now have two conditions. One condition is that French henceforth is to be taught only in settlements where that language prevails and where it has hitherto been taught. In other words, Regulation 17 has created a restricted atmosphere in which French can be taught. It can continue to be taught, though in modified form, in all the schools where it was taught before June, 1912. But in other schools it cannot be taught. In other words, in no new schools can the French language be introduced. I know that this disposition has been dealt with in other papers. I have seen it denied. But I am told on good authority, and I have reason to believe it is true, that the regulation has been so interpreted as to mean that the French language shall not be taught anywhere except in the schools where it was taught before June, 1912. Will any man tell me that this is a liberal disposition? Will any of my friends sitting in this House tell me that they are satisfied with it? But if I am told—

Mr. ROGERS: Will my hon. friend pardon a question? Will he tell us where that interpretation applies?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have told my hon. friend.

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It applies just what the word "hitherto" means, and I ask my hon. friend what the word "hitherto" means. Why is it there?

Mr. ROGERS: I will explain when my time comes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will explain now. If the word "hitherto" does not mean anything, strike it out. What will be the remedy I ask? Will my hon. friend agree to that? If it is meaningless why is it there? If it means nothing, why has it been inserted there? If it means what I say, why do you keep it there? Sir, we do not want any of this quibbling between us.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not want any of this quibbling between us. This word

"hitherto" must mean something or it means nothing. If it means nothing, if it does not mean that the tuition of French is to be restricted to schools where it was taught in 1912, then all I ask is that it be removed, and we shall have no further quarrel. This is my position. I know that it has been so interpreted elsewhere; at all events, I understand so. But if it has been so interpreted elsewhere, by mistake or otherwise, all I ask now is that there shall be no equivocation upon it, and that we shall know exactly where we are.

There is another disposition of Regulation 17 to which I take similarly serious exception. I must say that I have taken a long time to make up my mind as to what was the character of this regulation and what attitude I should take. Looking at those regulations, and giving them the best understanding I can, there is another disposition which I submit to the fairness and justice of my friends, the majority in the province of Ontario. The other thing of which I complain is that the language of tuition between teacher and pupil is made to be the English language for the French children, even in learning English. Between teacher and pupil the English language is made the exclusive language, except under very exceptional circumstances. Here is Regulation 17, paragraph 3:

> Subject, in the case of each school, to the direction and approval of the chief inspector, the following modifications shall also be made in the course of study of the public and separate schools.
>
> (1) Where necessary in the case of French-speaking pupils, French may be used as the language of instruction and communication; but such use of French shall not be continued beyond Form 1, excepting that, on the approval of the chief inspector, it may also be used as the language of instruction and communication in the case of pupils beyond Form 1 who are unable to speak and understand the English language.

What is the meaning of these words, "where necessary"? They did not exist before; they were introduced in June, 1912. Here are a few children between five and six years of age going to school. They have learnt at their mother's knee the French language and no other, and they are told that they must be taught in the English language unless it is found necessary to teach them in the French language. Who is to determine? The chief inspector. Here is a school in the back concessions, and you have to apply to the chief inspector to know whether or not it is necessary that the child should be given the privilege of having an education in the French language, in his own tongue, and not in English. Why this harsh provision, I ask? Why this unnecessary and harsh provision? Sir, I am free to say, and I say it without any hesitation, that men are not necessarily or wantonly cruel and offensive. This regulation has been introduced for a purpose, and with an idea. The idea is that the French pupil who comes into school, the young boy who receives his education from the teacher in the English vernacular will make more progress than if he were taught in the French language. I take absolute exception to that view, and I put this as a proposition of school-teaching under such circumstances that, if you want the child to make progress even in his own language, which is French, or in the English language, the medium of communication between the teacher and the child should be the French language. My proposition is plain. I put it to my hon. friends on the other side, and if I can make it good I hope they will give us the benefit of it. I will not give my own opinion as my authority; I will give authority much higher than my own. In the first place, I will quote upon this very subject the language of a man whose name I had occasion to mention before in this House, and who, though speaking from the grave, is still an authority in the province of Ontario as he was amongst the living; I mean Sir Oliver Mowat. In a speech delivered at Woodstock on December 3, 1889, he spoke upon this very point in these words:

> Our opponents pretend that the Government should insist on all instruction being given to the French children in the English language. No such regulation was suggested by the Commissioners—

These were commissioners appointed by Sir Oliver Mowat to investigate the question.

> —and none such has been made, because such a regulation would be absurd, and, instead of serving the cause of education, would often prevent education altogether.

This is high authority, I repeat. But I have other authority to submit to the House. The names are not as famous or as well known as the name of Sir Oliver Mowat, but they are the names of experts whose testimony ought to be acceptable, because they are regarded as experts in education in all parts of the British Empire.

In 1911 there was held in London an Imperial conference on education. Mark the words—Imperial conference on education; and a special sitting of the conference was

devoted to bilingualism. The conference on bilingualism took place on the 2nd of May, 1911, under the presidency of the Right Hon. Walter Runciman, then President of the Board of Education, and there were present experts from India, from Canada, from South Africa, from Malta, from Jersey, from the Scottish Education Department, and from the Board of Education of England and Wales, all countries in which, at that time, and from time immemorial, there has been bilingualism. This subject was canvassed upon every side. I could tell you of the suggestions offered and of the speeches delivered by the delegates from South Africa—Mr. Thomas Muir, Superintendent of Education, Cape of Good Hope, and Mr. Viljoen, a Dutchman, Director of Education in the Orange Free State. It would take too long to go over the whole pamphlet; but I will give the House some of the opinions which were then expressed upon this very topic that we have now under consideration.

In the first place, I will quote the opinion of Dr. MacKay, Superintendent of Education in the province of Nova Scotia:

> In Nova Scotia less than 10 per cent are Acadian French. In New Brunswick perhaps less than 20 per cent are Acadian French. For a number of years we endeavoured to give them at least in the common school grades bi-lingual readers with instruction from the beginning in English. It was held by the French that the children could make no progress because they could not understand English when first entering school. In order to settle the difficulty a commission was appointed; and the commission determined, and the Government accepted the determination, that the education of the French-speaking child should commence, and be continued during the first four years in the mother tongue, and French readers were provided for them. While these French readers were used during the first four years the teachers of these schools were expected to acquaint themselves with the method of teaching English colloquially, and during these four years the children were required to do as much as possible in English so that after the fourth year instruction could go on in English continuously. That is the way the matter stands at present in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I believe the French are pretty well satisfied with it. The children in this way learn English more easily. They can learn written French more rapidly, and that enables them with very little difficulty, to commence their studies in English thereafter.

Mark the words: children commencing their education in their own tongue can take up English afterwards more easily. Now, I pause here and ask every man in this House, who has had a bilingual education, if this opinion of Dr. MacKay is not justified to the letter by his own experience. Where a French child knows his grammar, and has the elements of a French education, the complications of the French language are so much more difficult than the complications of the English language that the task of learning English afterwards is made quite easy. I am sure that every man in this House who has had a bilingual education will appreciate and endorse what I say.

But, Sir, the one opinion to which I am anxious to call the attention of the House is the opinion of Mr. Owen Edwards, Chief Inspector of schools in the Welsh Department of the Board of Education in England, who spoke in this way:

> With regard to the teaching of English to Welsh-speaking children, for a certain number of years we tried the method that seems to be condemned unanimously by the Conference to-day. We thought that the best way of teaching English to a Welsh child would be to make language and the atmosphere of the school entirely English, and to use Welsh, if at all, for the purpose of absolutely necessary explanation. I can but state the result by quoting from a report of a small committee of teachers of great ability and long experience, a report adopted and published by the Anglesey Education Committee. The infant, as he leaves the infant school, is thus described.
>
> "He reads words with which he associates no meaning, and is denied access to the written word which would at once call up ideas and stimulate his intelligence. Thus, when he has attained the age of six or seven, his book tells him nothing; the language he reads he cannot understand, and the language he understands he cannot read."
>
> That was the typical product of our infant schools until a few years ago. As regards the bi-lingual districts, we have to face, in our smaller schools, the difficulty of a double curriculum and a double staff. We avoid both. If about 66 per cent of the children speak English as their home language, we take English as the language of the infant school; if about 66 per cent speak Welsh, we take Welsh as the one language. So far, we have had no difficulty that has not been easily overcome. Bi-lingual teachers are easily obtainable.

And he concludes with these words:

> The results, so far as we in Wales are concerned, are certainly unmistakable. In the Welsh-speaking district, it is not too much to say that the newer method of teaching by means of the home language has practically doubled the efficiency of the schools. For one thing, it connects the elementary school with the home and with other educational institutions, especially with two characteristic Welsh institutions: the Sunday School (which is a school for the whole people, not for children only), and the literary meeting. It has also greatly facilitated the learning of English. A child in Standard III, in a school employing the modern method writes English more correctly and reads it more intelligently than a child in Standard V, in a school in which the old method is till used. That is, a Welsh-speaking child of nine, who has learnt his own language first, will write better English and read English more intelligently than a Welsh-speaking child of 11 who has been taught English exclusively from the

first day he entered school. This is my experience.

Now, I quote to you the opinion of another of these experts in the Welsh language, Mr. A. T. Davies, secretary of the Welsh Department:

So far back as 1893, the following instruction was issued by the Board of Education to Her Majesty's Inspectors acting in Wales :

"In the case of Wales it is clearly established that in many cases in Welsh-speaking districts the use of Welsh in the school, side by side with English, will greatly facilitate an intelligent understanding of English. It is desirable that the attention of teachers should be called to this question, and that Her Majesty's Inspectors should encourage the practice of bi-lingual teaching by themselves making use of Welsh in testing children's intelligence. The use of Welsh songs and Welsh poetry in the schools in question will be of considerable service."

Now, I pass to another expert, Mr. Warre Cornish, who represented the Scottish department of the Board of Education. Mr. Warre Cornish expressed his opinions in these words:

The department refrain from laying down the law as to the bi-lingual problem; only they are careful that in the Gaelic-speaking districts there shall be an inspector, generally a Highlander, who thoroughly understands the difficulties of the problem, and who is in very close touch with the teachers, and it is left very much between the two parties; and I can only say that, so far as I am aware, this method of leaving the problem to settle itself on the spot has worked with very general satisfaction to the parents.

Of course there are enthusiasts for the Gaelic language and extremists who may make their voice heard sometimes, but there has been very little complaint from the parents that that language is not receiving sufficient attention.

Dr. Viljoen: Is it used as a medium in any way?

Mr. Warre Cornish: There is no provision for or against the use of Gaelic as a medium.

The Chairman: It is occasionally used as a medium in some schools, is it not?

Mr. Warre Cornish: It certainly is used as a medium.

In the face of these authorities, in the face of these opinions of experts, in the face of the mature reflections of men whose lives have been devoted to teaching in bilingual schools, am I not justified in asking the Legislature of Ontario at all events to give us a rehearing upon this matter? I ask nothing more. I ask to have a rehearing in a matter of such importance to us as to whether or not the policy which has been adopted by Ontario is right and proper or whether it may be improved.

But when I express this request I know that men will rise up before me with uplifted hands and say, "Hands off,"—we have heard it to-day from the Prime Minister—. "Hands off; the province of Ontario is an autonomous province, and it will not brook any dictation; the province of Ontario has paramount powers in this matter." The province of Ontario has paramount powers in this matter, and it is for the province of Ontario to say whether or not it will give us that rehearing which I ask for my fellow countrymen of French origin or whether it will refuse it. The province of Ontario has paramount power, but may I not recall to the province of Ontario the words of the great poet:

O, it is excellent
To have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant.

The province of Ontario has paramount power and I would be the last man to question it; I would be the last man to try to interfere with it. I am of the old school of Mowat and Blake, who were the prophets and the originators of the doctrine of provincial rights, and by that doctrine I stand to-day. I say that the province of Ontario will and shall determine that question; but I ask these new converts to the doctrine of provincial rights: Am I interfering with the doctrine of provincial rights when I ask humbly to be allowed to present my petition to the province of Ontario? Is it forbidden in the code of these new adepts in the doctrine of provincial rights that you shall not even be allowed to stand at the bar of the province of Ontario? and make your plea? I stated at the beginning of my remarks that I did not come here to admonish or advise the province of Ontario; I came here simply to present the petition of a humble subject of His Majesty who happens to have been born of French parents, and who wants to preserve the right which has been preserved to me by the British Crown, a right which has existed as long as the British Crown has had sway in this country.

I know that there is to-day in the province of Ontario a sense of irritation at the position which has been taken by some of my fellow countrymen of French blood in the province of Quebec, who have from the first deprecated the participation of Canada in the present war, and who have exerted their influence to attempt at least to prevent enlistment. Alas, it is true; it is only too true. It is deplorable, and it is to me as unintelligible as it

is deplorable. It is true there are in my province men of French origin who when France is fighting a fight the heroism of which stirs the blood of mankind, remain with their blood cold and tell us: "No, we will not lift a finger to assist England in defending the integrity of France; we want our wrongs to be righted in Ontario." Wrongs or no wrongs there is the field of honour, there is the call of duty. But, Sir, though our cause be just and fair, shall it be impeded because there are men who so far forget the duty which they owe not only to their British allegiance, but to the French blood which flows in their veins. If there are men who have taken that ignoble stand there are many men, also, who have gone to the front, and who are now standing by the side of their British comrades, fighting under the British flag with as much courage as any British soldier.

An hon. MEMBER: A pretty small number of them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If anything is to weigh in the balance, is it to be the voice of the shirker, the voice of the slacker, or is it to be the voice of the man who has responded to the call of duty and gone to the front, and who is doing his duty to the Empire, even to the shedding of his blood? Some hon. member says they are few in number. Yes, perhaps not as many as there might have been; I admit that. But, if it is so, where lies the responsibility if it is not with the men who, in 1911, said that under no circumstances should Canada fight for England. I have done my best, at all events. I have given the best of my life for the doctrine that I am now maintaining, not upon this question only, but in the fight for civilization which we are now waging on the soil of France. When Gladstone undertook to bind up and heal the wounds of Ireland and to give to that unfortunate country a last measure of liberty and justice, there were extremists among the Irishmen who did all they could to down the policy of the Grand Old Man. They did all they could to continue the old hatred against England, to sow discord, and to fan the passions of that unfortunate, but noble country. But Gladstone, great man that he was, was not deterred. He went on. Though, like Moses, he did not bring the people to the promised land, he sowed the seed. The seed he planted has germinated and brought forth fruit; the cause of Ireland has grown until it is fully matured, and to-day England is reaping her reward in the unanimity with which the Irish people stand behind her in this war. Indeed, in spite of all the gold and all the plotting of Germany, which did nothing more than to raise a riot which was at an end after three days at the most, the policy of conciliation inaugurated by Gladstone has been vindicated and the insane plot will not dash from Ireland the cup of fulfilment which was at her lips.

9 p.m.

I have lived too long not to know that the distrust that is caused by race quarrels is one of the banes of our life in Canada. If there is this exclusion of the French language which we complain of today in the manner which I have stated, is it because there is distrust of the French race? You do not look to the great body of the nation; you look only to certain extremists who have made use of the most detestable language. A journal published in the city of Toronto, edited by a man of great ability, an eminent writer who has given himself the mission of being the foremost advocate of a closer bond of union for the British Empire, has, within the last ten days, inaugurated a new programme, the first article of which is, "One language, and one language only." Under the present circumstances this means that only one language shall be taught in the schools of Ontario. The editor of that paper is not the only man to conceive that the Empire, to be united, must be united not only in aim and in purpose, but in every detail. Sir, I wonder if this new theory for bringing about unity of the Empire is to be applied in Wales, and the Gaelic language accordingly prohibited in the Welsh schools. Is this theory to be applied in the Highlands of Scotland, or in Malta, or in Egypt, or in South Africa? Sir, if there is one thing which to-day stands to the glory of England—a feat unparalleled in the history of the world—it is that to-day on the battlefield in Flanders there are men who do not speak a word of English, but who for England have come forward to fight and die. If the Britisher, when he went to India, to Malta, to South Africa, or anywhere else, had implanted that new doctrine of "one language and one language only," and had suppressed the language of the people who had just passed under his dominion, do you believe, Sir, you would have seen that great and noble spectacle which has astonished and is still astonishing the

world? No, Sir. It is because British institutions everywhere have carried freedom and respect for minorities that England is as strong as she is to-day.

My right hon. friend, commenting this afternoon upon the resolution which has been introduced by my hon. friend from Kamouraska, and especially upon the words, "That this House, especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war," wondered why this resolution had been introduced in the midst of the war. Can he have any doubt? Does he not see why? I will tell him. It has been introduced in this House for the same reason that a similar motion was introduced at the meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the Allies, held in old Westminster Hall. Assembled there to consider means for bringing about the end of the war, the committee declared that it would be in the best interests of unanimity to have the English and the French language taught wherever the banners of France and England floated. It is less than a month since eminent members of the French and English Parliaments met in that old hall to discuss the war and the best methods to be pursued in bringing it to an end, and one of the things which they did suggest was that the French and English languages should be taught wherever the French or the English ruled. Did they believe that in doing this noble work they were doing anything that would militate against the successful ending of the war? No, Sir, their thought rose higher than that; they believe that in so doing they were fostering the very object which we have in view—and what a lesson it is for us to-day, my fellow-citizens in this House of Commons! Sir, we are engaged in this stupendous war, which is to determine whether or not henceforth might or right is to rule the world. Alas, it is only too plainly evident that we are still very far from the end. More sacrifices will be needed; more mothers will have to mourn over their lost sons, and more horrors will be piled up on the soil of brave, desolate France and on the soil of unfortunate Belgium. But already to this black cloud there is visible a silver lining. After nearly three months of fearful battering, the citadel of Verdun, ever proud and defiant, still flies the tri-colour at its masthead. This failure of the German arms makes it very plain that in this contest Germany cannot win—that might cannot triumph over right. Already it is plain to any observer that in the trenches will be buried many of the old hatreds and old prejudices, and that from the soil of the battlefields will germinate a new spirit of affection and brotherhood, such as has never before been heard of or known since the angels themselves brought from Heaven the divine message of "Peace on earth, good-will to men." We have an earnest of this new spirit of brotherhood in the resolution adopted by the Interparliamentary Committee of France and England, which, as I said, came to us from Westminster Hall itself, that old and noble building which goes back to the time of the Norman Kings and which has seen the development and evolution of all that is contained in those great principles of freedom, justice, and tolerance. That call which was made in Westminster Hall to all British subjects, to all French citizens, I make bold to make here in Ottawa, not in any spirit of dictation, but in the same spirit which has inspired and is the true spirit of British institutions, in the hope that it will be heard in Ottawa, heard in Toronto, and heard in Winnipeg.

Hon. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, it shall be my duty to bring the attention of the House back to the real question before us, even if we have to descend from the high flights of eloquence attained by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I was rather surprised this afternoon when my right hon. friend said that he had received from the Orange Sentinel the inspiration to bring this resolution before the House. That, after having been forty years in public life, for twenty-nine years of which he has been the leader of the Liberal party he should look to the Orange Sentinal for his inspiration to become not the father, but at least the foster-father of this resolution, is, to say the least, somewhat surprising.

When I was practising at the bar I often watched the judges weighing the different arguments pro and con, and sometimes they were so long in coming to the point and rendering their decision that I was inclined to get impatient. I shall not on this occasion give the House time to get impatient awaiting my views on the questions before us. After the most mature deliberation, after having examined the situation, after having studied the resolution now before the House, and considered whether or not under the present circumstances it can be of any profit, advantage, or benefit to the minority in Ontario or

in Canada, I have come to the conclusion for the reasons which I am about to give that I cannot support the resolution.

But, Sir, there are certain circumstances which surround the introduction of this resolution in this House which to me are surprising and significant. As my right hon. leader said this afternoon, the agitation which we are witnessing at the present time has existed for at least six months. Since this House met in session on the 12th of January, the legislature of Ontario has met and has been prorogued. Why is it that, instead of waiting until the dying days of the session, my hon. friend from Kamouraska did not introduce this resolution at a time when it could be brought to the attention of the legislature of Ontario, and admonition given, if such a course were thought advisable?

There is another event which may have its bearing on the present situation and that is the pending general election in the province of Quebec. Although it is against the rules of this House to impute motives to hon. members, it seems to me that we can put two and two together and say that the introduction of this resolution at this time was considered necessary to supply a battle cry for the Liberals with which to defeat the Conservative party in the province of Quebec and thus make the way for my right hon. friend and his followers when the Federal elections come.

My right hon. leader spoke of the curious fact that reference to the situation existing in Manitoba is carefully omitted from this resolution. Of course we all know that the Government at Toronto is a Conservative Government, and that by reason of that fact, it is supposed at least to have some affinity to the Government which is in power in the Dominion, so that hon. gentlemen opposite deemed it good political tactics to attack the Tory party in Ontario in order to hit at the Tory party in this House. We all know also that the party in power in Manitoba is not the Conservative party, but the Liberal party, and notwithstanding the supposed reasons given a few minutes ago by the leader of the Opposition, I can see no other reason why the conduct of the legislature of Manitoba in abolishing bilingualism was not alluded to in this resolution, than the fact that in Ontario the Government is Conservative whilst in Manitoba the Government is Liberal.

We all remember quite well what took place in 1896, in the great struggle to which my hon. friend alluded. We remember that remedial legislation was introduced in this House, not through any whim or caprice of the Conservative party or of Sir Charles Tupper, its leader at that time, but because he had been told by the Privy Council in England that under the circumstances this House had the right to pass remedial legislation, which the province of Manitoba refused to adopt. That was why remedial legislation was introduced in this House. After the measure had been withdrawn because the term of Parliament had expired by the effluxion of time, my right hon. friend went to his electors in the city of Quebec and said to them: "I will bring Sir Oliver Mowat into my cabinet, and with him I will try to right this matter by conciliation; if I cannot do it by conciliation, I will take advantage of the means which the constitution affords so as to give back to the fullest extent to the minority the rights which have been taken away from them." That is what the right hon. gentleman said in Quebec, but in Ontario and in the other provinces he cried: "Hands off Manitoba." Then when the right hon. gentleman came to power he made a settlement with Mr. Greenway which is well known in history as the Laurier-Greenway settlement. One of the essential conditions of that settlement, which was afterwards incorporated in a statute, was that bilingual schools should be established in the province of Manitoba. Now that Manitoba has torn up this scrap of paper, has gone back upon its solemn obligations in this regard, has torn to pieces the agreement which the right hon. gentleman made with Mr. Greenway—an agreement made between the Federal and the provincial powers—my right hon. friend says, "We have nothing to do with this question; we will wait and see what happens and for the present we will take no action." As I have said, it is probably not in accord with the rules of the House to impute motives, but when I see that there is an election in Quebec at the present time; when I see that the Government in Ontario is a Tory Government, and that the Government in Manitoba is a Liberal Government, I put all these things together and I ask whether the inspiration which gave rise to the resolution that is now before the House is to be found in that high sense of duty and patriotism of which my right hon. friend spoke this evening.

There are some things in the speech of my right hon. friend with which I agree. I do not wish it to be understood in the least that I am at the present moment ap-

proving what took place in Manitoba or in Ontario but what I say is that this is not the place to discuss it. Certain rights or alleged rights in Ontario have been violated, as certain people say, and the question as to these has been submitted to the courts. I will not speak now of the legal rights of the minority of the province of Ontario. I wish to call the attention of the House, as my hon. friends on the other side have, to what I may call the historical and natural rights of the minority in the province of Ontario. My hon. friends have alluded to the history of this country, and, as the opportunity offers, it may be profitable that I should refer briefly to the historical aspect of the question.

At the conquest there was no geographical line dividing the province of Quebec from the province of Ontario; the district was all one province which extended from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Rockies. Sir John A. Macdonald said, in a speech made by him in this House, that Upper and Lower Canada were known under the name of the province of Quebec. At the western extremity of what is now the province of Ontario, on the shores of lake St. Clair and the Detroit river, there was a colony of Frenchmen who had come out when Lamothe Cadillac had founded the now prosperous city of Detroit. They were not numerous, but to-day they are a thriving and prosperous colony of French Canadians on the shores of the Detroit river. Although they were not numerous—this is interesting from several points of view—the legislature sitting at that time at Niagara and making laws for Upper Canada passed a resolution in the following terms:

> That such Acts as have already passed, or may hereafter pass, the Legislature of this province, be translated into the French language for the benefit of the inhabitants of the western district of this province, and other French settlers who may come to reside within this province.

That is the spirit in which the French inhabitants of the province of Ontario, or Upper Canada, were treated at that time, even though the only French member of the legislature of Upper Canada then was M. Jacques Duperron Baby. In 1840, as the member for Kamouraska said this afternoon, at the time of the union of Upper and Lower Canada, the use of the French language was abolished. A short time after, in 1844, a petition was sent to Queen Victoria by the legislature asking for the restoration of the French language. Here is one paragraph of the petition:

> That desirous that the hearts of all men in this province may be joined in unity, in their attachment to and support of Your Majesty's person, and Government, we humbly pray Your Majesty to endeavour to remove this cause of discontent, and to recommend to the Imperial Parliament the repeal of that portion of the law which has given rise to it; assuring Your Majesty that such a course will be hailed by Your Majesty's loyal Canadian people as an additional mark of Your Majesty's solicitude for their welfare.

In later years Ontario did not oppose the migration from the province of Quebec of those hardy settlers in the northern and eastern portion of Ontario. To-day the French Canadian population of Ontario is 250,000, and it is increasing all the time. Ontario welcomed these new settlers in the eastern and northern parts of the province. Was it not in the interests of Canada that instead of going to the United States, exiling themselves from their country, these inhabitants of Quebec should settle in these districts of Ontario?

As was pointed out by the member for Kamouraska and also by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, when Confederation came about, section 133 of the British North America Act was enacted, and it is the consecration of the principle of two official languages in Canada. Some say that this section 133 is restrictive; but it gives the French language a status which none other has in Canada except the English language. It suggests at least that the study of French should be encouraged and fostered so that the citizens of this country should be able to carry out more fully what seemed to be the inspiring idea of the fathers of Confederation. I congratulate my right hon. friend and leader upon what he said this afternoon, not only with regard to the French language, but with regard to the efforts which he has made to acquire a knowledge of it, and I am witness to the fact that on several occasions he has been able to address French audiences in the province of Quebec in their native tongue. Of all the English-speaking Prime Ministers of Canada since Confederation the present Prime Minister is the only one, not excepting Sir John Abbott, who was able to address audiences in the French language.

In 1890 there was a celebrated and protracted debate in this House, a debate which every one remembers who knows anything about the history of this country, on the abolition of the French language in the

Northwest Territories. I shall quote from some of the speeches made at that time by eminent men who have now passed away, to show in what spirit the French language was treated by them. The hon. member for Kamouraska quoted from the remarks made by the late lamented Sir John A. Macdonald. Let me cite what the Hon. Edward Blake said upon the occasion to which I have referred:

You may selfishly wish that he had agreed to be suppressed; you may have a profound conviction of the incomparable superiority of your tongue, your laws, your creed; you may earnestly desire for all men the inestimable boons of British birth, of English speech, of Protestant religion. But still, after all, cannot you put yourself in his place? And can you not, must you not, admire the courage, the fidelity, and the determination with which, at great odds, he fought in all fields—in the legislature, before the people, and in even sterner fields than these—for what to him was as dear as what you call your birthright is to you? Fought, aye, and conquered too! Cannot you recognise that his was after all a victory for humanity? And that if, as the case is, it has imposed greater difficulties and more arduous efforts and toils on those who are engaged in making a nation of Canada, it yet, by that very circumstance, gave the chance for more exalted triumphs, gave an opening for the exhibition of still higher and deeper and broader feelings of justice and liberality and tolerance than are permitted to a wholly homogeneous people? Can you not at least see—if that much you cannot see—that he has in fact conquered? Do you seriously hope to prevail to-day in a conflict in which, under infinitely greater disadvantages, he obtained the victory long ago? Surely if it were a conquest in which he was in the wrong, you had the right to struggle still; but his victory after all was for equal rights—rights equal with your own. That is all he asked; that is all he got. But you say: no; his language must be obliterated; it is inimical to the Constitution that it should continue; you must teach him your tongue; he must forget his own; he must not have what he regards—and, from his point of view, rightly regards—as equal rights with you, the Anglo-Saxon, of whom the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke so proudly this afternoon as destined by fate to swallow him up. Sir, I regard this larger question to which I have referred, and it is the real question we have to consider, as a settled question; and even were my views as to the settlement different from what they are, I would not consent, as a public man, to an attempt to reopen a controversy, long since closed, on grounds which do not give to my eye the least prospect of success, but which ensure ultimate defeat to the assailants, and meanwhile limitless disaster to the state. I say: No; a thousand times no! Whether you differ or agree as to what might have been best for the country, in the situation of the country as it stands, I say: No, a thousand times, no; to the least effort or proposal to reopen that settled controversy; and I maintain that it is the duty of those who truly regard the progress and the prosperity of Canada, who hope to see it advance in its path towards nationality, to defend the rights of the minorities in this regard, as by law and by convention and by national settlement established. I intend for my part to defend them just as warmly as if I were one of themselves; and I should regard myself as dishonoured and disgraced if I were now to yield to the forces which press me to any other course.

And Sir John A. Macdonald, on the same occasion on which he used the words quoted by the hon. member for Kamouraska, said this further:

Why, Mr. Speaker, if there is one act of oppression more than another which would come home to a man's breast, it is that he should be deprived of the consolation of hearing and speaking and reading the language that his mother taught him. It is cruel. It is seething the kid in its mother's milk. The greatest, perhaps, of all the objections to this measure, is that it is a futile measure. It will not succeed. It cannot succeed. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said the other day, and as the hon. member from the West Riding of Durham (Mr. Blake) repeated, in order to carry out an oppressive measure we must have a Russian Government or we must have a Stafford here; we must put down the language with a strong hand; we must exclude it from the schools; we must exclude it from official life; no man in Canada who spoke French must be allowed to take office; the Frenchman must be made a Pariah, and his language must be made a mark of scorn; that is the only way to carry out the principle or the object of my hon. friend the minister for North Simcoe.

What was the outcome of this discussion during which these noble words were delivered? It was this that the question was to be left to the Legislatures of the Northwest Territories, when they had received provincial organization. And all these men who spoke in this way of the French language came to the conclusion that this was a question not for the Federal but for the provincial domain. Why has this regard been paid to the French language, by custom, by Acts, by the speeches of eminent men? The French were the first comers in this country; they were the pioneers; they introduced civilization from the Gulf to the Rockies. They were a valourous race, they fell fighting with their faces to the foe. The British respected them, and after a few years gave them more liberal terms, by the Quebec Act of 1874, than were contained in the Capitulation.

Again, I do not put the question upon the legal ground which is submitted to the courts; I put it upon the historical ground, and I join with my right hon. friend in appealing to the generous sentiments of the people of Ontario. If it is true that these regulations are restrictive or prohibitive of the right of teaching French in Ontario, I appeal to the generous sentiment of my fellow Canadians, I appeal

to their sympathy, and I ask them to right what may be a great wrong towards the minority in the province of Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is all that anybody wants.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. CASGRAIN: My hon. friend from St. John says: that is all that anybody wants. But will the resolution now before the House attain that? Will this resolution allay the agitation which exists in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario? I fear not. I shall not follow my right hon. friend or my hon. friend from Kamouraska in the discussion of Regulations 17 and 15, for it is not my province to be informed upon these questions as I would be if I were a member of the Legislature of Ontario. But, if I do not discuss these questions, it is for another reason, and that reason is that I would not wish that any regulation or law emanating from the Legislature of Ontario should be subject to the censure of the House of Commons. If there is one province in the Dominion whose acts it would not be desirable to discuss in this House; if there is one province in the Dominion who should be careful of her autonomy; if there is one province in the Dominion who should be careful that the provincial sphere is not invaded by the federal, it is the province of Quebec. As my honoured leader said this afternoon, at one time it was rumoured—I do not know whether the rumour has ever been substantiated—that during the conferences on Confederation Sir John Macdonald wanted, not a federation as we have to-day, but a legislative union, and it was the province of Quebec which prevented the adoption of that constitutional system. Now, Sir, I put this question to the House: if we discuss to-day the educational affairs of Ontario; if we discuss to-day the educational laws of Ontario; if we discuss to-day the educational laws of Ontario or the educational regulations of the Ontario and Department of Education, is it not a fact that it would be competent for us to discuss in this House any law or any regulation emanating from the Legislature of Quebec?

Mr. MARCIL: Does the hon. gentleman imagine that the province of Quebec would pass such a regulation as has been passed in Ontario, or has he ever heard any complaint from the minority in Quebec?

Mr. CASGRAIN: That is not the point at all. There are certain laws which have been passed by the province of Quebec—and I am not blaming the province of Quebec—which have been distasteful to the province of Ontario, and if, because they were distasteful to the province of Ontario, they were brought before this House and condemned or criticised, certainly I would be the first, and I have no doubt my hon. friend would be among those who would oppose any interference by the Federal House in the provincial sphere.

Let me examine this resolution. It says:

> That this House especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French percentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with.

Sir, this resolution either is not sufficient or it goes too far. What does it suggest? It simply suggests that the laws of the province of Ontario be made clearer. Well, now, it seems to me that it is not for us, that we have no mandate in this House, and that we have not sufficient knowledge, to say to the province of Ontario that its laws are not clear enough, that its laws do not clearly say such and such a thing which we would like them to say. My humble opinion is that this resolution is not only absolutely useless, but harmful. It is fraught with great danger to the other provinces, and especially to the province of Quebec.

What would be the result if this resolution passed the House? Supposing, for instance, the majority of this House passed the resolution in question. What would we do? How would we make the suggestion to the Legislature of Ontario, and how would it be received by that legislature? That is what we have to ask ourselves. What reception would it get by the Legislature of Ontario and what good would it do? What good would it do? Supposing we passed this resolution and sent it to the Legislature of Ontario, what would happen? Sir, I have only to read some of the extracts from the press of the province of Ontario to show you what reception a suggestion of that kind would get from the province of Ontario, and from the Legislature of Ontario. The Toronto Star was one of the most sympathetic organs of public

opinion in Ontario to the cause of the minority, but it said on the 14th of April:

No row that can be raised at Ottawa, no play that can be made on the rivalry between the two political parties in Canada, will be of any avail whatever in modifying Ontario's position in this matter. In no school in the province will English be excluded. It will be taught by a teacher who knows how to teach English. The inspecting will be done by an inspector competent to see that the teaching is done.

That much being assured. the province of Ontario is disposed to be quite reasonable as to details.

Again, on the 27th of April it said:

Those who are seeking Federal interference in the present case may succeed in fomenting strife and increasing difficulty, but they will not help the French-Canadian in Ontario. To any conciliatory suggestion there can, of course, be no objection, but all notion of disallowance, or of any kind of coercive action, must be abandoned. For that reason, we see no advantage in starting any kind of debate in the House of Commons at Ottawa. Such a debate would be misunderstood.

Then, the Toronto Globe, not the Orange Sentinel, but the Globe of the 10th of May, said:

Canada is a Confederation. The Federal Parliament seems to forget that fact occasionally, when it gives advice to the provinces.

That is the reception which any suggestion from this Parliament to the province of Ontario would get. Who are taking part in this agitation and where does the agitation exist? It exists in the province of Quebec, and in the province of Ontario, and I say that by bringing this question up in the Federal House and asking us to pass this resolution, those responsible are sowing discord in this country, which will spread from one end of Canada to the other.

The resolution is insidious. It is skilfully drafted; it is drafted in such a way as to appear harmless to the uninitiated, who do not appreciate the distinction between the federal power and the provincial power, or between the executive power and the judicial power. After all, if the law is not clear, it is is being submitted to the courts for definition. There are two cases now which are on their way to the Privy Council, one in which the constitutionality, the validity and the meaning of Regulation 17 are submitted to the Privy Council, and the other in which the law which applies more particularly to the the city of Ottawa, and which substitutes a commission for trustees, is to be tested. Why should we, when these two cases are before the courts, seek to substitute the interpretation of this House for the interpretation which is being sought by the friends of the minority in the courts of this country? I say it is a dangerous principle to mix up in this manner the legislative power with the judicial power.

It is said that we have the expressive power. It may be so, but when the powers are defined by our constitution, as clearly as they are with respect to education, this Parliament, when it uses that expressive power in respect to subjects which are allotted to the provincial authorities invades a sphere from which it has been expressly excluded in regard to legislation or an expression of an opinion. There was one aspect of the question which could probably have been brought before this House, allusion to which has been made this afternoon, and that is, disallowance of the Act passed by the Legislature of Ontario in 1915, which was asked for by a great many people in the province of Quebec especially, and in the city of Ottawa. That was a proper matter to be brought before this House, as was correctly stated by my hon. friends who have preceded me, and I was glad to hear them say so. The right hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Kamouraska have said that they approved of the action of the Government in not disallowing that Act. If we were right in not disallowing the Act, how is it that hundreds and thousands of signatures were procured in the province of Quebec and in Ontario asking us to disallow it? Was it for the purpose of keeping up the agitation, and is it by such means that the agitation is being kept up not only in the province of Quebec but in other parts of the Dominion? The fact that we have not been blamed, that no member of this House has dared to rise and condemn the Government for not disallowing the Act of the Ontario Legislature is not only a vindication of the position we have taken, but a condemnation of those who have gone around in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario gathering those signatures to a petition, the prayer of which finds no supporters amongst the 221 members of this House.

Questions similar to this have occupied the attention of this House in times gone by. I remember well when the Jesuits' Estates Bill passed by the Legislature of Quebec in 1888 was brought before this House in 1889. That Act was distasteful to a large proportion of the citizens of Ontario; it was distasteful also to a large proportion of the Protestants in the province of Quebec. The matter was brought be-

fore this House, and I am proud to say that under the leadership of the late Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir John Thompson, the principle was laid down that there should be no interference with provincial legislation by the Federal Parliament. The principles upon which Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Thompson, and the Conservative party acted in those days in respect to an Act passed by the Legislature of Quebec are the principles upon which this Government stands to-day. In refusing to interfere, to admonish, or to suggest to the province of Ontario in relation to a measure which is within its competency, we are only following the precepts laid down in this House by Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Thompson, and the other former leaders of the Conservative party. I appeal to my hon. friends from the province of Quebec to-day to follow the example of the Conservative party, and especially of the English members of the Conservative party, in 1889, when, notwithstanding the fact that it was a Bill passed by the province of Quebec, a Bill which was distasteful to the great majority of Protestants in this country, the English-speaking Conservatives and the Protestant Conservatives of the House of Commons stood by Sir John A. Macdonald, by Sir John Thompson, and by the province of Quebec, in declaring that they would not interfere with provincial legislation.

I know perfectly well that I am running counter to the feeling of a large majority in my province, but in my sober judgment I think I am right. Let the storm gather, let the clouds burst and the thunder roll; the tempest will pass away, and to those who come after me I leave my defence.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House in respect to the resolution now before you, I am well aware that the course I am about to take may be misunderstood. It is always easy to avoid a difficulty of a transient nature, but there are issues of a higher order which compel a man with a sense of duty to face them squarely, come what may. The present resolution, moderate in form, gives expression to a sentiment and embodies a principle which cannot but rally the unqualified support of all who have at heart the welfare of Canada. A grievance, as was well said yesterday by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, because it happens to be the grievance of a minority, should not be lightly discarded or ignored. On the contrary, the true basis of strength in a majority lies in the fact that it can dispassionately listen, as it has listened to-day, thank heaven, that it can scrutinize, weigh, solve. It has been stated, I know, that this Parliament should scrupulously avoid dictating its will to any province in matters essentially provincial. Far be it from my mind to dictate to anyone, or to dictate to any province. Belonging, as I do, to the minority in Canada, need I say that I stand for provincial rights? Historically, traditionally, the Liberal party has always resisted any encroachment on what properly appertains to the provincial domain. But this Parliament, as was admitted a moment ago by the hon. Postmaster General, has never lost its expressive power, nor has any British legislature in the world ever lost its expressive power. My hon. friend said a moment ago that this was not the proper tribunal. I take issue with him on that point. I say that this is the highest court in the land, and that if a subject of His Majesty the King has a legitimate grievance he has the right to ask redress for that grievance before the supplies are voted. That is what the French Canadian minority of the province of Ontario is respectfully doing to-day.

There are questions, I know, more acute in one section of the country than in the other, and because of that very acuteness they affect the well-being, peace and good government of our country. The language issue, unfortunately, is one of these acute questions. It is not a new one, because in a country made up of several nationalities it is liable at times to appear on the surface and bring confusion and misery where peace, harmony, and concord should prevail. It is, unfortunately, a vexed issue, because behind it nestle feelings of pride which tend to embitter and inflame, but I hope that in the few remarks I shall offer the House this evening nothing that I will say may accentuate that bitterness, or arouse acrimony. I fully realize that moderation is a virtue. I will speak this evening the language I would use in the historic city of Quebec, and that I would use to-morrow in the city of Toronto. After all, in this country there is but one constituency for a public man worthy of the name, and that constituency is Canada as a whole.

The bilingual issue has reached such a climax that to-day we are face to face with a condition and not a theory, and I do not

intend to set up a case on behalf of the minority based on any treaty or any statutory enactment. Whatever may be the legal or constitutional aspect of this question, I know full well that a minority must always depend on the good will and forbearance of the majority for the full enjoyment of its rights and privileges. It is, Mr. Speaker, an appeal to reason; nay, more, it is an appeal to fair play, to those generous instincts which have always characterized the British race in its treatment of minorities that I intend to make this evening. The question of whether or not the French were conquered or were ceded does not affect the issue one way or the other. Granted that they were conquered, but I claim that the French were not conquered on the Plains of Abraham. They were conquered in 1774; in 1791; in 1841; they were conquered in 1867, when British diplomacy, wise and strong as it has always been, gave the French Canadian minority all the rights which the British subject enjoys wherever the Union Jack floats. That is your conquest of the French Canadians. The Treaty of Paris, signed in 1763, speaks for itself. The outstanding point remains that there is in Canada to-day an English-speaking majority and a French-speaking minority. But will you not agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of statesmanship to see that both should learn to appreciate and respect each other? Right here it may not be amiss to recall a proposition laid down by that great British jurist, Lord Mansfield, on the effect of conquest by British arms. Says Lord Mansfield:

> The conquered inhabitants once received under the conqueror's protection, become subjects and are universally to be considered in that light, not as enemies or aliens.

The same principle was propounded by Wedderburn, by Marriott, by Thurlow, at the time of the Quebec Act in 1774. That has been the traditional policy of Great Britain in all parts of the world, and I need not say that it is due to that broad, tolerant and fair policy that the British flag to-day floats at the topmast of the British Navy over the Seven Seas, and that Great Britain owns one-sixth of the inhabited globe. A race may be ceded to another race, it may be conquered by force of arms, but every man who has a heart in his breast, every man who has some intelligence in his head—and I am addressing myself to men of the highest intelligence and to men who have hearts in their breasts

—will admit that, ceded or conquered, there are moral frontiers which cannot be overcome by mere force. The language of a race is one of these frontiers. This itself need not be safeguarded by the covenants of a treaty or by statutory enactment. Civilization would be a sham if that were necessary. Why? Because language is part of a man's soul, because there are traditions and ideas binding men to the same language by indissoluble ties, and because it would be cruel to deny a man the right to speak the language that he learns to lisp at his mother's knee. That language is sweet with the breath and aroma of memories that bring to his heart the joyance of happy tears, that language which exalts, inspires and fills his heart with reverence and faith and heroism that shine as stars in the temple of his race.

During the last half century Germany has vainly tried to eradicate the French language in Alsace-Lorraine. She has vainly tried to suppress Polish in Posen and Danish in Schleswig-Holstein. The Magyars have vainly sought to make their tongue the language of Hungary. But all these attempts have lamentably failed; failed in Alsace, failed in Denmark, failed in Poland, and failed in Hungary. Sir, need I say that the German policy is not of the British or of the French pattern. When the other day the French army reconquered a considerable portion of the lost province of Alsace, General Joffre issued a proclamation to the Alsatians containing the following ominous words:

> Our return is final. You are French forever more; France brings you, with the liberties that she has always represented, respect for your liberty, the liberty of Alsatians, the respect for the traditions of your convictions, of your customs.

Sir, the greatest colonial Empire of any time has been built up by Great Britain, and she has been able to hold that Empire together largely by following the policy of her statesmen, that the traditions, the religious convictions, the civil rights, the customs, and the language of her subjects shall be respected. It is radically false, I submit, to think that unity of Empire must be based on uniformity of language. Read the history of the world; read the history of the Roman Empire by Gibbon, and you will see that no empire has ever been united by oneness of language. To use the words of a modern writer "a nation, small as it may be, is a torch and it is important that there should be several luminous centres in the world." I submit

that the British example demonstrates that diversity of language and of laws, far from being a disintegrating factor, is on the contrary a most healthy and unifying influence. Not to mention India with her mosaic of languages freely taught and freely spoken, take that quaint little island of Malta where Italian is the official language of the courts, and parents have the right to say whether their children shall learn English or Italian at the schools. In South Africa, Dutch and English are on an equal footing. It was my privilege in 1910 to be present at the inaugural ceremonies of the new constitution of South Africa. His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, the present Governor General of Canada, was there, representing his nephew, His Majesty the King. I well remember the lasting impression made upon the minds of every one present when the speech from the Throne was read in English and in Dutch, and when the prayers were recited in both languages, just as they are in this House of Commons every day. In Wales a million people speak Welsh, and 250,000 of them speak Welsh alone. In Ireland the Irish Gaelic is taught in five thousand schools. In the highlands of Scotland Scotch-Gaelic is the language of a quarter of a million people. In Mauritius, French is the official language. I have in this House friends of Scotch origin, and only yesterday my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) told me that his grandmother spoke not a word of English, but Gaelic only. In the county of Inverness, as in the old Scotch settlements of the county of Gaspé, which I had the honour of representing for fifteen years in this House, I know old Scotchmen who speak the English language with the greatest difficulty, and who have ever been attached to their mother-tongue, the Gaelic language. In the Channel islands things are much like Quebec, except as regards religion. The people in the Channel islands are Huguenots, while in Quebec they are Catholics, but both cling to their national traditions, to their language, to their laws, their customs and their usages. But at the same time both are loyal to the British Crown, and both have given evidence of their loyalty. Both are, however, of a conservative frame of mind. A change in the constitution or an alteration in the laws is always looked upon with apprehension by the minority. A man who after long struggles has at last succeeded in obtaining what the Latin poet has so aptly defined "aurea mediocritas" will pause and reflect before he accepts any new proposition presented to him, and in this respect nations are not unlike individuals. Many people I know, honestly believe that there should be uniformity of laws and of language in the Dominion, because forsooth it would be far more practicable. Those who look at such questions from the mere practical point of view are apt to forget that sentiment, after all, is no mean factor in the map of life. I remember when I was a boy at college the first thing I learned in English was "Gray's Elegy in a Churchyard," and the first booklet I was asked to read bore the following suggestive title: "Put Yourself in his Place." I am simply asking the majority of my fellow men in this House to put themselves in our place. Our traditions, our laws, our language, constitute the inheritance which was left to us by our forefathers in 1759. It is a glorious heritage which any man of honour will always treasure. Would not my English speaking friends have less respect for me if I were unfaithful to that sacred trust? For an Englishman, after all, valour is still of value; he will always admire courage, thrift, perseverance displayed by his defeated foe.

10 p.m.

Let me remind you, Sir, at this juncture of what happens every day in London, at the very heart of the British Empire. In Downing street, next to the residence of the First Lord of the Treasury, sits the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This able body of men, some of whom may be classed amongst the greatest jurists in the world, holds periodical sessions to hear the appeals from the several colonies and dominions. From the Cause List, you will notice that one day an Indian case may be heard and the next day a Canadian case; one day the appeal is from Bengal, the next day it is from Mauritius or Ceylon. Each of these colonies—not to mention the many others—has kept its own laws, and one who is a daily attendant at the sessions of the Judicial Committee, may listen to very able arguments based on the common law, the Roman law, the Dutch law, the Indian law, the Coutume de Paris, or even the Coutume de Normandie, when it is a case from the Channel islands.

It is argued by some usually fair-minded people that once you grant the French language its status in the schools of Ontario, you immediately open the door to similar

privileges to the foreign-born who seek a home in Canada. Hence, they say, the imperative necessity of a uni-lingual policy. I hold no brief for the foreign-born, be he Slav, German, Hungarian, Italian, or Greek, he is fully entitled to all the rights of his newly acquired British citizenship. But when an immigrant comes to Canada and settles on the homestead which is freely alloted to him by the bounty of the Canadian Government, he knows that he becomes subject to the laws of the Dominion. He cannot claim special privileges; he knows that there are in Canada but two official languages, the English and French. Surely no one will contend that, as between the immigrant coming from a foreign land and the son of the soil—and we the French Canadians claim to be the sons of the soil for eight, nine and ten generations, the men whose ancestry was here long before the Cession, two hundred and sometimes three hundred years ago—there is no distinction to be drawn. Quebec and Ontario were part of the territory then known under the name of New France, and it is that territory with all its inhabitants which the Treaty of Paris placed under the domination of His Britannic Majesty.

As I have already stated, the traditional policy of Great Britain has even been to respect the religion, the civil rights, the usages, the customs, the language of a conquered people. The French Canadian is not an immigrant—I do not use the expression in any offensive sense—and he should not be treated as an immigrant. He does not come on this continent hat in hand, anxious to fit into the new ways of a strange country, ready to cut all bridges behind him, willing to surrender his race individuality by the process of the crucible or the melting pot. Canada is his fatherland; it is not for him an adopted country; it is his country and his only country. Occasionally, the habitant of the province of Quebec or from the French counties of Ontario will emigrate to the New England States to earn money in hard times to pay off a mortgage, but he never bids a final adieu to his farm; his heart remains behind with the long pastures, the bright-hued villages and the tall spires. He naturally clings to the traditions, the ideals, the language, which are so closely associated with the land where his forefathers long before him played such a prominent part.

Right here allow me to say, in order once and for all to answer the very insidious criticism which is made of the language as spoken by the French Canadian of this country: his language is not a dialect; it is not a patois; it is the language of old France, of France of the 18th century, the language which since the Congress of Vienna has replaced Latin in diplomacy, the language which for centuries was spoken in England, at the Court, in Parliament, the language which in all parts of the civilized world constitutes one of the highest manifestations of humanity. That language has always been respected and recognized by a wise and far-seeing British statesmanship. Evidence of this can be found in a series of Imperial enactments, the latest of which is the British North America Act, of which section 133 reads:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses.

Mark the words: either of the two languages may be used in this House and in the Senate and in both Houses of the Quebec Legislature, and both languages shall be used in the records and the journals. Is it not an elementary proposition that, the English and the French languages, having been thus declared official, in the spirit if not in the letter of the Constitution, it follows that the teaching of both languages was intended to be left free and untrammelled.

Do you look, Sir, for some more evidence of the bilingual complexion of this country? Some thirty-five years ago, when the Marquis of Lorne, later on the Duke of Argyll, was Governor General of Canada, he founded the Royal Society of Canada, which has been given an official status by this Parliament. I wish to remind you, Mr. Speaker, and my English-speaking fellow members of the House that there are two sections of that society, the English and the French sections. My hon. friend the member for Kamouraska this afternoon cited another enactment of this Parliament which is evidence that the bilingual complexion of this country is fully recognized. We passed two years ago a new naturalization law in order to meet Imperial requirements. It was sound policy to adopt that legislation. While it was peculiar to Canada a proviso was inserted in that law whereby the English and French languages were considered as test languages for the new-

comers applying for their naturalization papers.

I have read in the press, not without amazement, an assertion to the effect that bilingualism meant French domination. The English-speaking members of this House were solemnly warned not to surrender. Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that in a country like ours, such warnings should find any echo? Is it possible that any such appeal could be successfully made to a proud and chivalrous race like the English-speaking people? Every French Canadian is anxious that his children should learn English, because English is the language of business. It is the language of the continent of America and no man is fully equipped for the battle of life if he is not conversant with that language. Besides, in a loftier sense the knowledge of English literature is in itself no mean privilege. The idea of French domination is altogether too silly an invention to be seriously entertained. On this continent of America, from the Rio Grande to the polar sea there are 100,000,000 people speaking the English language, and practically the English language only; and as against that immense number of people barely 5,000,000, perhaps less, Louisiana included, use the French language. Can this minority, will this minority ever attempt to dominate the vast majority? The idea is preposterous. No, Mr. Speaker; on this continent, in this country, in this great province of Ontario, the minority could not and would not dominate. It shall not be dominated, either, if we are all imbued with the spirit of democracy, if we all live up to true British ideals. The French Canadians want equal justice. They want fair treatment, nothing more and nothing less.

Two men have been mentioned in this debate whose name and fame shall ever be remembered in history. They were political opponents, but both were patriots and statesmen. I refer to Sir John A. Macdonald and Edward Blake. They lived at a period when the French population was larger in proportion than it is to-day; when the British isles and the Western States had not poured into the western prairies that steady and healthy stream of immigration which made it necessary in later years to carve two new provinces out of that great lone land. Yet Macdonald and Blake, when the bilingual issue came up before Parliament in 1890, gave utterance to their views in no huckstering spirit. Let me quote two short sentences from that historic debate in which both of them took such a prominent part. The first sentence uttered by Sir John A. Macdonald finds its application in the very Ontario case that we are discussing this evening. True it is that when he spoke he was opposing a Bill which had been introduced by the late Dalton McCarthy to do away with the French language in the legislative councils of the Northwest Territories. I draw the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and of the Postmaster General to these words of Sir John A. Macdonald. After quoting the resolution which was read a few moments ago by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, which was adopted by Upper Canada in 1793, providing for the translation into French of their Acts for the benefit of the few French settlers in the province, Sir John went on to say:

> Are we, one hundred years later, going to be less liberal to our French Canadian fellow-subjects than the few Englishmen, United Empire Loyalists, who settled Ontario? No, Sir. This resolution would cast shame on men who tried to deprive our French friends in the province of Ontario of the privilege given them a hundred years ago by a body of men altogether speaking the English language.

Further on he said, in still more eloquent language:

> Are we going to be less liberal? Forbid it, Mr. Speaker. In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in the name of the progress of this great country, I appeal to all our friends in this House, without reference to party, to forget what may be an inconvenience when they go back to their constituents on both sides, to forget that for a moment, and to merge everything in the great desire to make Canada, French and English, one people.

I am at a loss to understand the sentiments expressed this afternoon by the right hon. Prime Minister on whose shoulders has fallen the mantle of Sir John A. Macdonald as leader of the Conservative party. Does he believe for one moment that the resolution which is now before the House smacks of coercion? In 1890, the late Dalton McCarthy had introduced a Bill to do away with the rights of the minority in the councils of the Northwest Territories. Sir John A. Macdonald in his answer took the very attitude which is taken today by the leader of the Opposition and by the member for Kamouraska, he appealed to the better instincts of the Canadian majority to treat the French minority in a fair spirit. Not that Sir John A. Macdonald wanted to impose his views upon the people of the Northwest;

not that he wanted to coerce the Executive he simply made the appeal that any true Briton is entitled to make whenever he thinks a wrong is committed.

Sir, thus spoke the old chieftain of the Conservative party, the statesman who built up Confederation, with Cartier and Galt. Listen now to the Hon. Edward Blake, the leader of the Liberal party—not in 1890, because in 1887 he had himself moved that a man of French birth should succeed him in the leadership of the Liberal party—all honour to his memory for that. Edward Blake, a man whose profound knowledge of the law and constitution made him the peer if not the superior of any man holding a brief before any British court, said:

> Whether you differ or agree as to what might have been best for the country, in the situation of the country as it stands, I say: No; a thousand times, no to the least effort or proposal to reopen that settled controversy; and I maintain that it is the duty of those who truly regard the progress and the prosperity of Canada, who hope to see it advance in its path towards nationality, to defend the rights of the minorities in this regard, as by law and by convention and by national settlement established. I intend for my part to defend them just as warmly as if I were one of themselves; and I should regard myself as dishonoured and disgraced if I were now to yield to the forces which press me to any other course.

Such was the language of two of the noblest men who ever appeared in public life in this country. But I may be told that what I have just quoted is not relevant to the Ontario case—and remember that when I speak of Ontario I speak with the greatest respect of the Legislature and of the people of Ontario. I am myself a resident of the province of Ontario, and my children I have brought up in that province. Let me state briefly, as I understand it, the grievance of the minority in Ontario. As was stated by previous speakers, long before the Union of 1867 French schools existed in Ontario, and when Confederation took place in 1867 the English minority in Lower Canada was confided by Sir A. T. Galt, by Sir John A. Macdonald, by George Brown, to the care of the Legislature of Quebec in educational matters; and the French-speaking minority of Upper Canada was confided by Sir George Cartier, in educational matters, to the care of the Legislature in Toronto. A denominational system, I may be told, was provided for, not a bilingual system. Is there any one who will seriously contend that Sir John Macdonald, Sir George Cartier and Sir A. T. Galt did not contemplate, in their honesty of purpose, a reciprocity of treatment with regard to both minorities? I have already quoted the weighty words of Sir John Macdonald. Let me read a letter from Mr. Egerton Ryerson, formerly Superintendent of Education, upon that particular point. It is dated Toronto, 24th of April 1857, and was addressed to Messrs Donald McLean, John Cuttenach, Angus McDonnell:

> Gentlemen,
>
> I have the honour to state in reply to your letter of the 16th instant that as the French is the recognized language of the country, as well as the English, it is quite proper and lawful for the Trustees to allow both languages to be taught in their schools to children whose parents may desire them to learn both.
>
> I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,
>
> Your obedient servant,
>
> (Sigd) E. Ryerson.

Subsequently, and long before Confederation, grants were made, from time to time, to those bilingual schools. French inspectors were duly appointed to carry out the regulations of the Department of Education with regard to those schools. By regulation 15 the right of the parents to demand that the French or German language be the language of instruction and communication in the schools attended by their children was recognized. I will read, after others, regulation 15, because it cannot be read too often. It is the regulation which we ask the Government of Ontario to reinstate. Let the Department of Education restore that Regulation 15 on behalf of the French as it exists to-day on behalf of the German minority, and the agitation will cease—and what boon that will be for Canada. That Regulation 15 reads as follows:

> In school sections where the French or German language prevails, the trustees may, in addition to the course of study prescribed for public schools, require instruction to be given in reading, grammar and composition to such pupils as are directed by their parents or guardians to study either of these languages and in all such cases the authorized text books in French or German shall be used.

Such was the regulation governing the bilingual schools of Ontario when it was superseded by Regulation 17, a most drastic regulation indeed, which affects the French only and, mark well, not the Germans. I will not say that these bilingual schools were not at times threatened, but be it said to the honour of Sir Oliver Mowat, to the honour of Sir George Ross, they always treated the minority in a broad and generous spirit. The words from Sir Oliver Mowat on precisely the same issue have been quoted, but they may well be recalled.

Mr. EDWARDS: Can my hon. friend tell me when Regulation 15 was changed or repealed?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I did not say it was repealed. Regulation 15 exists, but for the German minority only. It has been superseded by Regulation 17 as regards the French schools.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is on the statutes just as the hon. gentleman read it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As regards the French?

Mr. EDWARDS: Just as you read it. Do I understand it still remains on the statute book?

Mr. LEMIEUX: My contention is that it remains on the statute book as regards the German minority, but not as regards the French minority. However, my hon. friend will have occasion in a moment to explain his point. I am proceeding with my remarks.

Mr. EDWARDS: I want to make that clear. Does he claim that the wording of Regulation 15 has been changed?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I claim that Regulation 15 does not apply to the French minority as before. It still applies to the German minority, but it does not apply to the French. If I am wrong I wish to be corrected by my hon. friend.

I was saying that on precisely this issue of the English-French schools, as regards the language of communication—and this is the crux of the grievance—Sir Oliver Mowat used the following language:

> Our opponents pretend that the Government should insist on all instruction being given to the French children in the English language. No such regulation was suggested by the commissioners, and none such has been made, because such a regulation would be absurd, and, instead of serving the cause of education would often prevent education altogether. How can you teach in a language which the children do not understand?

Sir, Regulation 17, which superseded Regulation 15—and this is the point I wish to emphasize—does away with the system which Sir Oliver Mowat consistently maintained and defended. In other words, Regulation 17, reduced to its real size and significance, means the gradual elimination of the French language as a language of instruction and communication beyond the First Form, and the suppression of the study of that language, beyond one hour each day, in the other Forms, such study, and the time allowed for it, remember, always and completely subject to the approval and direction of the chief superintendent of education and supervising inspector. Read the Regulation, shorn of its proxility, and any one whose mind is unbiassed will come to the conclusion that it is unworkable and ineffective. This is, put in concrete form, the gist of the complaint of the French minority. Surely three or four men of good will can be found in this Dominion who would sit around a table with the Minister of Education in Toronto, and I venture to say that in half an hour's time the whole controversy would be settled.

The assertion that Regulation 17 is unworkable and ineffective—that is the complaint of the minority—I do not base on my own judgment, as my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) would infer. It is the conclusion reached by the six inspectors specially appointed by the Ontario Government to report as to the nature and effect of that regulation. The report was unanimous, and here are the findings. I ask any fair-minded gentleman who belongs to the majority in the province of Ontario to listen to me at this moment because I have reached, I think, the point where the whole difficulty is laid bare. The inspectors appointed by the Government—three were French and three were English—agreed that

> The above Regulation 17 has not been effective for the following reasons: It was taken to mean that French could not be used as a language of instruction and communication, it was regarded as an attempt to gradually eliminate the French language from the English-French schools.

I now ask were the inspectors unduly pessimistic? Is the French-Canadian minority in Ontario unwarranted in resenting the radical change in the mode of instruction attempted by the Department of Education of Ontario? Let me answer very moderately but very frankly. When it is solemnly resolved by influential public bodies: "that the use of the French language in the public and separate schools of Ontario constitutes a grave menace to the integrity of the province, as an English-speaking community;" when it is alleged: "that it is not within the power of the provincial Government to compel the observance of the law as long as there is one loophole for the use of the French in the schools;" when the Government is asked: "to enact such laws and make such amendments to the regulations of the Education Department as will make it unlawful and

impossible for the French language to be used in any of the public or separate schools of the province of Ontario;" when, on the other hand, concurrently with these appeals and as a result of a regulation, most drastic in its terms and character, the number of bilingual schools is limited to those where French has hitherto been a subject of study; when the teaching of French must not exceed one hour, and it may be less; when the language of communication to learn the mother tongue is left at the discretion of the inspector; when the status quo ante is maintained as regards the German minority—and I do not begrudge the privilege to the German minority, but I claim at least equal rights for the French Canadian minority—and specifically, mercilessly altered as regards the French minority, can anyone, I pray, be surprised if my fellow-countrymen feel aggrieved and molested in what they justly consider is their most sacred privilege?

My right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) this afternoon referred to the fact that he had learned French after he became leader of the Conservative party in the House of Commons. He and I were elected on the same day to this House and I have often told French Canadian audiences in the province of Quebec that I looked upon him as an example of what a British statesman could do in a bilingual country like ours. I have often commended him as I saw him struggling with a language which was not his own, yes, I have often complimented him on the feat, which he had accomplished, of speaking well—yes, very well—the language of my forefathers. I put the question to him, not as representing the minority, but, as I believe he is in spite of his speech this afternoon, as the friend of the minority; I address myself to him as the leader of the Government of this country; as such, I put him above our party quarrels, and I say to him: Take your own experience; you came into this House in 1896 as I did; I could not then speak the English language; you could not speak the French language; if he had been forced to use the French language as the language of communication and of instruction, would he have attained the knowledge of the French language which he has attained?' And, Mr. Speaker, could I have learned what little English I know if I had been forced to learn it, by setting aside my mother tongue. Mr. Speaker, I say to my hon. friends this is the case; this is the whole question. This is no vain agitation; it is an appeal for generous treatment made to the majority of this country, and the right hon. gentleman might well rise above party politics and above party success in order to give to the French minority the privileges which it has always enjoyed since this country was ceded to Great Britain by France.

I ask again, Sir, is it to be wondered at that the French Canadians of Ontario feel themselves aggrieved and molested in what they justly consider as their most sacred privilege? No treaty, no statute, no law, can deprive a man of a natural right. If I were not as I am, and as I claim to be, a friend of peace, harmony and concord, I would say to the legislature of the province of Ontario: Maintain regulation 17 and the French will thrive under it; they will pay rates for schools that they cannot and will not send their children to, but they will pay double rates, too, in order to keep for their sons and for their daughters the teaching of the language which they have learned to lisp at their mother's knee. With regard to this question of natural right, the right of a child to learn and to speak the language of his mother, is just as sacred as the duty which devolves upon parents to look after their children, just as sacred as the duty which devolves upon children to support their parents if they are in need.

I may be told, and I believe it is right that I should be told, that the English language was not sufficiently taught in the old bilingual schools, and that this drastic departure was made necessary by that very evasion. I grant that this should not be permitted. But, Mr. Speaker, two wrongs do not make a right. You do not redress a grievance, you do not remedy an abuse, by destroying a privilege. Competent bilingual professors can, however, be found, they can be trained, and their training can be properly supervised and tested, just as their teaching of the pupils can be closely supervised and tested by the proper authority.

Once more, Mr. Speaker, I do not rest my case on any treaty, on any statute. From my seat in Parliament I rather appeal to the spirit of fair play of my fellowmen of English birth, who are the vast majority in Ontario and in the Dominion of Canada. Let us not forget that it has been decreed by Divine Providence that we, French and English, should live side by side on this half of the North American continent. We

have, therefore, become the trustees of those two proud races which, after centuries of conflict, have become joint partners in Europe in the upbuilding of a higher and nobler civilization. May we not, long after the plains of Abraham, "meet each otner, understand each other, love each other?"

There are, I know, obstacles embedded in the memories of the past, but can they not be overcome by goodwill and mutual forbearance? Is not the history of South Africa an object lesson to us? Less than twenty years ago, that beautiful country was the scene of a deadly struggle—succeeding a turmoil of nearly a century's duration—which threatened to make of the veldt the seat of an everlasting feud. Two proud races were set up the one against the other. Two conflicting ideals were at stake. War with all its bitterness, its vindictiveness, war with all its horrors, raged. It left a land devastated and desolate, a country divided into two camps of victors and vanquished.

To those who judged only by surface indications, to speak of peace might well have seemed a mockery. But there were those who saw deeper and knew that peace had come at last. The brave men who surrendered at Vereeniging kept their self-respect, but they in return, won the respect of their adversaries. The war issues were settled without humiliation. England did not fear for her own greatness; the terms made were generous. British statesmanship knows by long experience that a brave foe is usually a staunch friend. Events in South Africa have justified the British in their treatment of the Boers.

I, too, will say to the English-speaking majority of Canada and of the province of Ontario: "Rise up to your own greatness; be generous with the minority; be fair;" and, to repeat the last words of the English captain of the doomed Titanic: "Be British." That is all we ask.

Sir, when after Mons and Charleroi the driven and defeated line of the Allies stood almost under the walls of Paris, when the world expected that the Prussian hordes would soon ride in through its historic gates, thus striking a death blow to the cause of human liberty, there was a halt called by Joffre, and as the grim old soldier stood and watched, men in khaki and other men in dim blue coats suddenly swung out in long lines upon the plain, slowly folding upon Von Kluck's army. As it wheeled eastwards, the bugler blew the charge, and the English Tommies, for the second time in the history of British arms, found themselves victorious at Crecy. There in the olden times English knights and French knights had fought and died under the ensigns of St. Denys and St. George. And there again they met in September, 1914, this time side by side as after a long lovers' quarrel to break the Prussian thrust and to once more deliver Christendom and save civilization.

Sir, let us Canadians of French and of English origin take a lesson from that eventful day in the history of mankind. Let us bury the past with its passions, its quarrels, its contention, its miseries. And, exalted by the unique spectacle given to the whole world by both our Mother Countries, let us in common brotherhood and mutual solidarity make of this country what the Fathers of Confederation fervently hoped it would be: a country of equal rights, of toleration, of freedom under the aegis of the British Crown.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, at this hour of the night I shall certainly not attempt an oratorical effort even if I were capable of such a thing. But, coming as I do from the province of Ontario, it does not seem unreasonable that I should at least attempt to outline, for the benefit of those who have criticised the legislation and regulations of my province, what I consider to be the law and regulations applicable to education in Ontario. I shall direct my remarks to three aspects of the question: first, the constitutional development of Ontario, and her attitude towards French as a constituted language of instruction in the province. I shall next direct the attention of the House to the development of this bilingual struggle, and then I shall endeavour to explain wherein I think a misapprehension exists in regard to the regulations. In the first place I might say that if anything were necessary to convince me that a resolution of this class should not be introduced into this House it is the great difference of opinion that exists among the speakers who have spoken as to the construction of the regulations, what their meaning is and what the position of the French in the province of Ontario has been and is to-day.

The first part of the resolution of the hon. member for Kamouraska says:

> It has long been the settled policy of Great Britain whenever a country passed under the sovereignty of the Crown by treaty or otherwise, to respect the religion, usages and language of the inhabitants who thus become British subjects.

There is always a danger in stating a fact in the preamble of a resolution. But the resolution is cleverly drawn in this respect, that the preamble is misleading, and to my mind conveys the impression that the religion, usages and language of the original inhabitants of this country were protected and have a right to exist as the religion, usages and language of the province of Ontario. The first speaker this afternoon took the position that it was the inalienable right of every man to have his language, and that it was impossible to take it away from him by legislation, reasoning from that he claimed that it was the inalienable right of the scholar in the province of Ontario to be taught in the French language, and that the province of Ontario had no authority to modify that right. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), being a lawyer, and being more close to Ontario, perhaps appreciated the difficulty into which he was being led and his argument did not go quite so far. But he inferred that the French-Canadian in attendance at the schools in the province of Ontario had by implication certain rights under section 93 and section 133 of the British North America Act. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in a most wonderful speech of classic eloquence, admitted frankly that this problem must be settled by Ontario. He stated frankly and openly that the predominant right lay with Ontario. Now it is quite impossible to reconcile these three arguments one with another, and I propose briefly, and, I trust, not to such an extent as to tire the House, to show this House, and perhaps through this House, the country, what Ontario considers to be her position and what she claims is her right.

It has been alleged that by capitulations certain rights and privileges were guaranteed in reference to the language of the French-Canadian population of Ontario. I should like to direct attention first to the Capitulation of Quebec, 8th day of September, 1759. I am quoting from page 6 of the Constitutional Documents of Canada. And let me say, Sir, that if there is one thing I desire to do more than another it is to impress upon this House that Ontario has no desire to act the part of tyrant, and that in speaking as I speak to-night I am only trying to express to this House what I believe to be the true spirit of Ontario, and what I believe her desire and intentions are. Turning to page 6 of the Constitutional Documents of Canada, section 6 of the Articles of Capitulation at Quebec makes no reference whatever to language, but it does refer to the question of religion, and this is what was demanded:

> That the exercise of the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion shall be maintained; and that safeguards shall be granted to the houses of the clergy, and to the monasteries, particularly to his Lordship the Bishop of Quebec, who, animated with zeal for religion and charity for the people of his diocese, desires to reside in it constantly, to exercise, freely and with that decency which his character and the sacred offices of the Roman religion require, his episcopal authority in the town of Quebec, whenever he shall think proper, until the possession of Canada shall be decided by a treaty between their most Christian and Britannic Majesties.

And the answer was:

> The free exercise of the Roman religion is granted, likewise safeguards to all religious persons, as well as to the Bishop, who shall be at liberty to come and exercise, freely and with decency, the functions of his office, whenever he shall think proper, until the possession of Canada shall have been decided between their Britannic and most Christian Majesties.

That is the only provision I know of in that treaty in reference to language or religion. Turning to the Capitulation of Montreal, which took place on 8th day of September, 1760, approximately a year later, we find on page 27 of the same book, as follows (Article 41):

11 p.m.

> The French, Canadians, and Acadians of what state and condition so ever, who shall remain in the colony, shall not be forced to take arms against his most Christian Majesty, or his Allies, directly or indirectly, on any occasion whatsoever; the British Government shall only require of them an exact neutrality.

That is what was demanded, and the answer was:

> They become subjects of the King.

Article 42 demanded:

> The French and Canadians shall continue to be governed according to the custom of Paris, and the laws and usages established for this country, and they shall not be subject to any other impossibilities, than those which were established under the French dominions.

And the answer was:

> Answered by the preceding articles, and particularly by the last.

The reason I made reference to these two capitulations is this. The right hon. leader of the Opposition in addressing the House this afternoon said, in reference to that answer "They become subjects of the King" that the French Canadian subjects of that day had reason to suppose that they would have protection. I suppose he desired this House to infer that protection meant that their usages would be respected,

that their language would be respected, and that their customs would not be disturbed. But if that was the object of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, certainly history does not bear out that conclusion; because His Britannic Majesty, by the proclamation of October 7, 1763, which is quoted on page 118 of the book from which I have been reading, certainly went a long way from protecting what was thought to be the laws and usages of French Canadians of that day, for he ruthlessly cast them aside, and by proclamation introduced English Common Law into the province of Quebec. It seems to me that that conclusion cannot be otherwise than reached. And if you admit that the answer "They become subjects of the King" entitled His Britannic Majesty to introduce English Common Law into the province of Quebec, it certainly entitled His Britannic Majesty or any other competent legislative authority to pass legislation affecting the French language in the province or what then constituted Canada. Those who have studied the history of Canada are aware of the discontent that followed in Quebec the proclamation of 1763. They know how the French Canadian people, in the habit of being governed by the civil law, resented the imposition of the English common law. They know the petitions that went to His Britannic Majesty to restore again to them the law that they had known, and those who have paid attention to the fact are aware that in 1774 the law of France was again restored to Lower Canada. One might naturally ask: Why was this done? Was it all done out of kindly consideration for the French Canadian people, or was it done because England wanted to make Lower Canada unsuitable as a colony of Britain? Let me ask you to turn to page 389 of the Constitutional Documents of Canada, where, I think, some very enlightening information may be found. There is a quotation at the bottom of the page taken from one of Cavendish's debates, and this is quoted from one of Lord Wedderburn's speeches:

> I think there ought to be no temptation held out to the subjects of England to quit their native soil, to increase colonies at the expense of this country. If persons have gone thither—

That is, Lower Canada.

> —in the course of trade, they have gone without any intention of making it their permanent residence; and in that case, it is no more hardship to tell them, "this is the law of the land"—

That is, the civil law.

> —than it would be to say to a man whose affairs induced him to establish himself in Guernsey, or in any other part of North America. With regard to the English who have settled there, their number is very few. They are attached to the country either in point of commercial interest or they are attached to it from the situations they hold under Government. It is one object of this measure that these persons should not settle in Canada.

Now, the reason I direct the attention of the House to that fact is this, that I want to impress on this country that in 1774, when the Quebec Act was brought into effect, it was not brought into effect with the desire of making Lower Canada a British immigration colony; it was brought into effect to make it a French colony, but part of the British Empire. A change took place, one might almost say, in a night. The war between England and the United States came and went, and men left the United States, preferring their allegiance to the flag to a home in the United States, and they settled in what is now known as Ontario. They were men who spoke the English language. Practically the only French settlements of that day were at the forts of Kingston, Niagara and Sandwich. These men did not know the laws of Paris; they wanted the laws they had known on the other side of the border, and the result was that the Constitutional Act was passed by which Upper Canada was carved out from what constituted Canada at that time; one of the first Acts of that province was to bring the common law of England into effect, and that law has been from that time to this the outstanding principle of law governing the province of Ontario.

In all those days nothing was said as to language. Ontario was free to have such language as she wished. It was recognized as an English-speaking colony and Quebec was recognized as a French-speaking colony. We know what history tells us subsequently happened. Discord arose not only in the lower province, but in Upper Canada. Lord Durham, astute of mind, farseeing and tactful, was sent to Canada in the hope of reconciling the two races. His expressive sentence is well known; it is one of the outstanding remarks of history; he said he found "two nations warring in the bosom of a single state," and his solution was a legislative union between Upper and Lower Canada. In 1840 the Union Act came into force, and by that Act it was declared that English should be the

language of debate in that legislature. French was expressly excluded by the Act; but so chivalrous were the people of the joint legislature that in 1848 they passed a resolution asking that French be restored as the language of debate, and their request was acceded to. From 1840 to 1867 things were not just exactly as we might have desired them to be, and in 1867 the best minds in Canada brought about Confederation. Confederation was a compact by which the men in one province conceded certain rights to the men in the other province, and it is a well-known historical fact that Sir John Macdonald desired a legislative union, one central legislative body for the entire country, and I think it is equally well-known that that was found to be impossible because the province of Quebec did not desire such a legislative union.

The British North America Act is the Magna Charta of Canadian liberties; it is the document by which we must judge our rights, and if I read Canadian history aright, my opinion is this, that in these matters of racial and religious difficulties, when they are peculiarly relegated to one province as distinct from the Dominion, the Dominion is wise if she leaves them alone. This position was the position I took in my very early days in the consideration of public questions when the Jesuits Estates Act stirred this country from one end to the other. I said that was an Act that came within the jurisdiction of the province of Quebec, and that the Dominion had nothing whatever to say about it.

In 1896 this country was again shaken over another subject of similar character. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition said: By "sunny ways" he could find a solution of the difficulty, and in 1896 I refrained from voting for the Conservative candidate in the city of Kingston because I believed that the principle that the right hon. leader of the Opposition then advocated was right, and that hands should be kept off Manitoba, because Manitoba had a right to work out her own educational system free from any interference on the part of the Dominion of Canada. To-night, when this question is again before the country, I take exactly the same position on general principles that it is wise for the Dominion to be cautious and not start what it may not be able to stop.

Coming to the British North America Act, let us see what the rights of the provinces are under that Act. The rights of language are defined by section 133, which reads:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and the Houses of the Legislature of Quebec; and both those languages shall be used in the respective Records and Journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec.
>
> The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both those languages.

Now, we men from Ontario construe that to mean this, that French is an official language in the courts established under the statutory jurisdiction of the Dominion; that French is an official language in the Parliament of Canada; that English has rights in the province of Quebec; but we say, neither inferentially nor otherwise, does that fact affect, regulate, or control the province of Ontario? It was never contemplated that French should have equal rights in Ontario with the rights accorded to English in the province of Quebec. We take the ground that the fact that right being declared, covers the whole principle of the argument, and that Ontario is free in so far as language goes to make such regulations and to pass such laws as she may desire.

In regard to education, the rights are settled and determined by section 93, which reads as follows:

> In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions:
>
> 1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province of the Union.

The question is, Sir, what right had any class in the province at the Union? The section reads as follows:

> Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affecting any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the Union.

Legislation falling within the prohibition of this subsection is, of course, ultra vires. The rights and privileges protected are those which any class of persons had by law at the Union with respect to denominational schools. All legislation affecting those rights is not prohibited, but only such legislation as prejudicially affects them. Whether any given legislation is prejudicial or not is a question of fact to be determined in the particular case. At

the Union the only law of Upper Canada that conferred rights or privileges with regard to denominational schools in Ontario was contained in 26 Victoria, chapter 5. It authorized the voluntary establishment of separate schools by Protestants, by coloured people and by Roman Catholics. The distinguished feature of the Protestant and Roman Catholic separate schools was religious belief. No provision was contained in the Act for the use of any special language. The only schools which were in any sense differentiated by language or race were the schools of the coloured people. There were in Ontario at the Union certain French settlements and also certain German settlements, but neither the French nor the German inhabitants of Ontario were authorized to establish separate schools. Their children attended either the comman, now called public, schools, or the separate schools, as best suited them. But the statute 26 Victoria, chapter 5, did not, nor did any other law of the province, confer upon either the French or the German people any special right or privilege with respect either to the Protestant separate schools or to the Roman Catholic separate schools.

The point that I am endeavouring to make is this: by sections 133 and 93, Ontario has plenary jurisdiction in regard to what language of instruction shall be used in her schools, and she may pass any legislation she desires so long as she does not prejudicially affect the rights that were to be respected pursuant to that Act from which I have just read.

The question naturally arises, has Ontario been reasonable? In regard to the religious aspect of the case, I do not think there is a man in this House who will say that what is commonly known as Protestant Ontario has not been liberal to Roman Catholic Ontario. The rights enjoyed by the Roman Catholic people in Ontario to-day in reference to education are vastly wider than the rights they enjoyed at Confederation. Changed conditions have necessitated new laws: Ontario has met the condition and has been willing to widen the scope and influence and rights of the Roman Catholic population. But in regard to the racial question, in regard to language, a different problem confronts Ontario. We have, as you know, but one system of separate schools, and when you unite in that one school the Irish Roman Catholic and the French Roman Catholic, you must have, if both are to be adequately taught, two sets of teachers, or a teacher adequately conversant with two languages. Thus you throw a tremendous burden on the taxpayer, and that is the problem Ontario has had to face and is endeavouring to solve.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition referred to-day to what Sir Oliver Mowat did in 1885. That was the first time the question pushed itself into Ontario politics. But Sir Oliver Mowat, a man of tact and shrewdness, pushed it to one side and got it out of the way. He got in the region of Torres Vedras, and was successful. But, as one speaker said this afternoon, you cannot conquer a difficulty by running away from it, and Sir Oliver Mowat, by his speech in 1885, did not conquer the difficulty; he only diverted it. What came to Sir Oliver Mowat in 1885 came much more strongly to the Liberal Government of 1899. I want to read to you, Sir, portions from a certain document published by the Minister of Education for Ontario:

During several years subsequent to 1885 the complaints continued, until in May, 1889, the Hon. G. W. Ross, Minister of Education appointed a Commission of Inquiry, consisting of Messrs. John J. Tilley, Rev. Alfred Reynar and Rev. D. D. McLeod. The reasons given for appointing this commission were that the regulations of the Department of Education required instructions in English to be given in all public schools, and that the department desired to learn with certainty whether and how far these regulations were complied with in the counties of Prescott, Russell, Essex, Kent and Simcoe or what steps should be taken for the more complete enforcement of the regulations of those counties. The commission, therefore, were specifically directed to consider and report in what way the study of English may be most successfully promoted among those accustomed to the use of the French language in their mother tongue.

The report of the commission declared that progress had been made in the teaching of English in the schools. In very few schools had sufficient attention been given to colloquial exercises, and in 28 schools less than the time prescribed was given in English. The school boards, however, recognized their obligation to obey the law of the province in several particulars, accordingly in 17 schools the results were very satisfactory indeed and in several schools quite equal to the work done in good English schools. In 21 schools fair progress was being made, and in 18 the pupils knew very little English.

That demonstrated, Sir, this fact: that if the regulations were adequately lived up to in the so-called French schools, an adequate education could be had in English and in French. (Reading):

To meet the deficiencies found to exist the recommendations of the commission included (1) the establishment of a special school for the

training of French teachers in the English language; (2) the holding of special institutes for the benefit of the teacher then in the schools; (3) the calling of the teachers' attention to the necessity of making greater use of the oral or conversational method in teaching English; (4) the introduction of a series of bilingual readers. By the use of such readers, the commission reported, the pupils should in time be sufficiently familiar with English to enable them to receive instructions in this language in the various subjects prescribed. In accordance with these recommendations the department established in 1890, in the village of Plantagenet, a model school for the instruction of teachers in English and French, and a series of bi-lingual readers was introduced. In 1892 the department issued a circular of instructions to teachers in regard to the teaching of English.

In 1893 the commission of 1889 was re-appointed, with instructions to report especially upon the condition of the schools in Prescott and Russell. They were "to consider and report what progress, if any, has been made in the study of English since the date of the last report." The commission reported in August, 1893, "a decided advance upon the state of things which we found on the occasion of our former visit." The commission also reported:

It only requires that the better methods now being used at the instance of the department be persevered in. In all educational measures time is an essential element. And from what has been accomplished in the past four years, the whole benefit of which has not yet been reaped, we may conclude that the continuance of these measures, and the use of such others as may yet be necessary, will give to the people of these counties schools which, as to efficiency, in English will be quite satisfactory.

The results of the inquiries, with the adoption by the department of the reforms recommended, failed to meet expectations and in August, 1900, the Minister of Education, Hon. R. Harcourt, issued a circular to the inspectors directing attention to the needs of the French bilingual schools. "The establishment some years ago", the minister declared, "of an English-French training school at Plantagenet did much towards improving the condition of the schools in the eastern part of Ontario. Advancement has not, however, been as rapid as would be desirable, owing to the difficulty of securing teachers who have the necessary knowledge of both the English and French languages." It was decided, therefore, to establish a course of professional training equivalent to the training given for provincial third class certificates. The minister concluded.

"The regulation requiring that so far as possible all communication between pupils and teacher shall be in English must be carefully observed. There should be a little teaching of English from books until the pupils have gained a fair knowledge of oral English. To this end the teachers should follow the instructions in the circular prepared by the Education Department on the teaching of English."

In 1910 a fresh Commission of Inquiry was appointed, and now I come to a portion of the subject of which I have peculiar knowledge, because I happened to be a member of the Legislature of Ontario at that time. The discussion was not launched in such a way that it could be stated that it was a matter of religious difference. It was not a matter between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants; it was a difference between Roman Catholics in attendance at the separate schools in the province of Ontario, in the districts into which the French people were coming, and in which, by natural increase, they were increasing. The French Canadians took a predominant control in certain of the schools to such an extent that certain of the Roman Catholic authorities asserted that the English language was suffering in comparison with the French language, and as a result Dr. Merchant was appointed to report. His instructions were:

The investigation should be so conducted as to ascertain whether there has been any departure from the provisions of the Public and Separate Schools Act or any of the Departmental Regulations or circulars affecting such schools, and if so to what extent. As the School Law intended to provide all pupils with a thorough training in English, it is desirable that you ascertain whether, and if so to what extent, the means to attain this end are inadequate or defective.

They laid down the principle that Ontario wanted every scholar to have an adequate education in English. The right hon. leader of the Opposition agrees with that, and I agree with him. It is absolutely essential, if the child in the province of Ontario who speaks French is to have an equal chance with the child who speaks English, that the French child should have every opportunity of mastering the English language, and Ontario has never been unwilling to do anything she could to bring about this result. But before Dr. Merchant reported something occurred. The matter got into the legislature in 1911. There was a good deal of discussion at the time, a good deal of newspaper controversy, a good deal of national heat; but after giving the matter full consideration, the Legislature of Ontario, on the 22nd day of March, 1911, passed a resolution unanimously and I may say in passing that no French member in the Legislature of Ontario objected to that resolution which reads:

Resolved that the English language shall be the language of instruction and of all communications with the pupils in the public and separate schools of the province except where in the opinion of the Department of Education it is impracticable by reason of pupils not understanding English.

In 1911 I voted for that resolution, and I believe it was sound. As an Englishman I voted for it because I believed that

the children whose mother tongue was French had a right, if they lived in the province of Ontario, to be in their early days educated in that tongue so that they would have a fair chance in the province of Ontario. We did not stand on our strict legal rights in the Legislature. We did not say: if the French come into that province they must learn in the schools we have; but we said to them that in their young days they might be taught in French. We wanted to give them every chance, and that resolution is incorporated in the Legislation of Ontario and stands on the statute book? Could anything be fairer? And yet they say that Ontario is tyrannical, that Ontario is over-bearing. Do they understand the resolutions that prevailed? Do they understand that to-day, in the province of Ontario, if a French child not understanding any English comes into an English settlement and goes to an English school he is entitled to be taught in his mother tongue? Do they understand that we have accorded that right? True it is inconvenient; true it is at times bothersome; but Ontario has not stopped to object to that sort of thing. We welcome them all, we want to give them education because the State, we believe, is better if every pupil has an adequate education. But, as I say, that resolution was passed, and then Dr. Merchant's report came in.

Mr. MARCIL: Did Mr. Racine, who represented Russell, inquire whether the adoption of this resolution would change in any way the standing of the schools of Ontario?

Mr. NICKLE: I could not speak positively as to that and therefore I shall say nothing. The resolution passed unanimously.

Mr. PROULX: It is true that before this resolution was moved in the House there had been one standing on the Order Paper for a long time in the name of the acting-Minister of Education to-day, which went further than this went. It aimed to make the English language the sole language of instruction in the schools, and I understand that this resolution was moved by the late Premier, Sir James Whitney. He amended the resolution which had been proposed by the acting-Minister of Education, and assured the Legislature that it left the law as it was. In fact there is in the Public Schools Act a section which says, in enumerating the duties of teachers, that they shall teach in the English language, except where a child does not understand that language.

Mr. NICKLE: Dr. Merchant's report came in. The right hon. leader of the Opposition this afternoon read at some length, certainly I think to the point, as to what great educationists thought was the proper system of teaching a child in a strange tongue; and the surprising thing is that the very trend of argument of the right hon. leader of the Opposition is the thing on which Dr. Merchant relies in the preparation of his report. I wish to read to the House a part of this report to show what the attitude of Ontario towards this whole question of French instruction in Ontario is. It is on page 72 of the report on the condition of English-French schools in Ontario, by Mr. F. W. Merchant, published in 1912. Here is what he says on conditions that promote efficiency:

> In some of the schools, the French-speaking children are acquiring a good working knowledge of English, both oral and written. At the same time, they are learning to read and write French, and are being given a satisfactory training in the other branches of a public school education. The success of these schools demonstrates the possibility of carrying out the provisions for education in French-speaking and German-speaking communities if the necessary conditions are observed in the organization and the conduct of the schools.
>
> In the course of the investigation I aimed to inquire into the conditions which appeared to promote efficiency. My conclusions are embodied in the remaining sections of the report:
>
> 1. Language of Instruction. The best results are obtained when the medium of instruction is in the beginning the mother-tongue. Life in the ordinary school is so different from the life of the home that the child on entrance to school finds himself in a strange and perplexing environment. He is bewildered if the language he hears in his lessons has no meaning for him, and for a long time he makes but little progress.
>
> When he appears to learn, he is usually but repeating meaningless words. My conclusions, I find, are in accord with those of others who have investigated the bilingual problem in other parts of the Empire. A discussion on bilinguialism was held at the recent Imperial Education Conference, and the question of the medium of instruction received a large share of the attention. While the delegates differed regarding the question of the time when English should be introduced into the course of study, and also regarding the stage at which it should be used continuously as the language of instruction, all were agreed that the child on entrance to school should receive his instruction through the vernacular.
>
> Dr. MacKay, of Nova Scotia, said: "In order to settle the difficulty a commission was appointed—

That was in Nova Scotia.

> —and the commission determined, and the Government accepted the determination, that the education of the French-speaking child should commence, and be continued during the first four years in the mother tongue, and French readers were provided for them. While

these French readers were used during the first four years the teachers of these schools were expected to acquaint themselves with the method of teaching English colloquially, and during these four years the children were required to do as much as possible in English so that after the fourth year instruction could go on in English continuously. That is the way the matter stands at present in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I believe the French are pretty well satisfied with it. The children in this way learn English more easily. They can learn written French more rapidly, and that enables them with very little difficulty to commence their studies in English thereafter."

Mr. MARCIL: He said four years in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Mr. NICKLE: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: I would be satisfied with four years.

Mr. NICKLE: You have got three in Ontario now. The report proceeds:

Dr. Parmalee, of Quebec, said: "Our experience abundantly proves that we must first give instruction in the mother tongue. We consider that the instruction must be in the first instance in the mother tongue. The change to a second language comes at a later stage."

Mr. Owen Edwards, in describing the condition of affairs in Wales before the introduction of Welsh as the language of instruction, said: "We thought that the best way of teaching English to a Welsh child would be to make the language and the atmosphere of the school entirely English, and to use Welsh, if at all, for the purpose of absolutely necessary explanations. I can but state the result by quoting from a report of a small committee of teachers of great ability and long experience, a report adopted and published by the Anglesey Education Committee. The infant, as he leaves the infant school, is thus described: 'He reads words with which he associates no meaning, and is denied access to the written word which would at once call up ideas and stimulate his intelligence. Thus, when he has attained the age of 6 or 7, his book tells him nothing; the language he reads he cannot understand, and the language he understands he cannot read. That was the typical product of infant schools until a few years ago.'"

Then a change came about and Wales allowed the Welsh children to be taught in Welsh in the early days. The report goes on:

Mr. A. T. Davies, in describing the condition of affairs in Wales at the present time, says: "H.M. Inspectors, without exception, reported—I have a sheaf of reports here that I could refer to if necessary—most favourably upon the beneficent operation of the new provisions. Here is one report, dated 1909 (or two years after their first issue), and taken at random. It may be regarded as typical of numbers of others: 'The introduction of Welsh as the medium of instruction in the infant class has had a most beneficial effect on the whole school; the interest of the scholars is aroused from the beginning, and the older scholars bring to the study of other subjects an alert mind and not a mere memory.'"

[Mr. Nickle.]

When I read that, it seems to me that it must impress the members of this House that we in the Legislature of Ontario in 1911 were right when we said that the French child should be taught in French in its early days. Let me explain what Dr. Merchant's conclusions were as to organization. He says:

The organization which gives, on the whole, the most satisfactory results requires the pupil to remain three years in Form I and two years in Form II, during which time English is made gradually to replace French as the medium of instruction. At the end of this period the most backward pupil should have sufficient command of the language to follow with comparative ease lessons conducted in English.

This organization adds one year to the time commonly taken in English schools to complete the public school course. I am convinced that, considering the additional labour involved in learning a new language, the work cannot be done satisfactorily in a shorter time. In some good schools the extra year is taken in Form III, but, on the whole, pupils make more satisfactory progress when the additional time is spent in the earlier part of the course.

In schools attended by both English-speaking and French-speaking pupils the English-speaking pupils are best taught by themselves in Forms I and II. The French-speaking children naturally need, in the beginning, special attention in English not necessary to be given to the English-speaking children, and the separation of classes allows both the English-speaking and the French-speaking children to proceed with the least possible loss of time. In such schools the classes are combined with advantage in Form III.

Let me emphasize this fact that when teaching the two languages they had practically to break the classes into two, and have the English in one room and French in the other during the earlier days. He proceeds:

The mixed school offers the French-speaking children the best opportunity of learning English. Not only does this form of organization give them an opportunity of acquiring English through association with the English-speaking pupils on the playground, but it permits of the teaching of English throughout the grades by teachers whose mother-tongue is English and of French by teachers whose mother-tongue is French by a system of exchanges in teachers easy to arrange. Now and then we find a teacher whose mother tongue is English who speaks French perfectly, and one whose mother tongue is French who speaks English perfectly, but instances are rare.

I have read thus far with the purpose of showing that the Education Department of the province of Ontario realized that instruction must be given in French to the French child until he attained a knowledge of English during his early years in school.

Now I come to the regulations, and if the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), has the control over his party which he

says he has, the whole question is settled, and as the right hon. the leader of the Opposition said to-day, we will rise from this discussion better and wiser men, because clause 12 of section 2 which the ex-Postmaster General said would satisfy the French people has never been repealed and is in effect to-day. The fact is that the men who are criticising these regulations do not understand them. They say that Regulation 17 is a modification of Regulation 12. It is not a modification; it is supplementary thereto. Clause 12 has never been repealed. I read to-night from the School Report of 1915, and this is the regulation that is in effect to-day; it is the law of Ontario to-night. If as the ex-Postmaster General says it meets the requirements of the French people, then the whole subject is settled. We thought there was going to be turmoil, but peace may come out of it. This is the regulation:

12. (2) In school sections where the French or German language prevails, the board may, in addition to the courses of study prescribed herein, require instruction to be given in French or German reading, grammar and composition to such pupils as are directed by their parents or guardians to study either of these languages, and in all such cases the authorized textbooks in French and German shall be used. But nothing herein contained shall be construed to mean that any of the textbooks prescribed for public and separate schools shall be set aside because of the use of the authorized textbooks in French or German.

That regulation is the law in Ontario to-day, and any school section throughout the province of Ontario where the French or German language prevails, the French people or the German people have a perfect right to have their language taught in their schools. But they must not neglect the English language and the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition says that they should not. That is what we ask in Ontario. We say: when your language prevails in a section, you have a right to teach your language; but having become a majority, you must respect our rights and you must see that our children, and your children as well—because it is as important to us as it is to you that your children should have an adequate education in English. That is the law in Ontario to-day. Let us come to the celebrated Regulation 17.

Mr. PROULX: What does the hon. member mean when he says, where the French language prevails? I will cite the case of Grand Valley, in the country of Glengarry, where 75 per cent of the rate-payers were of French origin and 75 per cent of the school children spoke the French language, and still the counsel for the Board of Education before the Court of Appeal maintained that the French language did not prevail, that it was the English language which prevailed, because the English language was the language used in the commercial transactions of the people.

Mr. NICKLE: The hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) understands the regulation in regard to schools question as well as I do. The counties appoint the inspectors and where the county inspector decides that in his county the French language prevails he is the arbiter as to the schools. The county council appoint the inspector and the inspector says whether or not the French language prevails. It is a question of fact to be decided by the inspector.

Mr. PROULX: We have—

Mr. NICKLE: I think I must be allowed to develop my argument and to carry it to its conclusion, after when I will be quite prepared to answer any questions, within the range of my knowledge, that any hon. gentleman may care ask me. There were two sets of Regulations 17. This was the regulation passed in 1912 and afterwards thrown out:

1. There are only two classes of primary schools in Ontario—public schools and separate schools; but, for convenience of reference, the term English-French is applied to those schools of each class in which French is the language of instruction and communication as limited in 3 (1) below.

Clause 3 (1) is as follows:

The use of French for Instruction and Communication.

(1) Where necessary in the case of French-speaking pupils, French may be used as the language of instruction and communication; but such use of French shall not be continued beyond Form 1 excepting during the school year of 1912-13, when it may also be used as the language of instruction and communication in the case of pupils beyond Form 1 who, owing to previous defective training are unable to speak and understand the English language.

The original Regulation 17 said that the French language could only be used in form 1 during the school year of 1912-13. But the slightest consideration ought to demonstrate to anybody the impracticability of that regulation. Regulation 17 passed in 1912 was purely temporary in character and in August, 1913, a new circular was prepared and it is called " Circu-

lar of Instructions." Here is what the circular said:

> There are only two classes of primary schools in Ontario—public schools and separate schools; but, for convenience of reference, the term English-French is applied to those schools of each class annually designated by the minister for inspection as provided in 5 below and in which French is a language of instruction and communication as limited in 3 (1) below.

Now, observe what was the intent of that instruction. As I have endeavoured to point out, the province of Ontario says that every child is entitled to an English education. The province of Ontario, for 15 or 20 years, had been wrestling with this problem of bilingual education. It could not be solved by leaving it to the school boards to regulate each local situation. First, the minister said: I am going to take control of these recalcitrant schools and I am going to put them in a class by themselves. If every school will handle the teaching of English as it should be handled in the primary grade; if every school board will see that English is adequately and emciently taught, it may pursue it own course, but if any school board will not do that, then I am going to take the administration of that school under my control. That is what Regulation 17 does and it is in that respect that it modifies what is sometimes called Regulation 15. Regulation 17 simply enables the Minister of Education to say: If the school board in a certain school section will not see that English is properly taught, then I am going to see that it is done by virtue of the inspection that the section provides for. The school may come under Regulation 17 today and not be under it next year. The School Board may observe the provisions of the law. The result will be that the minister will not have again to put the school under Regulation 17.

The sense of responsibility may make the School Board come to the conclusion that it will observe the law of Ontario and see that the children get an adequate education in English and, observing the law, and the minister being satisfied of their good faith, the school goes out of Regulation 17 and the general law applies. It is purely a supplementary system for controlling those who are not willing to accept what the province of Ontario considers the ideal educational system. That is all it is. It does not take from the French people anything; in fact, it gives them something that they have not legally had. Accentuation has been put on the word "hitherto." That word gives the French in Ontario more than they had before, because there are schools now under this Regulation 17 in which French was illegally taught before they were brought under the regulation. It was illegally taught because French was not the language that prevailed in the section in which the school was situated. But, the province of Ontario was so fair that they said: If you have taught French, we are not going to take the right from you and you can have French taught after you are put under Regulation 17.

Men from Ontario feel ruffled at times because we have sent our boys to avenge Catholic Belgium and maintain the status of France and we have been told by French Canadian newspapers, and it has been said by members of this House, that because there were differences on this educational problem, certain of the French Canadian people would not enlist. Certain of the leaders of French Canadian thought, to whom my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition did not refer this afternoon in complimentary terms, have induced the people to hold back when the men of Ontario were going. I want to say in all sincerity in this House to-night, and I trust I speak as a moderate man, that when this war is over, when victory perches on our banners, do not let the men who induced the French Canadians not to enlist, resent it if certain elements in the province of Ontario take their race at the value set upon it by their leaders. We in Ontario have sent our men overseas to protect Catholic Belgium in her agony, and to maintain France in her integrity, and we do not want to be told that other men have not enlisted because they cannot have exactly what they want in Ontario. We in Ontario love our language, we demand our right to have our children educated in the English tongue. It may not be as soft, as gentle, as smooth a language as the French language, but any man who associates it with his civilization, who knows it in his literature, regards it just as dearly as the French Canadian regards his tongue. We in Ontario require that every child gets a good education in English and if our French Canadian citizens will co-operate with us in this, then the province of Ontario will have no grudge against the French. But I say here, with every conviction and in all sincerity, that Ontario is determined that English must be the language of her schools. In the early days we are quite willing that the

French child should be taught in the French language, but we are determined that every child shall have an adequate education in English while at the same time we do not begrudge the French child the privileges of our schools in order that he may be educated to take his place in this province and in this country.

On motion of Hon. Charles Marcil, the debate was adjourned.

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN laid on the Table the report of the Special Committee appointed to inquire into the matter of soldiers' pensions, together with the documents relating thereto, and moved that rule 74 be suspended, that the documents might be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 12.01 Thursday.

Thursday, May 11, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

WAR SUPPLIES—GROCERIES.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who were the persons or firms who tendered for the supply of groceries called for by the Department of Militia in Vancouver?
2. What was the amount of each tender?
3. To whom was the contract awarded?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. P. Burns & Co., Ltd., Swift Canadian Co., Ltd., A. P. Slade & Co., Kelly-Douglas Co., Ltd., The W. H. Malkin Co., Ltd., White Bros., Oscar Brown & Co., Dominion Canners, Empress Mfg. Co., King Beach Mfg. Co., Ltd., Lindners, Ltd., Labrecque & Pellerin, E. D. Smith Co., Ltd., T. Upton Co., Ltd., Wm. Braid & Co., Wilson Bros., R. P. Rithet & Co., Ltd., Pioneer Coffee and Spice Mills, W. A. Jamieson Coffee Co., David Spencer, Ltd., Hudson's Bay Co.

The following were also asked to tender, but did not do so: Macdonald-Chapman, Ltd., Wm. Braid & Co., Duchesney Packing Co., London Grocery Co., Leeson Dickie Grocery Co., Ramsay Bros. & Co., Ltd., Skeena River Fisheries, Ltd., White Grocery, Vancouver Creameries, Mowat Produce Co., A. & C. Grocery, A. MacDonald Co., Knowler & McAulay, Canadian Produce Co., Naismith & Co., Canada Preserving Co., Glassco Co., Ltd., Imperial Extract Co., Kootenay Columbia Preserving Works, T. A. Lytle Co., Ltd., McCormick Mfg. Co., Nelson Jam Factory, Quebec Preserving Co., Alphonse Raymond & Co., Stuart, Ltd., St. Louis Preserving Co., Wagstaffe, Ltd., Wilson Bros., and Richmond Dairy & Produce Co., Victoria Tea and Coffee Co., Pacific Fruit and Produce Co., City Dairy and Produce Co.

2. Butter: 33c., 32c., 32c., 32½c., and 39c. Potatoes: 1¼c., 1½c., 1¼c. per lb. $24 ton April and May, $30 ton June and July, $25 ton August, $20 ton September. Cabbage and onions: 4c. lb. Carrots, parsnips, turnips and beets: 2c. lb. Assorted fresh vegetables: 2c. lb., 2½c. and 1½c. Jam: 11½c., 12c., 13⅛c., 11c., 15c., 10¾c. and 10¾c. Marmalade: 10c., 10c., 11c., 11c., 10½c. and 9¾c. Tea: 28c., 27c., 27c., 27c., 28c., 29c. and 27c. per lb. Coffee: 25c., 21c., 19⅒c., 23½c., 24c. and 27c. per lb.

Groceries proper: Beans, 6½c.; currants, 10½c., flour, soft pastry, 2⅞c., pepper, 15½c., prunes 7½c., rice 3½c., cheese 20c., rolled oats 3c., sago 6½c., salt 1c., sugar, white 8c., tapioca 6½c., split peas 6⅜c., baking powder 14c., macaroni 5c., raisins 8½c., yeast 30c. box., milk powder 17c., canned tomatoes $2.30 per case, canned corn $2.20 per case, canned peas $2.15 per case.

Beans 6½c., currants 13¾c., pepper 25c., prunes 9c., rice 5c., rolled oats 2¾c., sago, 6c., salt in 50-lb. pkgs. 45c., sugar, white, $8.50 per cwt., tapioca 6c., split peas 7c., baking powder $9.60 per doz., macaroni 40c. per box, raisins 9c. per pkge., yeast $1.30 per box, canned tomatoes $1.27½ per doz., canned corn $1.15 per doz., canned peas $1.20 per doz.

Beans 8c., currants 13c., flour, soft pastry 3¼c., pepper 27c., prunes 8⅞c., rice 4½c., rolled oats 3¾c., sago 7c., salt 2c., sugar, white, 8½c., tapioca 7c., split peas 7c., baking powder 15c., macaroni 9c., raisins 10c., yeast 18c., milk powder 36c., canned tomatoes $2.70 per case, canned corn $2.45 per case, canned peas $2.45 per case.

Beans 7½c., currants 12c., flour, soft pastry 2¾c., pepper 18c., prunes 7¾c., rice 3½c., cheese 19½c., rolled oats 3⅝c., sago 7c., salt ⅜c., sugar, white, 8¼c., tapioca 7c., split peas 6c., baking powder 15c., macaroni 5c., raisins 9c., yeast $1.30 per box, canned tomatoes $2.60 and $2.35 per case, canned

corn $2.10 per case, canned peas $2.10 per case, cheese 19c. and 19½c.

3. Lowest tenderers: Jam and marmalade were awarded to the lowest tenderer among the British Columbia manufacturers of same. Butter, A. P. Slade & Co., 30½c.; jam, Empress Mfg. Co., 12c.; marmalade, Empress Mfg. Co., 10c.; tea, Kelly-Douglas Co., Ltd., 27c.; coffee, W. H. Malkin Co., Ltd., 19⁹/₁₀c.; potatoes, W. H. Malkin Co., Ltd., 1¼c.; fresh vegetables, W. H. Malkin Co., Ltd., 1¼c.

Groceries proper: W. H. Malkin Co. Ltd., beans 6½c., currants 10½c., flour, soft pastry 2⅞c., pepper 15½c., prunes 7½c., rice 3½c., cheese 20c., rolled oats 3c., sago 6½c., salt 1c., sugar, white, 8c., tapioca 6½c., split peas 6⅜c., baking powder 14c., macaroni 5c., raisins 8½c., yeast 30c. per box, milk powder 17c., canned tomatoes $2.30 case, canned corn $2.20 case, and canned peas $2.15 case.

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS THROUGH HALIFAX.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many tons of freight were exported through the port of Halifax during the calendar year 1915, to the British Islands, the British Possessions and to foreign countries, respectively?

2. What are the corresponding figures concerning the imports through said port?

Mr. REID: No information is obtainable for the calendar year 1915. According to shipping returns to customs, the figures for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1916, are as follows:

	Tons weight.	Tons measurement.
Vessels departed—		
Great Britain... ..	264,049	291,902
British possessions..	171,155	2,387
Other countries..	105,129	26,988
Vessels arrived—		
Great Britain... ..	85,732	
British possessions..	73,193	
Other countries..	109,622	

THE BILINGUAL QUESTION.

Consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Thomas White: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply;" and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Lapointe (Kamouraska) thereto; resumed from Wednesday, May 10.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, at this advanced stage of the session, with a general desire prevailing among the members to retire to their peaceful vocations, I do not intend in the present debate to enlarge upon the arguments which have already been submitted to the House; and, ar far as possible, I shall curtail within reasonable limits the arguments which I shall have the honour to submit to the House in support of the motion by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe).

I wish in the first place to congratulate the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) on the very interesting statements he gave us last night in his retrospective view of the parliamentary history of Canada, with all of which, of course, I do not agree, and especially with that part in which he undertook to explain the present educational policy of Ontario and the action of the Education Department; but to both of those portions of his speech I shall have occasion to refer later on in the course of my remarks.

The House has reason to congratulate itself on the high plane of the debate so far. This House is a reflection, so to speak, of the Canadian people; this question concerns every home in Canada, and it is one of those questions which we can discuss dispassionately and to the advantage of Canada as a whole. Education is a sacred cause, not only in Canada, but in all countries of the world, and I am glad that in discussing education we have not drifted into a discussion of religion. Thank Heaven, the present discussion is in no way tinged with a religious aspect, and, however we may disagree on religious matters, we can discuss at least this great educational question without passion, and in the best interests of the country.

It is admitted, of course, that the English language is the great universal language being spoken throughout the English colonies, dominions, and possessions all over the world. It must also be admitted that French is one of the great languages. The man who can speak the English language has a great advantage, but so also has the English Canadian who can speak the French language. Our boys from the West and the Maritime Provinces who are now in France and Flanders would find it a great advantage to be able to speak French in the great work they are carrying on; but they have not that advantage. We in Quebec have had that advantage. We have been brought up in the older part of the country, along the banks of the St. Lawrence. The people of my race have

been there for eight or nine generations. I am myself somewhat of a bilingualist, and I think it a great advantage to be able to speak both French and English. Were it not for that fact I should not have the honour of addressing myself to the House of Commons to-day, in favour of what I believe to be a deserving minority in the largest province of the Dominion. It will be admitted that the French members from Quebec and other provinces set a splendid example of courtesy by their conduct in the proceedings of this House. Under the Constitution they could easily do all their speaking in French; they could move all their motions in French; put all their questions in French; in fact, transact all their business in the House in French. You can realize at once, Mr. Speaker, the position in which we should be if the French members exercised in that respect the rights and privileges which they have under the Constitution. But the people of Quebec, and the French people of the Dominion at large, are reasonable. They are a moderate and a conciliatory people. With the spirit that has always animated the French race, we want to be courteous to the majority. We speak the language of the majority, not so well probably as the English people themselves, but we try to master it as well as we can. We had an example in the member who moved this resolution of what a little study and a little work will do when a man really wants to acquire a better educational equipment. The hon. member for Kamouraska has set an example in learning the English language, which, I think, ought to be imitated, as far as possible, by every member of this House.

Coming now to discuss this question, let me read the terms of the motion, to show how moderate it is and how far removed from any aggressive spirit towards the English-speaking people of Ontario, or of the other English-speaking portions of the Dominion:

That all the words after "that" in the main motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor.

"It has long been the settled policy of Great Britain whenever a country passed under the sovereignty of the Crown by treaty or otherwise, to respect the religion, usages and language of the inhabitants who thus become British subjects :

"That His Majesty's subjects of French origin in the province of Ontario complain that by recent legislation they have been to a large extent deprived of the privilege which they and their fathers have always enjoyed since Canada passed under the sovereignty of the British Crown, of having their children taught in French.

"That this House especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with."

Following my leader, I concede at once that it rests entirely with the province of Ontario to deal with this question; that the province of Ontario is supreme in this matter, and that the policy which has been followed by the present Government in not disallowing the Act of the legislature is merely in keeping with the traditional policy of the Liberal party followed in this House since Confederation. Upon that point we are perfectly agreed. But this is the High Court of the land; we are here to promote the happiness, the prosperity, and the contentment of the Canadian people. I think that this Parliament is employing its time well in trying to remove any of the difficulties that mankind inherits, whether those difficulties be material or educational, or whatever their nature may be. It has been well said that Canada is one of the most difficult countries in the world to govern. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister will no doubt agree with that statement as have some of his illustrious predecessors. The governing of this country is a difficult task as it is inhabited by various races, nationalities, and creeds, but I believe that in the last few years great headway has been made towards a better understanding amongst the different classes of the people. We cannot hope that we shall always see eye to eye on all questions. When the great issue of the war confronted us, we might have expected that when France and England, our two great mother countries, were united for that most sacred of all causes, the cause of civilization and humanity, all Canadians would have been united, but even upon that issue we were disappointed to find disagreement. Similar instances have occurred in other parts of the world and I suppose human nature is so built that there never can be perfect agreement.

On this question of education, I think the consensus of opinion in this House and throughout the country is that it rests entirely with the province of Ontario, and it is to that province that we are making our appeal. As many of our fellow-members

from the other provinces may not be familiar with what the French Canadians desire to attain and what they are complaining of, I will read a brief summary prepared by the French Canadian Educational Association of Ontario, showing exactly what they ask for and what they do not ask for, so that the House can readily understand the precise nature of the question at issue.

What the French Canadians are Asking.

1. The respect of their rights for the education of their children in schools supported with their money.

2. The efficacious teaching of the two official languages of Canada during the whole primary course in the schools or classes attended by their children.

3. The teaching of their children through the natural vehicle: the mother tongue.

4. The grouping by schools or classes of the children to which their parents wish to have the two official languages taught.

5. Competent teachers capable of teaching the two official languages of Canada to take the management of schools or classes attended by the children whose parents require teaching of French and English.

6. Their part of school grants voted each year by the Legislative Assembly.

7. One inspection, Catholic and Franco-English, of separate schools attended by their children.

8. One inspection, Franco-English, of public schools attended by their children.

9. The granting of certificates to bilingual teachers who have sucessfully passed the examinations required by the Department of Education.

If there is anything in this plain statement of what the French Canadians of the province of Ontario are asking, that is not already enjoyed by every other class in that province, I would like to have it pointed out to me later on in the course of the debate. The Association also makes this statement:

What the French Canadians do not Want.

1. The French Canadians of Ontario do not want schools exclusively French.

2. They do not wish to force English speaking children or others to study the French language.

3. They do not ask for the introduction of a third school system in the province.

4. They do not wish on the one hand to expel anybody from the province; but on the other hand they will not allow themselves to be treated as intruders. They have paid for every inch of territory they possess.

5. They do not want to put up with the confiscation of their school grants which they have been subjected to for the past three years, because they have insisted on having their children taught efficiently in both the official languages of Canada.

There is one point upon which both parties to this controversy are agreed. The Government of Ontario wants every child in that province to have an English education, and I have not yet met a member of the minority who is not of the same opinion. No child in the province of Ontario can be said to have a proper education unless he has been given a thorough English education. To bring up a child in this province without giving him an English education is to handicap him for the rest of his life. The Government of Ontario wants an English education for the children; the French Canadian people of Ontario ask for the same thing. The only point of difference is as to how much tuition in French is to be given to the child. The Ontario Government proposes under Regulation 17 to give in certain schools a certain amount of teaching in French, and in other schools where the teaching of French did not exist previous to 1912, there is to be no French taught at all, so that the line of cleavage is as to the amount of French teaching that is to be given. The province of Ontario is not asked to institute a new system; it has allowed the teaching of French from time immemorial. The Postmaster General, who yesterday delivered a very interesting speech, has in his nature somewhat of the bilingual; a native of the province of Ontario, he has become a distinguished citizen of the province of Quebec. He has become familiar with both languages; he knows the mentality of the people of Ontario; he knows the mentality of the people of Quebec. My mind wandered back to the days when the United Empire Loyalists in the first Legislature of Ontario passed a resolution on behalf of one member of that Legislature, Mr. Baby, who represented the French settlement of Essex, providing that the Orders of the Day and the Votes and Proceedings of the House be printed in the French language for the benefit of the French settlers along the Detroit river. What an example of generosity shown by the United Empire Loyalists who were the first to settle in Ontario, who opened and paved the way for the great and glorious province that Ontario has now become.

The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) referred in his usual dispassionate manner to the early constitutional history of this country, to the capitulation of Montreal, to the capitulation of Quebec, to the Quebec Act, and to all the other privileges which were granted to us by Great Britain. As I said in my opening remarks, I did not intend to delay the House upon this subject, because those points are more or less familiar to us all. England has never committed any injustice

on the French Canadians of the province of Quebec or of the rest of Canada, and I am proud to-day, Mr. Speaker, facing you in this British House, under the aegis and protection of the British flag, to declare that Great Britain has given to the French-Canadian people an overflowing measure of justice upon all occasions. Sometimes an error of policy may have been committed, but the British statesmen themselves have always been the first to correct it. In 1774, they may have somewhat restricted the Quebec Act. In 1841, the Union Act was looked upon as an error at that time, but I wish to read a few extracts from the statements of some of the Governors General, showing how valuable it was in the interest of Canada, in the interest of the Empire, in the interest of the retention of British power on the North American continent; it was, that the French language should be maintained here upon an equal footing with the English language. The hon. member for Kingston referred to those very speeches, and I shall quote one or two extracts showing what was the original British policy towards Canada and what was intended to be done with the two races inhabiting this country.

The Governors General of Canada, since Lord Elgin, have all, Lord Dufferin included, proclaimed the necessity of knowing both official languages in our bilingual country. Lord Dufferin, formerly Governor General of Canada, ex-Ambassador of England to Italy and France, one of the great statesmen who honoured the Empire in the last century, said in a speech that became famous:

> It is true that the racial differences existing in Canada complicate to a certain extent the problems statesmen have to solve from time to time; but the inconveniences resulting from this state of affairs are more than counterbalanced by the many advantages derived therefrom. I do not believe that ethnological homogeneity is a flawless boon to a country. It is unquestionable to say that the less attractive side of the social character of a great portion of the population on this continent is the uniformity offered by many of its divers aspects; and I believe Canada should be happy to rely on the co-operation of different races. The mutual action of the national idiosyncrasies introduce in our existence a variety, a colour, and an eclectic impulsion that would otherwise be impossible to attain. It would be an utterly impolitic policy to strive for their disappearance.

Lord Grey, Governor General of Canada, while visiting Victoria school, Quebec, in October, 1910, pointed out to the pupils:

> —that it was just as much in the interest of English-speaking Canadians to learn French as it was for the French to learn English.

Lord Elgin, writing to Lord Grey from Montreal, on May 4, 1848, said:

> I am very anxious to hear that you have taken steps for the repeal of so much of the Act of Union as imposes restrictions on the use of the French language... I must, moreover, confess that I, for one, am deeply convinced of the impolicy of all such attempts to denationalize the French. Generally speaking, they produce the opposite effect from that intended, cause the flame of national prejudice and animosity to burn more firmly... You may perhaps Americanize, but, depend upon it, by methods of this description you will never anglicize the French inhabitants of a province.

Lord Grey writes, in answer to Lord Elgin, on June 1, 1848:

> I quite agree with you as to the impolicy of the attempt.... Therefore, though I confess I am sorry to alter the Union Act as regards the languages, I shall almost immediately yield to their wishes by bringing up a Bill to effect the desired changes. You will receive an official announcement of this intention by this mail.

Lord Elgin to Earl Grey, Montreal, June 1, 1848:

> Let me also remind you of the importance which attaches to the passing of a measure to remove the restrictions imposed by the Act of Union on the use of the French language.

I shall say no more about that point. I think we all agree that it is an advantage, an asset, to Canada to possess two languages. Those members of this House who have travelled in Europe—and there are many—know that when they go to England, to France, to Italy, to Austria, to Germany, to Switzerland, or to any other part of Europe, they are rarely met by a man of some education who does not know two, three, or more languages. We are about to enter on a campaign for the extension of our foreign trade. I listened with interest to the instructive statements made to the House the other day by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). We wish him success in the campaign he is undertaking to make known our goods abroad and to bring trade from other countries. He will be the first, I have no doubt, to tell the House of the great advantage it would be for the people of Ontario, or any part of Canada, to have among their employees men who can write the French language. For French is used universally in Russia, Switzerland, in Italy —practically by every non-English-speaking nation on the continent of Europe. The hon. member for Kamouraska gave us yes-

terday the astounding statement that when the Turkish plenipotentiaries reached Berlin those wishing to be understood by the gathering had to address them in the French language. So we are not asking the great province of Ontario to adopt that which is unworthy of her; we are not asking her to go back on the traditions of the British race, of which they are the main stock upon this continent. We are asking only a reasonable privilege for French Canadians. We are not asking them to impose the learning of France upon their children, but asking only that the 250,000 French Canadians who are good law-abiding citizens of that province, should be allowed, while learning the English language at their own expense, to have the privilege of imparting to their children the French language. Is there anything unbecoming in this? Is there anything un-British in this appeal? Is there anything unfair?

Look at the way the Maritime Provinces have dealt with this question. Look at Prince Edward Island; look at New Brunswick; look at Nova Scotia. And, in passing, let me pay this tribute to Nova Scotia —that it has at all times been in the vanguard in educational progress in the Dominion of Canada, and has furnished leaders of thought in educational affairs to the rest of the Dominion. I need only to refer to President Falconer of the University of Toronto; to the late Principal Grant of Queen's University; in Montreal to Sir William Dawson; and many others. The province of Nova Scotia is small in population and area, but, blessed with a splendid educational system and led by men with broad views who have played a large part in this matter, it has settled this question without difficulty. I was reading the other day the report of the Minister of Education of Nova Scotia, and was glad to see that the report on the bilingual system was published in French. In 1871, shortly after Confederation, this House was appealed to in connection with the New Brunswick school question. That question was removed from the Federal arena, and, under the guidance of wise men, they have solved it to the satisfaction of the Acadian minority in that province. What a satisfaction it must be to-day for a member from New Brunswick to have it said by a member of the minority that in that province they have been given justice and fairplay.

I have a higher opinion and a higher idea of the province of Ontario than is held by many others. I do not look upon Ontario as a province that would wilfully do anything wrong or would commit a wilful injustice at the expense of a minority. I have every faith in the province of Ontario. I have not visited that province so much during the last fifteen years, as I used to do in the old days; but in those old days I used frequently to visit Essex, Kent, Oxford, Toronto, and various other parts of Ontario. I went through the whole province sometimes with ministers of the Crown and with men who occupied leading positions in the affairs of the province. Upon all those occasions I was received as one of the family, and, as a citizen of Quebec, was always welcome to the hearts and homes of the people. I found in Ontario a degfee of advancement, progress, and material industry and prosperity which unfortunately, we do not enjoy in the province of Quebec. No one need tell me that a people so progressive in all such matters would be backward in this, which is not by any means a new principle.

The province of Ontario has allowed the teaching of French from time immemorial. The older members of the House remember the late Hon. R. W. Scott, who died at an advanced age, and who was the author of the Separate School Act of Ontario. On many occasions he explained to me the difficulties which he had in bringing about the passage of that measure; but when it was finally adopted in 1863 by a majority of the Canadian Parliament, in which majority were found 25 Protestant members, it was a recognition of the rights of the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario. Such a measure redounds to the honour of that province. What has been done upon the religious ground can also be done upon the racial ground.

Has it not sometimes struck you, Sir, as most extraordinary that at a time when, for the last three months, at Verdun, within a few miles of Paris, France has been pouring out the blood of her children to repulse the hordes of the German invaders, to save the civilization of Europe, as in other days Charles Martel saved it at Poitiers from the invasion of the Mussulman—does it not seem strange to you that in this, the premier colony of the Empire, we should be begging, craving, almost on our knees, to be allowed to give to our children the language which those heroes speak around the walls of Verdun?

I cannot believe that the Government of Ontario has finally closed this question. I

look to the province of Ontario for better treatment, and following up the requests that have been made, I hope that reconsideration will be given to this subject as it easily can be given. The minority are not unreasonable. In a statement that I have just read, they express their willingness that this grievance should be submitted to arbitration. They are willing that their school system in the city of Ottawa, which is the most important in this respect in the whole province, should be taken over at once by the Department of Education of Ontario. They are willing that the commission that they have themselves elected should withdraw altogether on condition that the appointed commission should also withdraw, and that then the Department of Education of Ontario should take over the handling of the schools. They are willing that that arrangement should continue until judgment is given by the Privy Council. But whatever that judgment may be, whether it be favourable to the minority or not, the final and the ultimate application of that judgment will rest with the people and the Government of Ontario. The citizens of Ontario are strong; they are numerous; they are rich. A bountiful Providence has given them all the elements for the constitution of a great people. They have shown a noble spirit in the recruiting which is being carried on in their chief city. The city of Toronto has sent almost 30,000 men, almost 10 per cent of all the soldiers that have been sent from Canada. I envy the magnificent example set by the city of Toronto in having sent 30,000 men to the front to defend the rights of oppressed nations in Europe. The Legislature of Ontario was opened two months ago by the Lieutenant-Governor of that province, and in the speech from the Throne he used this language:

> Hitherto the relations of the European powers to each other have been regulated and controlled largely by treaty engagements, by international laws and usage and by good faith. In consequence of the repudiation of such restraints and obligations in the pursuit of unlimited and unscrupulous ambition, the world has been plunged into a general war. The British people have therefore been compelled to take up arms to vindicate their honour, to enforce the guaranteed rights of the small nations and to protect the Empire from attack.

This is what the boys of Toronto, and this is what the boys of the old province of Ontario, with those of the other provinces, have gone to Europe to do. We ask the people of Ontario who have remained at home if they cannot do for a small minority in Ontario what the boys are striving to do for other minorities in Europe. We are fortunate in this country at the present time to be far from the scene of conflict. We have not been afflicted as unfortunate Belgium has been. Our soul has not been rent and torn as has been the glorious soul of France. We enjoy the blessings of peace. We are blessed by a bountiful Providence, and if it is necessary to the happiness and the greatness of a people, surely the premier province of this Dominion is able, on a question like this, to show an example. Even if there are men in the province of Quebec who have so far forgotten their duty as to be backward in the present movement, is that any reason why the province of Ontario should not give us an incentive in the work that we have undertaken of cementing and bringing together the various elements of the Canadian people? This question remains in the provincial arena; but the present Government and the members from Ontario in this House can exercise a great influence in its solution, and I hope that we will be able to do it before this debate is closed, or if not then, within a reasonable time, so that an end will be put to this unfortunate agitation.

The member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) referred last night to the determination on the part of the Government of Ontario to see to it that every child in Ontario shall learn the English language. He said that Regulation 17 had been adopted to deal with recalcitrant schools, schools in localities where the English language had not been properly taught. For my part I am prepared to submit to the strongest measure that can be adopted by the Legislature of Ontario for the purpose of seeing to it that a fair and reasonable English education is given to every child within the province. But if I am prepared to do that in the interests of the child and in the interests of that province and of this Dominion, I ask from that province that they do not tear from the mouth of that child the mother tongue that has been given to him by nature and by God, because the man who is truly loyal to the instincts of his heart and his origin will never be unfaithful or disloyal to his Government, or to his Sovereign. We have found loyalty characterizing the French Canadian people in all the history of the race in this country; in Ontario, as in other parts of the old provinces, of Canada. What have the French Can-

adians done in Ontario? They came, the sons of the first pioneers of this country, mostly as shantymen; in some cases as navigators. They came through the wilderness, they followed up the Ottawa river, through the Great Lakes, and on beyond the head of lake Superior; La Verandrye to the Rockies; others to New Orleans. But those who settled in Ontario were the descendants of poor people, who found their way to Ontario through the wilderness. They did not go there in a Pullman car, with all the conveniences of a modern railway. They did not go into Ontario and take up land on which they could grow wheat on 100 acres in a year or two. They came into Ontario with the wives and their young children, with their strong arms, knowing that they were still upon British soil. They opened up the northern part of Ontario, they followed the water routes of travel. They established themselves along the Detroit river. They settled the eastern part of Ontario, and to-day they are loyal people and law-abiding citizens of Ontario. For many years a French Canadian was thought to be worthy of occupying a seat in the Cabinet of the province. Unfortunately at the present time they have no representative, but that is a mere accident. To-day these people are as good settlers, and in fact they are as good citizens of Ontario, as any to be found in that province. They are ratepayers in Ontario. The money which they pay goes to the maintenance of Ontario. They do not ask for their children the privileges which are given to the English-speaking children of Ontario. The English-speaking children of Ontario can go to the primary schools; they can go to the secondary schools; they can go to the high schools; they can go to the collegiate schools; they can go to the universities. The English child of Ontario can do that. He will find English taught wherever he goes; but the French child—what do we ask for him? We merely ask that introduction to the English language which he learns in the elementary school, and that he be allowed at the same time to improve the French that he inherits from his parents. He can go to the high school, but on the understanding that he loses his French. He can go to the collegiate institute on the same footing. There is no course of French study in the high schools.

Mr. CURRIE: There is a course of French in the high schools, and every collegiate institute has to teach it.

Mr. MARCIL: It is a subject for an hour or so a week.

Mr. CURRIE: No, more than that; the same as English.

Mr. MARCIL: Then I stand corrected, because it has been represented to me otherwise.

An hon. MEMBER: Do not believe all you hear.

Mr. MARCIL: But there is no difficulty on this point. We are not speaking of collegiate institutes; we are referring merely to the elementary course, and asking for what Ontario has always granted. The Ontario Government has, of its own free will, placed upon the statute book of the province an enactment in which it recognizes the teaching of French in the elementary courses under certain conditions for the benefit of French Canadian children in that province. The whole question rests upon the interpretation of that regulation. Surely Canadians ought to be big enough to settle a problem of this kind. Surely this question ought not to be beyond solution. For my part, I would be prepared, if I were a citizen of Ontario, to submit a question like that to three or four men. Give me Principal Falconer, of Toronto University, Principal Peterson, of McGill University, and the Principal of Queen's University, of Kingston, and give me one representative out of the four for the French minority, and I will abide by their decision. If they say that what is given to the French minority under Regulation 17, so far as the teaching of French is concerned, is in any way practicable; if these pedagogues, these men of high standing and experience, declare that Regulation 17 can be worked to advantage and for the benefit of the French minority, I will submit to their decision. But we are in this state of affairs, that the minority say that it is impracticable, and that it means the gradual extinction of the French language. Winston Churchill, in the words cited by the hon. member for Kamouraska, in dealing with the South African problem, said: "We must settle this question, and it must be settled to the satisfaction of the minority." How did British statesmen settle the South African question? Is there a brighter page in the annals of British diplomacy or of British statesmanship than the solution of the difficulties in South Africa? In less than five years former rebels, men formerly in

arms against Britain, were made the most devoted subjects of the Empire. It is a policy such as that which we would like to see adopted in the province of Ontario. We are pleading for fairplay. We are pleading, Sir, for the great privileges which have never been denied, but which we grant cheerfully, the minority in the province of Quebec. There are in this House 65 members from the province of Quebec, of whom 15 are English-speaking. These 15 members could rise in this House, one after the other, no matter to what race or to what political party they belong, and say that it is the glory of the province of Quebec that the minority in that province has never complained of ill-treatment on the score of education. We are proud of that; it is one of the satisfactions we have in connection with our educational system in Quebec. We do not ask for the same treatment in Ontario. We do not ask for an independent council of education in Ontario such as the English-speaking people have in the province of Quebec. We do not ask all the benefits and advantages which the English-speaking people of Quebec enjoy. We are satisfied to continue with the purely elementary system which you granted to us. You tell us that under Regulation 17 we can have it, but under certain conditions. We consider that those conditions are inadequate, unfair to us, and unworkable, and we ask you to give us another hearing, to give us another trial, in order to find some solution of this question. Are you going to refuse that? Is the province of Ontario going to refuse that? I do not think so. I think the province of Ontario is inhabited by men who have higher ideals on that score.

The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) last night read long extracts from the report of Dr. Merchant. I have the answer to that here in a pamphlet; but I do not dare to inflict it upon the House, because I know that it is the intention to get through this debate as quickly as possible. Suffice it to say that the report which Dr. Merchant prepared gives a very able analysis of the bilingual system of Ontario. He has paid the French people of Ontario a tribute which they cannot forget. He has declared that the bilingual schools of Ontario are satisfactory, so far as they go, but that they might be improved in some respects. Let me read just a small paragraph, in which he says:

"English is a subject of study in all the schools visited," so Dr. Merchant himself assures us. It is an admission which should be made much of. It may be used, with effect, against those who accuse our schools of not cultivating the English language, or of not understanding the public and private interests of our people in this part of the Dominion. What must we now think of those who asserted that English formed no part of our teaching? "English is a subject of study in all the schools visited," we repeat, with Dr. Merchant. Let me proceed with further particulars. English conversation as distinguished from English reading finds a place in most of the schools in eastern Ontario and in the districts, but is seldom regarded as a separate subject of study in the schools of Essex and Kent. Where the subject is introduced, a fair beginning is being made in its development.

The result of Dr. Merchant's visit to bilingual schools in Ontario is summarized as follows:

These results are made clearer by the following table, made up of figures borrowed from Dr. Merchant:

In the 1st Form, out of 254 schools visited, 229 are marked passable (from excellent to bad exclusively) or 90.15 per cent.

In the 2nd Form, out of 252 schools visited, 192 are marked passable, or 76.20 per cent.

In the 3rd Form, out of 230 schools visited, 174 are marked passable, or 75.65 per cent.

In the 4th form out of 163 schools visited, 143 are marked passable, or 87.73 per cent.

These schools, it should be noted, are to be found in all the different French Canadian centres of the province, that is to say, in Russell, Prescott, Carleton, Nipissing, Algoma, Simcoe and Kent. The French Canadian population of these districts being chiefly agricultural, it is evident that their children have not all the facilities for attending school which could be wished for.

The French Canadian people have taken pride in the education of their children. In the city of Ottawa we have had some instances of the remarkable progress made by pupils of bilingual schools, and the same can be said of some of the rural parts of Ontario. The following figures show the number of pupils of bilingual schools who have passed the entrance examinations:

Year.	No. of Pupils.	Average Age.
Casselman, 1908 to 1912	12	13 to 15
Hawkesbury, 1908 to 1912	27	12 to 15
" 1914	18	
Bourget, 1912	6	13 to 15
Embrum, 1907 to 1912	32	13 to 16
" 1913	5	
" 1914	7	
Rockland, 1908 to 1913	23	12 to 16
Clarence Creek, 1913	5	13 to 14
Fournierville, 1914	4	14
Mattawa, 1914	4	12 to 14 and 16
St. Eugène de Prescott, 1914	6	13 and 14
Sudbury, 1915	10	13 and 14

This shows that generally throughout the province of Ontario the bilingual schools have brought forth students who were able

to pass the entrance examination. I do not like to bother the House with this issue, it seems to me such a clear one, and I will not attempt to make any more quotations. I will not attempt to go back and show what the relations have been between the two races, the difficulties that preceded the introduction of the Separate School system, and the difficulties that had to be solved at Confederation by the understanding between Sir George Etienne Cartier, Sir John Macdonald and the representatives of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Whatever may have been the failings or mistakes of the past, let us hope that the dead past will bury its dead; and when we find that the world is about to be renewed and renovated in the older hemisphere, let us try to draw a lesson and an inspiration from the great sacrifices which many of our fellow countrymen are making daily; let us draw an inspiration from these great events, and let us do something to remove some of these grievances which have always been a cause of dissension between our people and a source of weakness to them. The greatest Conservative beyond doubt that this country ever produced was Sir John Macdonald. He was the man who, with George Brown, Sir George Etienne Cartier, and representatives of the Maritime Provinces, brought about Confederation. Why was Confederation brought about? It was brought about because government in this country had become impossible, because the requirements of government were beyond the resources of its greatest and most enlightened statesmen. The racial difficulties between Quebec and Ontario had been of long standing, and Confederation, it was thought, would put an end to a number of questions from the provincial arena and allowing the Dominion to deal with them. When Confederation was brought about Quebec was not consulted with regard to it, no election was held, the people were not asked whether they favoured Confederation or not; but the hierarchy of Quebec and leading public men of the Conservative party took

3 p.m.

the stand that this was the only means by which an end could be put to the difficulties that we might have to deal with, such, for instance, as this bilingual difficulty. This and other difficulties of a similar kind were proposed to be done away with by Confederation. The province of Quebec came into Confederation knowing that Quebec would be the only French province in the Dominion. The people of Quebec knew that there would in time be five or six or seven or nine other provinces, that they in the province of Quebec would be condemned to be the minority and that they would be limited to 65 members in this House no matter whether the population of Canada should be 2,000,000, or 5,000,000 or 10,000,000. They knew, I repeat, that they would be in the minority in Quebec but they knew British principles, they had faith in British ideals, they had faith in the promises that were made by the British Crown, they had faith in the Imperial Parliament in dealing with the British North America Act, and they had confidence that the rights of French-speaking citizens would be secured under the new order of things. Sir John Macdonald, who presided at the Confederation conferences, and who had long before entered the galaxy of the great men whom Canada has given to the world, uttered some memorable words, which are well worthy of note at the present time. The French people of Ontario do not ask to be placed on the same footing as their English-speaking friends; they ask only for a limited share in the education of the province, which is paid for by their own money, while learning English at the same time and while submitting to Government rules and inspection. They are very moderate in their requests. At that time Sir John Macdonald was speaking of the standing of the French race in this country, no matter what its past might have been, no matter what the future might have in store for it, and these are the words he used:

> I have no accord with the desire expressed in some quarters that by any mode whatever there should be an attempt made to oppress the one language or to render it inferior to the other; I believe that would be impossible if it were tried and it would be foolish and wicked if it were possible. The statement that has been made so often that this is a conquered country is "à propos de rien." Whether it was conquered or ceded, we have a constitution under which all British subjects are in a position of absolute equality, having rights of every kind, of language of religion of property and of person. There is no paramount race in this country, there is no conquered race in this country, we are all British subjects, and those who are not English are none the less British subjects on that account.

This is a fine illustration of what Sir John Macdonald intended this country should be. I have had the honour of being the representative in this House for the last 16 years of a constituency in which there are 5,000 English-speaking people sprung from old Loyalist stock, and inhabiting such

places as New Richmond, New Carlisle and Hamilton township. These people are Scottish Presbyterians, Anglicans, Baptists; some are Brethren; they belong to various creeds and nationalities. The most of them speak the French language. In this connection I wish to give an instance of the generosity of this county, and I hope it will serve as an example for which some day we may find a parallel in the province of Ontario as in the olden days, when Mr. Lafontaine, beaten in Rimouski, found a seat in the county of York. In 1896, when this country was almost torn to pieces over the Manitoba school question, my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stood up in his place in this House and moved the six months' hoist of a coercive measure, stating that he would appeal to the spirit of justice and fair play of the people of Manitoba as we now appeal to the spirit of justice and fair play of the people of Ontario. On that occasion the county of Bonaventure, which has 25,000 French Canadians and 5,000 English people, elected by an overwhelming majority a French Protestant Huguenot, Mr. Fauvel, to occupy a seat in this House. At a time when the racial and religious question was being discussed in the county of Bonaventure, the French-Canadian Catholics of that county, rising superior to the appeals that were made to them, elected a French Protestant to this House as their representative, and he remained their representative until the day of his death.

In the past, on more than one occasion, we have had such questions to deal with. Yesterday my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition referred to that grand old man of Ontario, Sir Oliver Mowat, who was able to bring about a solution of these difficulties when he was the Premier of that province. We had in Quebec another grand old man, who was also a colleague of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I refer to Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière. Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière was the only Protestant who ever occupied the position of Premier of the province of Quebec, and occupied it, Sir, because the citizens of Quebec, regardless of his religion, regardless of what his fathers had taught him, regardless of the altar at which he knelt, and at which he had been brought up, had confidence in his honesty and fairness.

Among our fifteen colleagues sitting here from the province of Quebec, twelve at least represent constituencies where the French Canadians or the Catholics are in a majority. But that does not in any way affect the political action of those people. Whether the man who seeks their suffrages speaks the English or the French language, whether he is a Protestant or Catholic, if he has the confidence of the people, they vote for him. I know the people of Ontario appreciate these things. But we in Quebec may take a different view. I know the people of Ontario are a British people; I know the stock from which they sprang; I know that their forebears came from the Mohawk Valley, leaving that country rather than betray the flag their fathers had upheld and brought to the continent of America; I know that the people of Ontario want to maintain British institutions in this country. But allow me to say, Mr. Speaker, with the light of history guiding me that the best way to maintain British institutions and traditions, not only in Ontario but throughout the Dominion, is by carrying out in all respects the British policy which has been tried in this and in other countries. It is the boasted pride of Britain that there is no slave under its flag; that the chains of the man who in the old days was a slave fell to the ground when he set foot on British soil. Is it to the credit of Canada that any portion of our people should complain upon the score of language, or upon any other score? I do not want to dwell at any further length upon that. I think hon. gentlemen have all pretty well formed their opinions now. The House will probably agree that there is something to be done in this case in the province of Ontario. What I am asking for the French people is not unreasonable. They have had the French language ever since the days when Ontario was a wilderness. They have had French taught on the banks of the Detroit river when the city of Toronto did not even exist. They have had the French language in the old outskirts of Ontario. The hon. members for North and South Essex know the valour and the loyalty of the French population, and the member for Kent can testify to the worth of the French people inhabiting that county. Those of us who live in the city of Ottawa know how law-abiding and peaceful the French Canadians of this city are. They are ratepayers, they are Canadians, they are British subjects, just as we are, and why should they be given cause to complain? Why should there be a grievance in this country?

I do not think any advantage is to be

gained by speaking upon this point at any further length, and I will now summarize. The settlement which the minority ask for is not an unreasonable one. They ask the Government of the province of Ontario to give their children an English education, to pass regulations to that effect, and to see that those regulations are enforced. But at the same time they ask that with their own money their children shall be taught enough French to enable them to keep up the French language, which to them is as dear as life itself. It is useless to ask a man to give up his language, or the ideals that are dear to his heart. As Lord Dufferin has said, it is one of the assets of Canada and adds to the variety of life in this country to have these different languages spoken by people united by the common bond of the English language, which will always remain the language of an overwhelming majority of the Canadian people. The French language adds a charm to our varied life. Think of the stranger, the European, perhaps, who comes from other lands to visit Canada. Where will he direct his steps to find something historical, something romantic, something interesting, in the past history of Canada? We all know where he will go. He will go to the cradle of Canadian civilization, down to the banks of the St. Lawrence, down by the sea, where Canadian history began, where British history on this continent began, and where took place the cementing of the two great nations that has brought about the expansion of this broad Dominion —the creation of this great Empire on the North American continent. There are here in this House representatives from the West, representatives from the East, and representatives from the centre of Canada. They know what the French race has done for this country. They have learned in the histories they read at school what the pioneers have done for this country; what has been done by the missionaries and those who came here as the forerunners of civilization. They know also that the French race in their loyalty and devotion to the service of the King of England have never been wanting. Governors of Canada have testified, one after another, to the loyalty of the French population, not only in Quebec, but in Ontario as well. The King of England himself, when Prince of Wales, visited the Plains of Abraham at Quebec, and was gratified at the great spectacle that at a given moment Canadians could present. What was that spectacle? It was a gathering together of representatives of the whole of Canada on the Plains of Abraham. Ontario was represented on that occasion by the late Sir James Whitney, one of the great men who have represented that province; and other distinguished men from all parts of Canada met there upon common ground, to bury the differences that had in the past separated and disunited the Canadian people. They were there trying to establish a bond of friendship and amity.

I do not wish to close my remarks without alluding to a matter that is not referred to in the motion before the House. Allusion has been made here to the position of the French minority in Manitoba. The natural spokesman for the French people of Manitoba is the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy), in whose constituency live the great majority of French-speaking people of that province. But, being ill and unable to be present, he asked me two or three weeks ago if I would act in his place and bring before the House in this debate the position of the French minority in Manitoba. I do not ask for any different treatment for the French people in the province of Manitoba than for those in the province of Ontario. We have precisely the same appeal to make to Ontario that we have to Manitoba, and vice versa. But I am sorry for this: in Manitoba the old sore seems to have broken out again. We thought it had healed for all time to come. After all the trouble and anxiety that both political parties had had, not only in Manitoba but throughout the Dominion, we thought that this question had been settled forever; but, unfortunately, it has broken out again, and why? Because the Government of Manitoba has repealed one clause of the Laurier-Greenway agreement, an agreement which had been brought about by the joint action of the Dominion Government of that day and the province of Manitoba. The clause repealed is very brief, and reads as follows:

> When ten of the pupils in any school speak the French language, or any language other than English, as their native language, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French or such other language, and English upon the bilingual system.

That was the clause of the Laurier-Greenway agreement, which was put into effect in the bilingual schools in Manitoba, and which has been in effect for the last fifteen years. It has been repealed now by the

Legislature of Manitoba, by a vote of thirty-six to eight. Included in the minority of eight is the sole English-speaking Protestant Don in the legislature, the six French Canadian members belonging to either political party, and the one Ruthenian representing the district of Gimli. Those eight representatives protested against the repeal of that clause, which they thought was in the interest of the French minority in the province of Manitoba, who occupy a unique position. In 1720 there were no white people out West when Pierre de la Verandrye wended his way from the lake of the Woods into the province of Manitoba, planted at Massacre island the first Christian cross erected on that part of the North American continent, and paved the way for the pioneers and settlers who came after him. In 1870, when the province of Manitoba was about to become united to the Dominion, delegates from Assiniboia and the Northwest Territories negotiated with the representatives of the Dominion and were granted their rights and privileges. The Manitoba Legislature met and those rights were confirmed. In 1890 the school law was passed and the separate schools were abolished. Then we had the long appeals to the Dominion Parliament, the Remedial Bill of 1896, and finally the appeal to the people of Canada, who decided against coercive measures, and I think the Canadian people would decide now, or at any other time, against coercive measures of any kind. In 1896 that question was settled and would probably have remained settled for all time. I do not refuse to any man, no matter from what land he may come, the advantages that he may have, the satisfaction that he may enjoy in retaining his language and the traditions of the race from which he has sprung; but, because of the arrangements entered into between the French and Scotch representatives of Assiniboia, because of the Manitoba Act, because of the judgment of the Privy Council, because especially of the Laurier-Greenway agreement, which was a scrap of paper, it is true, but which was a treaty, so to speak, between the Dominion and the province of Manitoba, which was placed upon the statute book of Manitoba, and which was an undertaking by that province to give the minorities certain rights, the French Canadians of Manitoba feel that they have peculiar rights different from the rights of those who have come into the province latterly. I understand that so long as the French Canadians were alone and claimed the privileges, no great objection was taken, but later on, when people of other nationalities came into Manitoba, the situation became more complex, as those other nationalities took advantage of the clause, and that, I understand, not having read the debate, was the reason given for the repeal of the clause. In the absence of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy), and at his request I shall read to the House the resolution adopted at a general meeting of representatives of all the French Canadians in the province of Manitoba, held at St. Boniface on the day after the introduction of this Bill in the Manitoba Legislature, to indicate to the House the position taken by the French Canadians of that province. The resolution, which was moved by Mr. Talbot, member for La Verandrye, reads:

Whereas the French and Catholic population in Manitoba are, according to natural law, by right of their title as first occupants, under solemn treaties, under the British North America Act, pursuant to the solemn pact expressly entered into between delegates from the territory of Assiniboia and the Northwest Territories and delegates from the Dominion of Canada, by virtue of the Manitoba Act and subsequent legislation, entitled to rights and privileges that have been violated by the legislature of Manitoba;

And whereas the French and Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba has enjoyed its national and religious rights until there was enacted in Manitoba the law of 1890, by which the minority's constitutional rights were wiped out of the statute-books of the province;

And whereas the French and Catholic minority had its constitutional rights confirmed by the highest court of the British Empire;

And whereas in 1897 a general arrangement known as the Laurier-Greenway agreement was entered into between the Governor in Council and the Lieutenant Governor in Council in Manitoba, which agreement restored to the French and Catholic minority of this province a part only of its constitutional rights:

And whereas the said minority was never a party to the said agreement and never accepted it as a complete and final settlement, but only as a partial satisfaction of its claims;

And whereas the present Prime Minister of Manitoba, the Hon. Tobias Crawford Norris, was, at the time the said agreement was entered into, a member of the Legislature of Manitoba, and a supporter of the party then in power, and therefore made himself a party to the contract by voting in favour of it;

And whereas since that day the minority in Manitoba has never ceased to claim the full and complete acknowledgement of its constitutional rights;

And whereas the present Executive Council of this province, with the support of a majority of the members, has submitted to the Legislative Assembly a Bill abolishing once more the rights of the Catholic and French minority in this province, setting at defiance the solemn treaties confirmed by the highest court of the British Empire;

And whereas such an action is tyrannical, unconstitutional and contrary to all true notion and fair definition of British fair play;

And whereas Great Britain and the British Empire are now engaged in a war solely to uphold the honour of the signature Great Britain has appended to a treaty;

And whereas a treaty made and signed in Canada should not be considered as a mere scrap of paper in this country any more than in Europe, unless there be two different codes of honour;

Be it therefore resolved that:

The Catholic and French Vigilance Committee appointed at St. Boniface at a public meeting held on February 9, 1916, for themselves and for their co-religionists and compatriots of the province of Manitoba, solemnly proclaim their absolute attachment to the constitution of their country;

They vigorously protest against any legislation such as is now submitted and they express their unflinching determination to resist any law that may be enacted in violation of their rights and privileges as defined by the constitution of the country.

They further solemnly pledge themselves to use at their discretion and according to their judgment all constitutional and necessary means to prevent the said Act being put into force.

This question in the province of Manitoba, to which I understand the Prime Minister has referred, is not now before the House, but we are told that the Ontario question is not before the House, that this Government having refused disallowance, it has passed out of the Dominion arena, and the Manitoba question has not yet come into it. I was anxious to show that, in fighting the cause of the minority of Ontario, I did not overlook that of the province of Manitoba, and I think what is fair treatment on the banks of lake Ontario should be fair treatment on the banks of the Red river. We are asking merely for the same recognition of those rights enunciated in this resolution as have been recognized by the highest court of the Empire and by all Imperial and Canadian legislation. Nevertheless, those rights have been set aside. I am not going to discuss the merits or demerits of the case, because I did not listen to the argument. When the present amendment is disposed of I intend, at the request of this minority, to submit the following resolution, which has been drafted by them for presentation to this House. I am prepared to submit this resolution to-morrow, or at any time that the Government may decide. I will read the text of the resolution:

Whereas, on the advice contained in the judgment delivered on the 29th January, 1895, by the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the appeal of Brophy and others v. the Attorney General of Manitoba,

Her Majesty was pleased to pass the Imperial Order in Council dated 2nd February, 1895;

And whereas the Government of Canada in 1895, 1896 and 1897, under the respective leadership of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in conformity with the terms of the said judgment and Imperial Order in Council, has taken action thereunder, which resulted in the enactment by the Manitoba Legislature of the statute being 60 Victoria, chapter 24, sometimes referred to as the Laurier-Greenway settlement;

And whereas the said Legislature, by an Act passed at its last session, has repealed section 258 of the Public Schools Act of the said province, which, prior to the consolidation of the statutes of the said province in 1902, was section 10 of the said statute 60 Victoria, chapter 24;

And whereas the repeal of said section 258 prejudicially affects a large portion of the Roman Catholic minority of the said province, by depriving them of a right which they deem essential to the proper education of their children and the suppression of which, moreover, grievously affects the working of the other clauses of the said settlement;

And whereas it is desirable, especially at this critical period in the history of the British Empire, to avoid any cause of inward strife and to promote a feeling of union between the various elements of the Dominion;

Be it resolved: That this House record its regret that the Legislature of Manitoba has at its last session repealed said section 258 of the Public Schools Act, thereby recalling legislation passed after a long and disquieting agitation with the object of relieving a grievance of a large section of His Majesty's loyal subjects in said province.

If the Government will afford me opportunity, I am prepared to move this amendment on the next occasion when the motion is made for Committee of Supply. In view of the statements that have been made; in view of the fact that this question is not yet in the Federal arena, no application having been made for disallowance of this measure; and seeing that hon. members are anxious to save time and to get through this session as soon as possible, I would prefer to take the earliest occasion to bring this matter forward. In doing so I shall fulfil a promise made to my hon. colleague from Provencher (Mr. Molloy), with whom, I am sure, we all sympathize in his illness. It will be my duty to make an appeal to this House for a small minority in the province of Manitoba. They may number only 30,000 in that province, but they are descendants of the first pioneers, those men who were trusted in that province by the Federal Government when the power of the Dominion was first extended to that territory. Those people had faith in the word of this Parliament when the Manitoba Act was passed; they had faith in the Privy Council of Great Britain when it declared that justice

should be done to them; they had faith in the Laurier-Greenway agreement, a treaty solemnly ratified by the province of Manitoba and placed upon its statute-books. They had a right to believe that the small concession accorded to them, of giving to their children, along with an English education, a knowledge of the French language, the first European language to be heard in the western part of Canada, would be respected. But it has been repealed. I do not know what the intentions of the National Government are with regard to it, whether they intend to recommend some legislation concerning it, or whether the matter lies there the subject of an appeal for disallowance.

I lay these facts and views before the House, and in doing so I feel in my heart and soul that I have fulfilled my duty as a Canadian, as a British subject, and as a representative of the people, anxious to promote harmony, good will, concord and a better understanding between the various elements comprising this Dominion. I hope that in the statement I have made, which is much longer than I expected, not one word has passed my lips which can wound the feelings of any member of this House. If such a word has escaped me, I apologize therefor. I submit these facts to my fellow members of this House, firm in my resolve to sustain the constitution under which I was born, and the flag under which I was reared, and with faith that British fair play will be accorded to all parties in Ontario and Manitoba in the settlement of these unfortunate differences.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I desire to preface my remarks on this subject with a personal reference. When I was considerably younger than I am now, I spent several years in the very useful though not very remunerative occupation of teaching school. Most of these years I spent teaching in the public schools of Ontario, one in the county of Essex, where I happened to have as pupils a few French children who could not speak any English, while I was in the position of not being able to speak any French. And, strange as it may seem to some hon. gentlemen opposite, these children made satisfactory progress under these conditions. I also was principal for a matter of two years and a half of one of the largest schools in the province of Manitoba. I merely mention these facts for this reason —that perhaps, because of my close connection with the teaching profession, I have given to educational matters in the Dominion of Canada considerable thought and attention, and have specially given considerable thought and attention to educational affairs in the province of Ontario and in the province of Manitoba.

I trust that I shall be able to say what I have to say moderately and fairly and without giving offence to any one in this House. But I candidly confess, Sir, that in stating that I am undertaking a rather difficult task. For, as a resident of Ontario, it is by no means easy to sit in one's seat and hear the Government and the English-speaking people of my native province characterized as tyrannical, oppressive, and all that sort of thing. Under these conditions, it is not very easy, perhaps, for one to speak as moderately as he would wish to do. But I assure you I am going to do the very best I can to handle this matter fairly and in a moderate manner.

Outside this House, and in the House too for that matter, this subject has been discussed particularly upon two lines. Men who are in favour of the bilingual system have assumed that the rights of the French Canadian minority in Ontario have been interfered with, not only their constitutional and legal rights, but also their natural rights. May I be permitted to glance very briefly over history, as was done by others who have preceded me in this debate. I find that in the terms of capitulation after the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, and after the fall of Montreal a year later, and in the Peace of Paris of 1763, not one word appears with regard to the French language or the use of that language in Canada. In 1774, the Quebec Act was passed, in which I find no reference whatever to the question of language. There was provision made, and, I think, ample and generous provision, for safeguarding the interests of Roman Catholics in Canada at that time.

The next great event affecting the history of Canada, and affecting to a very large extent this question, was the American revolutionary war, immediately following which there was a large influx into the province of Quebec and the other provinces, of United Empire Loyalists. I believe that about 50,000 of these came into Quebec. Some 10,000 came in 1783 and 1784 into Ontario alone. Many settled in Nova Scotia, many in Cape Breton and along the St. John river in New Brunswick. The result of this settlement—and every encouragement was given to these people to

come in—was a good deal of jealousy and antagonism between the two races, the French and the English. Following this, and as a result of this I think, was the passing of the Constitutional Act of 1791, by which a separate Government was given to each province. The population of Ontario in 1791 was about 20,000 all English; and the population of Quebec at that time was about 125,000, of whom a little more than one-third were English. In passing on from the Constitutional Act of 1791, all I have to say is that in that Imperial Act there was no reference whatever to the question of language or language rights.

We come next to 1840, the passing of the Act of Union, which came into effect in 1841 and by which the two provinces were brought under one Government. It was provided in this Act that the English language only was to be used in the parliamentary records. While this was modified some years later, it is of importance to remember what the conditions were at the time of the adoption of the Act of 1840, if we are to properly understand the British North America Act of 1867. The population of Upper Canada in 1841 was 465,357, of whom 14,763 were French. The population of Lower Canada or Quebec was at that time 698,000, of whom 524,307 were French. In other words, the population of the two provinces which were brought together by the Act of Union for parliamentary purposes, to do their parliamentary business in one parliament, was 539,074 French and 624,283 English. That is, at that time the respective populations of the two principal races were practically the same in the two provinces. Just previous to the Act of Union of 1841, there had been troublous times in this country resulting in a rebellion in 1837. The people of the province of Quebec or Lower Canada and the people of Ontario or Upper Canada had many grievances to complain of, and it does seem to me that if at that time, when they were asking consideration of their grievances, this matter of language had been regarded by them as one on which they had a grievance, that would have been one of the things that would have been taken up and that would have been especially referred to in the Act of Union of 1840. But it was not so taken up. The Act of Union came into effect, and, as I have already said there was in it a distinct provision for the use of the English language in the records of the House, which was not changed for a number of years. To sum up in regard to this period from 1763 to 1840, I make the statement that in all the Acts that were passed, either in this country or by the Imperial Parliament, there was not one line, there was not one word, there was no controversy, no demand, in regard to the use of the French language in the Dominion of Canada.

While in all this legislation which had been passed from time to time the question of language was not made a basis of settlement in any Act in regard to teaching in schools, separate schools were recognized and were authorized in this country on denominational grounds. We find that in almost every Act from 1774 right down to 1867.

The Quebec Government, in this controversy, or since this controversy started, has undertaken to advise the Government of the province of Ontario, and has actually passed legislation permitting some of the people of Quebec to apply some of their money to assist certain of their compatriots in Ontario in fighting Regulation 17. I am going to place on Hansard some figures to show why, in my judgment, the province of Quebec should not presume to offer advice to the province of Ontario on educational matters. I do not do this with any intention or desire to wound the feelings of any person; I am simply going to give you facts which you can obtain, as I have obtained them from the census records of this country. According to the census of 1901, there were only 10.23 per cent of the children of school age in the province of Ontario who could neither read nor write. By the same census, there were in the province of Quebec 22.08 per cent of the children of school age who could neither read nor write. Then take the census figures of 1911. Of children, 5 years and over, who could neither read nor write at that time, there were only 6.51 per cent in Ontario, while in the province of Quebec there were 12.66 per cent.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition has said that he would be satisfied if in Ontario Regulation 17 was repealed and conditions restored as they were previous to 1912. What were the conditions previous to 1912? I have already stated, and I think it is fair to state, the relative positions of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario in regard to education of the children as indicated by the literacy or illiteracy of the children in each province. But I wish to go further, and to call to the attention of this House the fact that in the province of Ontario we find the greatest number of

children who can neither read nor write in those counties in the province of Ontario where the French Canadians are in the largest number. For instance, in the county of Nipissing, according to the census of 1911, there were 26,277 French out of 74,130 people. In that county 15.23 per cent of the children of school age could neither read nor write. In Prescott county, with a population of 20,124 French out of a total population of 26,968, 15.48 per cent of the children of school age could not read nor write. In Russell county, with a population of 22,475 French out of a total population of 39,434, 13.77 per cent of the children of school age could neither read nor write. In Glengarry, with a population of 8,710 French out of a total population of 21,259, 13.70 per cent of the children of school age could neither read nor write.

Now, I ask this question: Why should the county of Prescott show 15.48 per cent of children of school age who cannot read or write, and the county of Russell 13.77 per cent, while Dundas county, very close to Prescott and Russell, shows only 4.75 per cent of children of school age who cannot read or write, and Carleton county only 6.93 per cent? Why should North Waterloo, for instance, where there are 25,352 German-Canadians out of a total population of 33,619, show only 4.26 per cent of children of school age who cannot read or write, and Prescott, where there are 20,124 French Canadians out of a population of 26,968, show 15.48 per cent of children of school who cannot read or write?

Mr. PROULX: Has the hon. gentleman the figures for Frontenac?

Mr. EDWARDS: In Frontenac they are 6·57.

Mr. PROULX: Addington?

Mr. EDWARDS: I have not the figures for Addington here. Why should Ottawa, the capital of Canada, show a greater number of children who cannot read or write than any other city in the province of Ontario? That is a fact, and one surely worthy of consideration. I ask in all seriousness was it not time for the Government of the province of Ontario, in face of conditions such as those I have mentioned, and which no man can dispute, to look seriously into this matter, not merely on behalf of the English-speaking children, but more strongly on behalf of the French-speaking children in the province of Ontario, who were evidently not getting the education which they should receive.

I want to call attention to this further fact, that out of sixty-five constituencies in the province of Quebec only two are up to the Ontario general average, so far as literacy of the school children is concerned, and in one of these only twenty-nine per cent of the population is French Canadian. That is most significant, it seems to me, and I think I am perfectly right in saying, coming as I do from the province of Ontario, that under these conditions we have a right, not to accept the dictum of the Quebec Government, or of the people of the province of Quebec, on educational matters. I say that without any desire to give offence, and simply on the facts which I have given.

The figures which I am going to give now will show the reason why Ontario shows a high record in regard to the education of its people. In Ontario we have 12,016 teachers, and we spend $12,104,422 a year on education. In Manitoba they have 2,341 teachers, and they spend $5,023,891. In Quebec they have 14,937 teachers, and all it costs them there is $6,794,333. While they have that number of teachers in the province of Quebec, their salaries are not so large; there may be good and sufficient reason for that, and I do not care to go into that, the figures are there to speak for themselves.

I want to carry this matter a little further. Some may say: "You are dealing only with the children of school age from 5 years upwards." Let us take the figures of the Canadian-born males of 21 years and over, that is, men who have the right to vote in this country, and what do we find? Illiteracy of Canadian-born males of 21 years and over in Canada amounts to 9.55 per cent. That is a comparatively small percentage. The percentage for Ontario and Manitoba is only 4·91 who cannot read or write. The percentage for Quebec of males Canadian-born, 21 years and over, who can neither read nor write is 15·64, as against 4·91 for the province of Ontario, and against 9·55 for the Dominion of Canada as a whole. That is to say, that in that regard Quebec stands lowest of all the provinces of the Dominion, and the only parts of the province of Ontario that rank with Quebec's general average in this respect are the counties of Prescott, where 21·75 per cent of the voters can neither read nor write, Nipissing, where 14·78 of the voters can neither read nor write, Rus-

sell, where 18.66 can neither read nor write and Glengarry where 14.46 can neither read nor write. The only county in the province of Nova Scotia which ranks at all in this class, I need hardly tell this House, is the county of Richmond, which has an average of 23.45 who cannot read or write. These are figures to which hon. gentlemen must give consideration. They are significant. It cannot be said that it just happens so that the counties which show the high percentage of illiteracy are counties where French Canadians predominate in the population. It is something we should think about, and that the Government of Ontario should think about. In Ontario 95 per cent of the voters can read and write. That is a high percentage. Am I using too strong language when I say that as a representative from the province of Ontario, where 95 per cent of the voters can read and write, I do not feel very much like accepting advice from the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), for instance, or from the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), especially when I find that over 20 per cent of the voters in their respective constituencies can neither read nor write the language which falls in such beautiful musical melody from their eloquent lips? Am I going too far when I say that I do not feel much like accepting the advice of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who for so many years represented the constituency of Gaspé, a constituency where over 33 per cent of the voters could neither read nor write? May I call attention to the fact also that over 25 per cent of the voters in Laval and Temiscouata can neither read nor write; that Three Rivers shows a percentage of 18½ per cent who can neither read nor write and that Wright, which is represented by the seconder of this resolution, has over 23.08 per cent who cannot read the beautiful speeches made by the hon. member for that county, nor write to him asking for a job.

It cannot be said, Mr. Speaker, that this degree of illiteracy is due to the British-born immigrants who come into that province or to any part of Canada, because the same census figures give us information to the contrary. So far as literacy is concerned, the British immigrants in this country rank higher than the native population in any province. There is only 3 per cent of British immigrants, 21 years of age and over, who cannot read or write. Nor can it be ascribed to the foreign-born immigrants who come to Quebec and other parts of Canada from all parts of the world, for it is the fact that they show a greater degree of literacy than the average in many constituencies in the province of Quebec. There are in the province of Ontario, or were at the last census, 202,000 French Canadians. We have been told that they number 250,000 at the present time. I am not in a position to dispute these figures; I state what there were in 1911. There was about the same German population in the province of Ontario as French Canadians at that time. In 60 out of the 86 constituencies there are more German Canadians than French Canadians; and let me also add this, that in all these years they have made no demands such as have been made by the 202,000 French Canadians in this province. I am not exactly right in saying that, because there are not 202,000 French Canadians making those demands. The demand has originated in the city of Ottawa, where they have not tried the regulation, where they have never tried to see whether it would work or not. As regards the French population of Ontario, what certain agitators in the city of Ottawa demand does not apply to the French Canadians in the province of Ontario generally. But I would like to ask this question of those who favour this legislation: Are those who demand bilingual schools for the French willing to accede to a similar demand from Germans, Austrians, Italian and other residents of this country? There has been considerable skating around that matter by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), I think, intimated that they lost their rights to their mother tongue when they crossed the ocean. He would not be prepared to give them the right to their language. If I am correct, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) said that he would not deny the foreign population coming into this country the right to the use of their language.

Mr. MARCIL: I said it was natural for a man to adhere to his native tongue, but I said that the French settlers on the Red river in Manitoba were very different from those who came to Canada latterly, because they had a treaty and legislation in their favour and the others had not.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have no wish to misquote the hon. gentleman. I understood the hon. member to say that he was prepared to move a resolution in this House rather deprecating the abrogation of section 258, and if that meant anything it meant that he

would like to see section 258 restored. If section 258 is restored, you have the restoration, not of bilingualism, but of polylingualism in Manitoba. Would my hon. friend favour the Laurier-Greenway agreement of 1897 being applied to all the other provinces in Canada?

Mr. MARCIL: There is no reason to apply it in Quebec because the French people in this Dominion are in a very different position from that occupied by Germans, Austrians and others. They have rights according to the constitution and the others have not.

Mr. EDWARDS: Do I understand that my hon. friend would approve of applying that regulation to all the provinces?

Mr. MARCIL: I do not believe in making German, Austrian or Italian official languages.

Mr. EDWARDS: Then the hon. gentleman is directly at issue with his leader, who was responsible for establishing that system in Manitoba in 1897. If his leader was wrong, then it is quite possible that his leader and himself are wrong now. I think it is not only possible, but that it is extremely likely. What are the conditions as far as the West is concerned? You are either in the position, in so far as that section is concerned, of repudiating what your leader did in 1897, or of saying that it is a proper thing for the whole country. What position are you put in then with regard to these western provinces? The foreign-born residents of the four western provinces are as follows:

Manitoba.

Nationality.	Number.
French	30,444
Germans	34,530
Austrians	39,665
Poles	12,310
Jews	10,741
Russians	8,841
Scandinavians	6,419

Alberta.

French	19,852
Germans	36,862
Austrians	26,427
Scandinavians	28,047
Russians	9,421
Polish	2,243

Saskatchewan.

French	23,251
Germans	68,628
Austrians	41,651
Scandinavians	33,991
Russians	18,413
Polish	3,785

British Columbia.

French	8,907
Germans	11,880
Austrians	7,015
Scandinavians	15,968
Russians	6,896
Chinese	19,568

My right hon. friend who leads the Opposition says: Let us face this issue like men. This issue is one that applies to more than the province of Ontario. You are laying down a principle that you cannot confine to the limits of Ontario. I ask the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition if he is prepared, at the head of his party, to go into these western provinces, into Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, and ask the Governments to place on the statute-book the Act which he himself placed on the statute-book of Manitoba in 1897? They dare not go into these provinces and advocate anything of that kind. Neither the right hon. gentleman nor his supporters in this House will dare, for political reasons, to go into Saskatchewan or Alberta and demand of these provinces anything like the privileges which are granted to the French Canadians in the province of Ontario by the Ontario Government.

4 p.m.

Mr. LAMARCHE: Has my hon. friend any statistics as regards the Algonquin or any other tribe of Indians in Canada?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not want to mix the Indians with the whites.

Mr. LAMARCHE: We are much obliged to you.

Mr. EDWARDS: You are quite welcome. In 1896 the slogan of the Liberal party in this country was, "Hands off Manitoba." I will again place on Hansard the section of the Laurier-Greenway agreement, although it was read by my hon. friend from Bonaventure.

When ten of the pupils in any schools speak the French language or any language other than English as their native language, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French or such other language and English upon the bi-lingual system.

That is the law that is called the Laurier-Greenway agreement of 1897. The Hon. Dr. Thornton, Minister of Education in the Norris Government is responsible for these figures: On June 30, 1915, there were in Manitoba 2,727 school-rooms of which 1,042 were urban and 1,685 rural. There were 126 French bilingual schools with 234 teachers, 61 German schools with 72

teachers and 111 Ruthenian and Polish schools and 114 teachers. That is in 421 school-rooms or one quarter of the province we have this bilingual condition. The enrolments in these schools were 16,720 or one-sixth of the total school population of Manitoba. The population of Manitoba was 465,614 at the last census of whom 58 per cent was of British origin and 42 per cent was divided into twenty different nationalities. In that province, under this Laurier-Greenway agreement, 36 schools could demand three languages, 5 could demand four, and in 110 there was such a marked admixture of nationalities that the arrival or departure of a family any day might change the teaching from one language to another. In nearly one-quarter of the schools conducted on the bilingual plan, French, German, Polish, or Ruthenian children were receiving instruction in those languages or some other non-English tongue. In the Strathcona schools there were 1,237 pupils of whom 97 were English speaking, representing 12 different nationalities, each one of which had the right to demand the teaching of their own language in the school under the Laurier-Greenway agreement. I venture to say that never in the history of Canada was such an intolerable curse fastened upon any province in this Dominion. Manitoba had a system fastened on it by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition which outlawed the English language in that province, which eliminated and proscribed the teaching of the English language and substituted therefor a conglomeration of tongues, a system which made national unity impossible and which encouraged national disintegration. That was the state of affairs brought about by the sunny smile of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. The advocates of bilingualism assert that the French in the province of Ontario are deprived of their legal constitutional and natural rights by the tyranny of the Government. They assert that Regulation 17 is ultra vires of the province. I assert that the passing of Regulation 17 is within the constitutional rights of the Provincial Government of Ontario, and in support of that statement I can cite as brilliant an array of legal talent as, I think, ever sat on the bench in Canada. For instance, Hon. Mr. Justice Lennox, at one time a member of this House; Judges of the first Appellate Division, the highest Court of Appeal in Ontario; Hon. Mr. Justice Garrow, Hon. Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Hon. R. M. Meredith; Hon. Chief Justice of Ontario, Sir William R. Meredith; Hon. Justice McLaren, Hon. Justice Magee, Hon. Chief Justice of the King's Bench, Sir Glenholme Falconbridge; Hon. Justice Hodgins. A number of other judges also declare that the Ontario Government is within its rights in passing Regulation 17.

I also wish to place on record the opinion of Senator Belcourt, who, I believe, is acting as counsel for those who are fighting against Regulation 17. I wish to quote his opinion, expressed at the first congress of the French-speaking people, held at Quebec in June, 1912. His opinion was delivered at a time when I think that hon. gentleman—and many of his friends in Ontario—had not been swept from sound constitutional grounds by the rising tide of fanaticism. His words have all the greater force because they were evidently uttered with keen regret. He said:

> The true fact, regrettable as it may be, is that for the federal domain and the provincial domain of Quebec, there is but the constitution which defines equality of both languages at the Dominion Parliament, at the Quebec Parliament, before the Federal tribunal or courts; and also before the courts of the province of Quebec is the French language on an equal footing with the English language.
>
> Section 133 of the British North America Act, which proclaims equal rights of the French and English before the Federal House, the Federal courts and before the Provincial House of Quebec and the provincial courts, and in section 93 of the same Act, which gives to each province the exclusive power to legislate in matters of education, constitute the sum total of the rights officially recognized in favour of the French Canadian people of the Dominion of Canada; these are the only rights recognized in favour of our race; they are the only rights which cannot be stripped from us without the intervention of the Imperial Parliament; they are the only rights which the constitution and the law formally guaranteed to us; they are the only rights which the law will permit us to exact and about which it gives us the means whereby to exact the same.

In the face of such a statement I do not see how any one can successfully contend that Regulation 17 is ultra vires of the province of Ontario.

I wish to deal a little more closely with Regulation 17. I do not wish to say that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have spoken have said anything which they did not believe or honestly mean, but I am surprised at the statements that have been made, as they would seem to indicate that some hon. gentlemen do not understand the matter at all. What has Ontario

done in connection with this matter? In the first place it took into consideration that there were over 200,000 French Canadians in Ontario, and about a like number of Germans. Then by legislative Acts it proceeded to deal with these people in a generous manner. It appointed a commission to inquire into conditions existing in those parts of the province where the French and German elements were in great numbers. It made provision for educating French and German children through the medium of their mother tongue, though, strictly speaking, they were not entitled to that privilege under the Constitution. I maintain that Regulation 17, as it exists to-day, is not a restriction, but a concession, and I cannot say that too emphatically. It is not a restriction, but a concession, to the French Canadians in the province of Ontario, and to the German Canadians also. The provincial Government of Ontario says: We recognize the fact that there are in this province a number of French and German Canadians; so far as you French Canadians are concerned, we think you should have teachers who understand English as well as French; we will put our hands into the public treasury of Ontario and take out money that belongs not only to French Canadians, but to German Canadians and to all the people, and with that money we will establish and maintain training schools, in order that French teachers may qualify and do better work in the schools where both French and English are used. The provincial Government established four of these training schools. This Government, which has been characterized as oppressive and tyrannical, went further. It said: In order to induce you to take advantage of those schools we will pay your travelling expenses and your board while you are training there. This tyrannical and oppressive Government did not stop there. It went further and said: We recognize the fact that the teacher who can speak both languages should command a higher salary; that salary may be higher than you French Canadians could pay; we will therefore again put our hands into the public treasury and bonus these schools to assist in paying these teachers their salaries.

It strikes me that this Government, which is characterized as oppressive and tyrannical and as trying to blot out the French language in the province of Ontario, is adopting very peculiar methods for that end. The Government has gone to all this trouble, not to blot out the French language, but to assist the French in having their children taught their own language, and the English language as well.

Mr. PROULX: My hon. friend should know that he is exaggerating. The Government does not bonus the schools. Regulation 17 provides that the Government may help in a few cases where the school sections are too poor. It is only in such cases that assistance is given. There has not been a case of bonusing since 1912.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not a lawyer, and I am very often at a loss to follow the turnings of a legal mind. Perhaps that is my fault. The hon. gentleman can call it what he likes—bonus, grant, or anything else. I say that there are bilingual schools in the province of Ontario whose expenses the Government of the province helps to pay by taking money out of the public treasury.

Mr. PROULX: Regulation 17 provides for that, but I do not know of one case where it has been done.

Mr. EDWARDS: It does not make any difference about Regulation 17. The fact remains that the Government of Ontario has established training schools at the public expense, and pays out of the public treasury the travelling expenses and board of teachers qualifying at those schools. The Ontario Government has given to those schools a special grant that no other schools in Ontario have received. That is a fact, and it is a fact that does not indicate that the Government of Ontario is oppressive or tyrannical, nor does it indicate any desire on their part to blot out the French language in that province. The Ontario Government goes further, and says: "French shall be made the language of instruction and communication in those schools in Form 1." If a French child is in Form 1, in which he will remain for two and a half to three years of his school course, that child shall be taught in the French language. The regulation does not stop there, and here I want the attention of the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), who intimated to the House that that ended the matter so far as that child was concerned. The hon. member was not correct in that statement. After those two and a half or three years, during which instruction and communication are carried on entirely in the French language, one hour a day, or more if the inspector thinks it desirable, is set apart for teaching

grammar, reading, and composition in the French language. I have been surprised that hon. gentlemen should take exception to that one hour a day, and that they should consider it an insufficient provision for the teaching of French. I have been a school teacher for many years, and I have never been able—and I do not believe any other teacher in Quebec, or Ontario, or anywhere else has ever been able—to devote one hour a day to any one subject. A school day consists of five actual teaching hours, and if you devote one hour a day to French you should surely give one hour a day to English. In that case you would have three hours left to devote to seven or eight other subjects. Hon. gentlemen do not know what they are speaking of when they refer to this one hour a day as a restriction. It is a concession; more than that, it is a liberal and generous concession. It is idle, it is folly, it is worse than folly, it is criminal—for hon. members to try to make the people of this country believe that they are being restricted, and that their language is being blotted out under the regulations that we have in the province of Ontario at the present time. When a French child of seven or eight years of age first goes to school he knows nothing of the English language, and the Government of Ontario recognizes that fact by providing instruction and communication in French for two and a half or three years. At the same time, the child hears his mother tongue spoken at home. Practically for the rest of his school life up to form 4, he receives instruction in French for one hour a day, or more if the inspector thinks it advisable. That hour is used in perfecting his knowledge of the French language; and, as I said before, he hears that language spoken at home. The result is that when that child leaves that separate school, he will have a knowledge of English and also a knowledge of his mother tongue. Will any man here seriously tell me that a child under those conditions, when he leaves that separate school, will have his mother tongue blotted out? It is utter nonsense to say anything of the kind, and I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen opposite who, I presume, have given this matter consideration, can make such a statement.

We have in the province of Ontario 269 bilingual schools, almost half of the school rooms being in the city of Ottawa. Those schools which have adopted and tried out Regulation 17 have, according to the reports of the inspectors, made satisfactory progress. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) says that this regulation is impracticable. How does he know that? Is he merely taking the statement of Sam Genest, of the city of Ottawa, that it is impracticable? Is he going to take the statements of men in this city who have never tried out the regulation, who have set the Government of Ontario at defiance, who say that they have never given and will never give the regulation a trial? It is idle to say that the regulation is impracticable when in other parts of the province it is working out satisfactorily. Here in the city of Ottawa it is impracticable because the people will not put it into practice.

Mr. MARCIL: Why, in Regulation 17, insert the words "when necessary"? Clause 4 reads:

> In schools where French has hitherto been a subject of study—

That is previous to 1912. Why is the word "hitherto" inserted? Why these two restrictions?

Mr. EDWARDS: Suppose you had a school fifteen miles out in the country. Last year there were no French children there. This year two or three families moved in. That would be a case where it would be necessary, where it had not been previously necessary. Is that clear? In regard to the word "hitherto," hon. gentlemen have stated—and I suppose they are honest in making the statement—that if new schools were to be established in a settlement where a number of French were, the children of those people could not have the French language taught. The right hon. leader of the Opposition made that statement; the hon. member for Bonaventure also made it. I say that those hon. gentlemen are absolutely wrong. If, for instance, some French settlers were to go into New Ontario and build a school, and if the French children were to go to that school, that is a case where it is necessary to adopt these bilingual regulations, and Regulation 17 steps in there and makes provision for those very changes. There is no "hitherto" in Regulation 17; it says very clearly:

> In the case of French-speaking pupils French may be used as the language of instruction and communication.

That does not apply only to the schools which are now in existence or those which

have existed; there is nothing to restrict it to the present or to the past; it applies just as much to schools that may be formed ten or fifteen years from now in New Ontario or in any other portions of the province as it applies to schools that exist or that have existed. Why, then, harp and quibble on the word "hitherto" if that is the case? I say that is the case. My statement is perhaps no better than that of hon. gentlemen who have stated the contrary, but at least I am honest in stating that is my opinion, and I believe I am absolutely right in my statement.

Mr. MARCIL: Seeing that there is divergence of opinion between the minority and the Government, does not the hon. member think that some means should be found of bringing the matter to arbitration and having the case heard over again? Does he not think that it is in the interest of Canada, and in particular of Ontario, that this difficulty should be removed if possible? If the minority is under a wrong impression, does he not think that it should be brought to understand the regulation?

Mr. EDWARDS: It will behoove my hon. friend and other members of this House to occupy their time in getting people in the city of Ottawa to try out this regulation rather than encourage them by speeches in their defiance of the laws of the province of Ontario. Give the regulation a trial. What right have I, what right has any member of this House, to say that the members of the Ontario Legislature passed that regulation without giving it their serious consideration? There were members there of both parties, of the French race as well as of the English race, and when this regulation was introduced as a resolution it passed without one dissentinent voice and went on record as the unanimous voice of the people of Ontario through their representatives in Parliament. Yet you ask me, because two or three fanatics and hare-brained senators over there—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: In what respect am I not in order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. gentleman that it is not in order to speak disrespectfully of gentlemen who occupy seats in the Upper Chamber.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. member may be in the Senate some day.

Mr. EDWARDS: If I ever do get there, I hope they will have a more select crowd than at present. I withdraw the word "harebrained." I may explain that the senator I had in mind was Senator Choquette, and surely no man of sane mind could act and speak as he does. I, as one from the province of Ontario, resent his actions and words in the Senate—while I have, of course, the greatest love and respect for the Senate of the Dominion of Canada.

Now, I wish to draw to the attention of the members of this House something that has not been previously drawn to their attention. Why is it that the Government of Ontario found it necessary to pass this Regulation 17? I have already given figures that indicate that in certain parts of the province the literacy of the people is not as high as it should be. Take any county in eastern Ontario—Prescott, Russell, Stormont or Glengarry. Following each census, the number of French Canadians in these counties has steadily increased. And what has happened in these counties? Here, let us say, is a school section in the county of Prescott, or Glengarry. A number of French Canadians come there and settle. After a time they become sixty per cent, seventy per cent, eighty per cent, of the population of that school section. It is but natural that they, the majority, should ask to have a French teacher, one of their own race, for that school. I say one would expect that, and nobody can find fault with them for it. And it is perhaps only natural that they should tell that French teacher: We want you to devote more time to French and less to English. As a matter of fact this is the condition that the commissioners have found, that in many of the schools of eastern Ontario less and less time was given to the study of English and more and more to the study of French, until there were actually schools in eastern Ontario where not one word of English was taught from morning until night. And the natural outcome of that was this: suppose that there are two or three English-speaking settlers in that section. They find themselves in a position where their children cannot get an English education. Many people so placed have been obliged, because of these intolerable conditions, to sell their farms at half or two-thirds their value and move to the West. I say that

has happened not in one or two cases but in hundreds of cases. That is the sort of thing that caused the Ontario Government to take action. They say in effect: we do not want to deny to the French Canadian his right to the French language; we will make provision for your child getting an education in the French language; but we insist that you shall not be in a position to drive English-speaking settlers out of any part of this province by denying them the right to the English language. And this, I say as a representative of Ontario, is right and just, and I am ready to stand by it. There is no attempt, no desire, on the part of the English-speaking people of the province of Ontario to deprive the French Canadians in this province of their use of their language. Let hon. gentlemen well consider the facts in this matter. During the first two and a half or three years of the child's school life he is taught in French exclusively; and during the remainder of the four or five years of his school life a part of his time is devoted to French. Average that and you will find that more than half the child's time is devoted exclusively to the French language.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. member allow me to ask him a question for information? I understand that Dr. McKay, Superintendent of Education for Nova Scotia, says that the best way to carry on bilingual instruction is to have that instruction extend through the whole course, and not have it stop with the first form. What is the hon. member's opinion on that point?

Mr. EDWARDS: In that respect I cannot understand the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. They keep repeating that at the end of two and a half years the instruction in French stops. But it does not stop. There is direct and specific provisions for continuing the instruction in the French language—in grammar, reading, and composition—for an hour a day, or more if the inspector thinks it desirable.

Mr. MARCIL: But suppose that in that hour you have four subjects—you can only give ten or fifteen minutes to each. I was talking with an eminent educationist the other day who pointed out to me the disadvantage of this division of the time.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is plainly set forth what that one hour a day is to be devoted to—to grammar, reading, and composition in French. You cannot take any part of that hour to teach geography, arithmetic, or anything else; that hour is to be given to French. Does it make any difference to you or to me whether we use French or English to learn multiplication or division? I suppose that if you were told in French that the city of Quebec was on the Ottawa river, it would be just as much on the Ottawa river as if you had been told it in English. There is not only ample provision for safeguarding the French in the province of Ontario, but I say most emphatically, speaking as an old teacher, that there is generous provision in this regulation, and that, instead of this being a restriction, it is a generous concession to our French Canadian fellow citizens.

Under section 93 of the British North America Act, power is given to the Provincial Legislature to make laws relating to education, subject to limitations imposed by the first subsection, which reads as follows:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the Union.

Whether or not the legislation is prejudicial should be determined in the first place by the people's representatives in the legislature; and if there are any who do not believe in that it should be determined finally by an appeal to the courts—to the Privy Council if necessary. Why introduce it in this House? Why not abide by the decision as the English-speaking Protestants in Ontario have in times past abided by decisions which were such as they did not like? For instance, after 1842, and from that time on, when there were forty-two representatives from Ontario and forty-two from Quebec in the United Parliament, the first act of the first Parliament was to appoint a committee on education, with fifteen from Quebec and eight from Ontario. They introduced the principle of separate schools. In 1848, 1850, 1852 and 1853 particularly, there were sweeping demands made and concessions granted in regard to the rights of Roman Catholics in the separate schools of Ontario.

Notwithstanding the fact that the majority of the members from the province of Ontario were opposed to this legislation, it was adopted, because there were sufficient members from the province of Quebec, with a few from Ontario, to put that legislation through in spite of the opposition of the majority of the Ontario mem-

bers. It went through against the wishes of the people of Ontario; but the people of Ontario have stood loyally by these Acts and have submitted. Why then should we have 200,000 of a certain class of people in this province undertaking to dictate to two and a half million people of the province of Ontario? I say further, that the only law of Upper Canada at the Union which conferred rights or privileges re denominational schools was the Statute 26 Victoria, chapter 5, which authorized the establishing of separate schools by Protestants, Roman Catholic and coloured people. Religious belief was recognized as a distinguishing feature, but language was not so recognized. Race was not recognized as a distinguishing feature, except in regard to the coloured people. From time to time attempts were made to secure more adequate teaching of English in the schools in Ontario, and on March 22, 1911, the Ontario Legislature passed a resolution which has already been put upon Hansard. Following this resolution, in June 1912, Regulation 17 was published. That was amplified or changed, although not materially, in 1913. No objection was made, either in 1912 or in 1913, to Regulation 17. It lay on the table of the House through the whole session; it was there and no objection was taken to it; and no person thought of such a thing, apparently, as bringing it to Ottawa and throwing it into the Federal arena. How is it that the feeling against Regulation 17 seems to come up just about this particular time? Why was it that the people allowed Regulation 17 to lie undisturbed through our session here in 1912-13? Where were the hon. member for Kamouraska, and the hon. member for Wright, that they did not get up? What was holding the member for Bonaventure to his seat, that he did not then rise and move this resolution? Why is it that in 1913 and 1914 we had no trouble about it? Why was there no discussion in 1914 and 1915? Why is it that it comes on now, in the session of 1915-16? Is it because there is an election coming on in the province of Quebec within a few days? Is that the reason?

An hon. MEMBER: No politics.

Mr. EDWARDS: No politics in this? No politics in this? I think I am right in saying that when the Government move to go into Supply and a member moves a resolution such as this, if the resolution carries in this House to-day, or whenever it is voted upon, this Government goes out of power. I may be right in my interpretation of the rules or I may not, but if I am right what does it mean? It means that this House unanimously agreed to an extension of one year in the life of this Parliament in order to avoid an election in war times. It means that hon. members are asking this House to vote for a resolution which will put the Government out of power and force an election on the country. And for what? For something that this Government has done? No, for something that the province of Ontario has or has not done. It is absolutely ridiculous, it should never have been brought into this House at this time, when it means just what I have said.

It is idle for hon. gentlemen opposite, or for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to rise day after day and say we should bend all our energies to the winning of this war and forget our party politics and differences. I maintain that this is not an evidence of forgetting party differences; it is not an evidence of unity. I charge it against the right hon. gentleman who led the Liberal party in this country for twenty-eight years that he has backed up a resolution here put before this House, which, if it carries, will make unity in this Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific an absolute impossibility for months to come; which will divide the people of this country along racial lines as they have never been divided since Confederation. I say, in the face of that—and the right hon. gentleman must know that this is the case—that he is taking upon himself a responsibility which I should not want to take upon myself, in asking the House to support this resolution, and to tear this country to pieces along racial lines.

In 1896 the slogan of the Liberal party was "Hands off Manitoba." That was the battle cry of the right hon. gentleman and his party at that time. Should not that apply equally to the province of Ontario as to the province of Manitoba? Apparently the old battle cry still obtains so far as Manitoba is concerned, because in this resolution it is still "Hands off Manitoba," but "Hands on the province of Ontario." What right has the right hon. gentleman to ask members of this House to support a resolution of this kind, which is placing hands on Ontario? You can cover it with all the words and all the eloquence that you are capable of—and I place no limit on the matchless eloquence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition; I only regret that he possesses that

eloquence in a case like this, because of the power that it gives him—he may use all the eloquence he is capable of in saying that this is not an interference with Ontario; but if it is not an interference with the rights of Ontario, if it is not an admonition to the province of Ontario, if it is not offering advice to the province of Ontario, if it is not telling Ontario what it ought to do and what it has not done, and is not blaming that province for its action, then what in the name of heaven is it? Why is it brought in here? You may affirm as often and as strongly as you like that you believe in the provinces handling their own affairs, but if you believe in the provinces handling their own affairs, give evidence of that belief. You would have given better evidence of that belief by not bringing before this House such a resolution as this. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) about a month ago made a speech in the city of Quebec in which he advised interference. If his speech meant anything at all it means this, that he was encouraging those who were back of this movement in their agitation, encouraging them to believe that they had a grievance, encouraging them to believe that if the Laurier Government was in power it would deal with this matter in a manner satisfactory to those who profess to have a grievance. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated, about the beginning of the war—and the sentence he used impressed itself upon my mind as I am sure it did upon the minds of the people throughout this country—that he did not desire to and he would not open the doors of office with a bloody key. That sentence echoed through this country from end to end. It was a very commendable sentence. But I ask him what kind of a key he is trying to use at the present time in order to open the doors of office? Is it a key bright with honour, or is it a key which will bring discredit on the career of the right hon. gentleman in years to come? The hon. member who just took his seat spoke of what the city of Toronto and the province of Ontario had done in recruiting. He credited the city of Toronto with having enlisted some 25,000 men. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he can pretty nearly double that for the city of Toronto alone. Let me call attention to the words so eloquently and so justly spoken by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) of the people of the province of Ontario. He has said that on the battle line in Flanders, standing side by side with the soldiers of France, who, I venture to say, are making a record in this war before which the records of even Napoleon's veterans will sink into the shade, are thousands and thousands of the sons of the province of Ontario. Let me ask you, Sir, and you men who represent French constituencies, if when the province of Ontario has shown this disposition, this spirit, if to-day the blood of her heroic sons is being poured out on the plains of Flanders in the defence of France and Belgium and England, in this great struggle for freedom and justice, if they are to-day fighting alongside of France in this great war of liberty, surely hon. gentlemen opposite can trust the men who represent the people of Ontario to deal justly and fairly with the French children in that province. Are they giving proper recognition to what has been done by Ontario's sons on the battlefield, to the sacrifices they have made, when they come to this House and charge the people of the province of Ontario with being tyrannical and oppressive, and with tearing the tongues out of the mouths of French Canadian children, speaking figuratively, as the hon. member for Bonaventure did. Is that the sort of language which should be used towards a province which is making the sacrifices that Ontario is making? I am a humble son of that province, and as a native I am proud to say that it has been fair and just and equitable in all its dealings with the minority in the province, whether French, or German, or anything else, and in time to come it will manifest that same generous spirit which it has manifested in the past towards the people who compose the minority.

I ask the pardon of this House if I have transgressed too much upon its time, but I think I can place some of the blame on those hon. members who asked questions, proper questions, which I have endeavoured to answer, and I trust they will not find fault with me for doing so.

Mr. P. E. LAMARCHE (Nicolet): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up much of the time of this House in dealing with the resolution which has been so well and ably discussed by its mover and by hon. members on both sides of the House who have taken part in the debate. I feel that it is my duty, however, to state here, as fully as I can, the reasons why I give to this resolution my unqualified support.

The speaker who has just taken his seat, my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Ed-

wards), opened his speech by saying that under the circumstances it would be very hard for him to be moderate, and he has, I think, given a fair illustration of the truth of his prophecy. Not only will I try to be moderate, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will be moderate. Surely my hon. friend from Frontenac will be astonished at the fact that we French Canadians have spoken in this debate moderately, because it is well recognized that in this squabble we are the under dog. Mr. Speaker, I have not devoted any part of my time to studying the different censuses, or to trying to assort the ignorance of this country into races, counties, and denominations, and that is the reason why I am not able at present to follow the figures given by my hon. friend from Frontenac. I remember, however—and I am sorry that I have not the documents in my hand—that when the statements just made before the House were published, not very long ago, the figures were repudiated by the proper department of the Quebec Legislature. I believe that some of the newspapers of this country will again repudiate the figures, since they have assumed more importance by being brought before this House. If I am unable to follow him in the statements he has made as to the proportions of ignorance or illiteracy, I believe that every one who has listened to the debate which has taken place on this resolution will admit that there are in this House to-day representatives of the French Canadian race who surely know how to read and write and talk, either in French or in English. Although I have differed on many questions from the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I was proud yesterday that one of my race could master the English language so well as to excite the admiration of both French and English in this country. Taking for granted, for the purposes of discussion, that the figures brought before the House by the hon. member for Frontenac are correct, what do they show? They do not show that the French Canadian people are not able to learn any subject of study as well as the English-speaking people. They do not prove that the French Canadian student cannot follow the courses in any school as well as his English competitor. They perhaps show that the results were due to non-attendance in the schools; and, if that is the case, the proper remedy is not to blot out French altogether from the schools, but to make necessary laws for compulsory education, and force every child in the province of Ontario to attend school; and the same thing might be suggested to the legislation of the province of Quebec.

My hon. friend from Frontenac was scandalized because such a question as this has been brought before this House because, he says, it is so remote from federal politics. He said it had been brought here only to serve the purposes of the political followers of certain leaders. I remember that only a few years ago certain questions were brought into the federal arena for discussion not only in this House but also before public opinion in this country. Certain questions were brought up, and I am told that to those questions many members on this side of the House, at least, owe their seats. Were those questions foreign to federal politics, or were they solely within the province of the local legislature? We all remember the famous question of the Ne Temere decree. We all remember the turmoil which was raised in certain parts of the Dominion on account of the presence of the right hon. leader of the Opposition at the Eucharistic Congress. We all remember that, Mr. Speaker; and can it be said to-day that those questions were not more foreign to the federal arena than the question of education?

The question of education is a question which is dealt with separately in the British North America Act. There are three sections dealing with legislative powers: One section, 91, which enumerates the different subjects upon which this Parliament has power to legislate; the second, section 92, which enumerates the different subjects over which the provincial legislatures are supreme, so far as legislative powers are concerned; and there is a special section, section 93, devoted to education. In that section it is provided that provincial legislatures are supreme, so far as education is concerned—supreme in the sense that the Federal Parliament cannot legislate except in an exceptional case; the case of a remedial Bill. But they can legislate only within certain limits. The subject is limited by a special proviso dealing with certain guarantees given to denominational creeds in this country. It is true that this guarantee contemplates religion. But I maintain that the French-Canadian Catholics have in that section certain rights as well as their English-speaking co-citizens of the Catholic creed.

If we go beyond the limit of Confederation, if we go back beyond the year 1867,

we find that education in Upper Canada was governed by the law of 1863, and that law of 1863 enabled the Catholics of this province to have their school matters regulated absolutely by a board of commissioners and by their own inspectors. The board of commissioners and inspectors were empowered to determine the kind of schools to be established and how those schools might be governed. They had the power also to say whether the schools would be totally English or totally French, or whether they would be French and English, that is, bilingual. That right existed before Confederation, and by section 93 of the British North America Act all these rights have been preserved. Therefore, I say that the legislation passed by the province of Ontario is not only unjust, not only oppressive, but is also ultra vires.

But it is not my intention to deal with that matter. The general terms in which this resolution has been worded allows, in my opinion, no serious objection to be taken as to the advisability of bringing it before the House. Its conclusion, if adopted, cannot be considered as binding in any way on the Legislature of Ontario. The subject-matter of the resolution is treated as a question of general policy in the light of British principles, which we all know, and which we all try to apply in this country as well as everywhere else. Furthermore, this resolution does not deal in any way with the constitutional or judicial aspects of the question. This enables me to say that even if all the contentions of our English-speaking friends in Ontario were maintained by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, this motion would still be in order, because it is the duty of this Parliament to discuss all matters which are connected with the good government and welfare of this country at large and with the welfare of any portion of it, because this Paraliament is the national forum where, naturally, according to British principles, these questions must be aired.

I am a lawyer by profession, and I have learned the principles of law in the office of a gentleman who occupies a seat on the treasury benches; I mean the hon the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain). I have not been able to follow him always in politics, but I have always thought that he was a very good lawyer, and I still think so. In order to illustrate that I am sincere, I am going to invoke his high authority on the very question that is before the House to-day. I would have preferred that the Postmaster General himself should have done it. He has very cleverly outlined the course which parliamentary procedure should take by attempting to show that this question should not come before this House, but in this case, Mr. Speaker, I must abide by the decision given by yourself yesterday, when you explained at length the doctrine applicable to such a case as this. I am at liberty to do so, especially as the Postmaster General has upheld your decision by his own vote. It having been settled by yourself, Mr. Speaker, and your position having practically been endorsed by the Postmaster General, that this is the proper place to discuss this question, and the Postmaster General having thought to put aside the question and not to deal with it upon its merits, it is my duty to the country at large to show what his position with regard to it is, lest some people might unjustly represent that the Postmaster General does not think the same way as we do upon it. I do not want him to suffer any harm from that.

5 p.m

I will quote the opinion of the Postmaster General on the question of schools in Ontario given to the New York Times Magazine of February 13, 1915. I will give an extract from a legal opinion written by him, because I say that the Postmaster General passes not only in Montreal, but all over Canada as a high authority on these questions:

> In Ontario, where there are 250,000 French Canadians, the difficulty is with the act of the provincial Legislature in hindering the teaching of French in some of the schools and actually prohibiting it in others.

I commend these words to the hon. member for Frontenac and the hon. member for Kingston:

> Until 1912 the schools in the French sections of Ontario were bilingual, as much attention being paid to French as to English. But in that year it was enacted that thereafter in all schools then established French should be used exclusively only for French children during the first two years of their schooling and that beyond that age the language in all forms should be English except for one hour a day.
>
> Now, since 1912, many new French Canadian settlements have been established in the province of Ontario, and of course they have their schools, but the provincial authorities have ruled that by the wording of an Act of 1912 no French whatever can be taught in the schools opened after that law went into effect.
>
> When France ceded Canada to Great Britain it was stipulated in the treaty between the two mother countries that the French in Canada should retain all their civil, religious, and social

rights. And, furthermore, the British North America Act, which is, in part, the Constitution of Canada, recognizes French as one of the two official languages of the country. So Ontario is violating both constitution and treaty. Two cases growing out of this very serious school disturbance, with its incidental strikes of teachers and pupils and protests of parents, are now pending in the courts and will be taken to the Privy Council of England for settlement. I believe that the final ruling will be in favour of the French Canadians, for the Privy Council has never failed to uphold our rights.

I agree entirely with the Postmaster General in the opinion he gave as a lawyer outside of this House, but I cannot agree with him in the opinion he gives as a politician sitting on the treasury benches.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What my hon. friend read from was an alleged interview with me in the New York Times, and it was not at all a legal opinion that I gave at that time. I may tell my hon. friend and this House that what I said was not correctly reported in the New York Times, although a good deal of what appeared in that interview I did say.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps the minister would state in what respect the interview was incorrect?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I certainly will. I gave the reporter of the New York Times the contentions of the French Canadians in Ontario, on the constitutional rights in the matter of the French language, and not my own contentions on the question.

Mr. LAMARCHE: According to the Rules of the House I have to accept the explanation given by the minister, and I can only regret that he has waited so long to give it. He has allowed this country and his compatriots to be guided by what I still consider the good legal opinion circulated by the New York Times. My hon. friend says he was misquoted. This interview seems to have been well prepared; it is even accompanied by a very good picture of the hon. gentleman. Unless he thinks that the photograph is not as good as the original, I am sure he will not deny that part of the interview.

As a consequence of the enactment of Regulation 17 a great deal of discussion has taken place in this country, and recently a petition was sent to the Executive of Parliament asking the Governor General in Council to grant disallowance of a statute which elevated to the dignity of the law Regulation 17. I have not studied very carefully the report laid on the Table by the hon. Minister of Justice; but from what I can gather at a first perusal, some of his conclusions seem to me extraordinary. A great part of the report is taken up with allegations and arguments to the effect that this Government can not grant disallowance of a regulation, but only of a statute. We knew that; the people of Canada knew that; the 500,000 petitioners knew it; and the best evidence of what I say is that they never asked for it. What they asked was that the statute elevating Regulation 17 to the dignity of a law be disallowed. I agree with the right hon. leader of the Opposition that in every case disallowance is ineffective in practice, inasmuch as the Government which has passed the law complained of can the very next day pass a similar one; nevertheless, I wish to go on record that had I been a minister of the Crown I should have voted for disallowance. The reasons given by the Minister of Justice for not granting disallowance can be put under two heads: first, a law can hardly be disallowed that is within the legislative power of a province, and this law is alleged and seems to be within the rights of the province of Ontario, dealing as it does with education; secondly, if this law is ultra vires, the proper remedy is not to seek disallowance, but to apply to the courts. As a consequence, a law being either intra vires or ultra vires, the fathers of Confederation have put this provision in the Act for no purpose. I do not believe that that explanation will be accepted in toto by the population of Canada, or at least by the numerous petitioners who have petitioned the Government. However, I do not wish to deal with this point any longer. The question is between the Executive and the petitioners, and they will probably have an opportunity of settling it one day or the other.

I was very pleased yesterday at the clever and admirable speech of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). He and I do not always see eye to eye, particularly in this case. But I have the greatest respect for him, and for two reasons: first, because in this Parliament he always discusses any kind of question in a very moderate tone and on a very high plane; secondly, because I know—and I am sure in this case as well as in many others—that the bases of his opinions are his personal convictions, and not mere petty questions of politics. On several occasions,

and particularly on one occasion, he has shown that when he had to choose between following his leader and following his personal convictions, he has followed his personal convictions, and I have great admiration for a man who will do that. That is why, in dealing with Regulation 17, I will take into serious consideration the arguments set forth by my hon. friend from Kingston, and I will try as well as I can to prove that his contentions are not quite correct, but that the contention of the hon. member for Kamouraska, of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and of those who supported them on this question, is the correct one. My hon. friend from Kingston has a different explanation from ours of the word "hitherto." I will not delve into dictionaries; I will not consult eminent authorities; I will not even quote the opinions of able lawyers in case such opinions may be contradicted later on; but I will give to this regulation the practical interpretation which is given to it by the Department of Education of Ontario. Although the interpretation of my hon. friend from Kingston is very generous, and although the interpretation sometimes given by Mr. Ferguson seems to be very generous, when we look only at the interpretation, yet, if any of my compatriots dare to follow those interpretations, they find that next day they are brought before a court of law, fined, and threatened with imprisonment. I believe this inclines them to take the other interpretation and to endeavour to live in peace at any cost.

In the city of Windsor, in the province of Ontario, a school was established long before the enactment of Regulation 17. Later on, after 1912, after the passing of that regulation, two new schools were established. According to our interpretation of the word "hitherto," the school established previous to the enactment of the regulation had a right to be classed as an English-French school and to have French taught to the pupils in it; but the new schools established after the passing of the regulation could not be granted the same privilege. I will read a copy of the resolution which was passed by the Roman Catholic School Board of the city of Windsor and which was sent to the principal of the St. Edmond and St. Francis schools:

Moved by A. Langlois, seconded by R. Langlois:

That a Sister be engaged to teach the French language exclusively in St. Edmond and St. Francis schools, the said teacher to be a French-Canadian and to hold a first class teaching certificate and capable of teaching the French language in all its branches. That she is to teach the said language one hour in each class except the entrance class each day at St. Edmond and half an hour each day in all classes at St. Francis school. Salary at $350 per annum to commence at date of service.

Carried unanimously.

Windsor, June 1, 1914.

The following is the answer received by the secretary-treasurer of the Separate School Board of Windsor from Mr. Colquhoun, Deputy Minister of Education of Ontario:

Toronto, August 5, 1914.

Sir:

I am directed by the Minister of Education to say that he understands that your Board proposes to introduce the teaching of French into the St. Edmond and St. Francis Separate Schools. The minister desires me to inquire whether this report is correct.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) A. H. U. Colquhoun,
Deputy Minister of Education.

D. Gourd, Esq.,
Secretary-Treasurer, Separate School Board,
Windsor, Ontario.

Now the answer sent to the Deputy Minister of Education:

Windsor, Ont.,
August 8, 1914.

To the Deputy Minister of Education,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of August 5th received, and contents noted. In reply would beg to say that we intend to introduce French in the St. Edmond and St. Francis schools, and you will find a copy of a resolution passed at a meeting held on June 1, 1914.

In your letter you ask me a question which I am answering you and I am asking you a question which I would like answered. From what source did you get this information?

Awaiting your reply on same by return mail, I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) D. Gourd,
Sec.-Treas. R.C. S.S. Board, of the city of Windsor.

Follows a letter dated October 31, 1914, sent by the Deputy Minister of Education:

Toronto, October 31, 1914.

Sir:

I am directed by the Minister of Education to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of August 8th, and to say in reply that the subject has been under his careful consideration, and that he finds that the Regulations of the Department of Education do not allow French to be taught as a subject of study in any of the Separate schools in the city of Windsor, with the exception of the school of the Sacred Heart.—

That was the school that was established before the regulation was passed.

—You will accordingly, within a reasonable time, make such changes in the organization of your school as may be found necessary under this instruction.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) A. H. U. Colquhoun,
Deputy Minister of Education.

My hon. friend the member for Kingston will probably think that one school was within one section and that the two others were within another section, and that according to his interpretation of the regulation as given yesterday, one would have been regulated by Regulation 15 and the two others by Regulation 17; but that is not the case, because the city of Windsor, where the three schools have been established, forms only one section, and these schools are within the limits of the same section. Therefore this is a practical application of the word "hitherto." The first school continues to have French taught in it, because, according to our interpretation and the interpretation of the Minister of Education of Ontario, it was established before 1912, and the two others, although within the same section and supported by the same ratepayers, are refused the same privilege, only because, according to this interpretation which, I believe, is the right one, they have been established after the passing of the regulation. This example shows that the interpretation given before this House by my hon. friend—was given probably to calm the demands of the French Canadians, but is not in accord with the facts.

Now, a rapid review of that Regulation 17 will reveal the fact that it changes altogether the system of education and is detrimental to our interests; and, as I have already said, this is the proper place to discuss this matter. Some of my English-speaking friends on this side of the House have asked me: "What interest do you have to bring this question before the House? Do you think it will settle the question?" My answer is very simple. We are so convinced that this measure is unjust, oppressive and illegal on the face of it, that it is to our interest to show it to the country at large; and those who passed that regulation are apparently so convinced of the same thing that they are interested in not letting the public at large know it; and the reason why we bring this subject before this House is to inform the public of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific—moreover, the world at large, if the world at large take an interest in this local matter—that of all the possessions of the British Empire the province of Ontario is the place where the language of the conquered is the least respected. When this thing is known in the country, when it is known that French, the language of the pioneers of Canada, the language of those who founded this country, who won it from the wilds, and who have preserved it not only for themselves, but for Canadians in the wide sense of the word—when it is known that this language has not the same rights and privileges in this country as Welsh has in Wales, as French has in Mauritius, as the Dutch language has in South Africa, notwithstanding the bloody war that took place there fourteen years ago, perhaps public opinion will have something to say about it, and perhaps men will be able to get together from the four corners of this country and ask that justice be rendered to whom justice is due.

Regulation 17 begins as follows:

English-French Public and Separate Schools.
Circular of Instruction.

There are only two classes of primary schools in Ontario—public schools and separate schools; but, for convenience of reference, the term English-French is applied to those schools of each class annually designated by the minister for inspection as provided in 5 below and in which French is a language of instruction and communication as limited in 3 (1) below.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the only English-French schools are those designated for us by the Minister of Education, and even these are limited by clauses to which I will now refer. The French language, by Regulation 17, is treated from two different points of view: First, as the language of instruction and communication; that is, the language to be used in teaching geography, arithmetic, catechism, or any other matter; and secondly, as a subject of study. The French language as the language of communication between the pupil and the teacher is absolutely abolished, except as regards the child who is beginning his schooling, and who is absolutely unable to understand anything but the language of his mother, the French language. As soon as this child has been able to gather the principle of the English language, he ceases to benefit from the privilege of having his tuition given in his mother tongue. This is the "generous" part of Regulation 17, as it affects my compatriots of Ontario. As a subject of study, this regulation deals with the French language differently. It puts French on the same footing as geography, arithmetic, or any other subject

of study in the class. But where this is so permitted, the time assigned to it is one hour. But the inspector can, without giving any reason, and whenever he chooses, reduce that hour to three minutes or to one minute.

This "privilege," as it is called, is limited in another respect. Article 4 of this regulation provides:

> In schools where French has hitherto been a subject of study, the public or the separate school board, as the case may be, may provide, under the following conditions, for instruction in French, reading, grammar, and composition in Form I to IV. (See also provision for form V, public school regulation 14 (5) addition to the subjects prescribed for the public or separate schools.

I have already given the interpretation, which I think is the right interpretation, to this clause, an interpretation sustained by the practical interpretation given by Mr. Colquhoun in the Windsor case. And in the face of these things I can only conclude, and I state without fear of contradiction, that the privilege of having French taught as the subject of study can exist only in the schools where French was taught before the regulation was passed. My hon. friend from Frontenac has cited Regulation 15. That regulation provides for the teaching of German and French. But my contention is that, since the passing of Regulation 17, although the other regulation remains on the statute-book, one part of it at least has become inoperative, that part dealing with the French language. The only part of Regulation 15 which is still in force is the part which deals with German. We are to-day confronted with this state of things. Around Verdun, in France, on the one side people talking the German language are directing shells and gas against another people whose language is French. And to-day in this country, or at least in Ontario, we find privileges given to the language of the Huns which are refused to the language of those who are defending the altars of civilization.

I believe that no matter how you twist this regulation, no matter how cleverly you put it, you can come to only one conclusion, that its object is the gradual proscription of the French language in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Frontenac calls it a concession, and says that the French Canadians never had as many privileges as those contained in Regulation 17. On the other hand, it is pointed out that there are people in Ontario who think that too much is given to the French Canadians by this regulation. Then the matter can be easily settled. If, on the one hand, it is thought that the French Canadians get too much; if, on the other hand, the French Canadians do not like this regulation, do not care for this present from the Greeks, the matter can be easily settled by abolishing the regulation altogether, and then both sides—call them extremists if you like—will be satisfied. If you refuse to do that it is because you do not believe that you have given to the French a concession. The hon. member for Frontenac has a very peculiar way of dealing with a problem of this kind. On the one hand he says: "This state of things was arrived at after proper resolutions had been passed in the Legislature of Ontario, and nobody made any complaint. even the representatives of your race did not make any complaint; therefore, you have no right to come and say that this regulation is oppressive or abusive." On the other hand, after dealing with the matter from other aspects, he comes back to the same subject, and, notwithstanding his former statements, says: "Why are you condemning this? You do not know its effect; you have not tried it out." If we try it out we accept it. If the hon. member for Frontenac claims that we have accepted a state of things by reason of silence, if we try it out he surely will come and say: "Not only have you accepted it, silently, by not raising a voice against it, but you have accepted it practically, because you have used it."

I was very glad to hear the Prime Minister yesterday say that if ever there was a motion proposing interference by the Federal Government in the provincial politics of the province of Quebec, he would be the first to raise his voice in protest against it. I believe, however, that he will never be put to that test, because in the province of Quebec the minority, which is English-speaking, is our star witness in this case. That minority is in a position to teach the people of Canada at large that the French Canadian majority knows something about justice, about tolerance, and about equity.

It has been insinuated, even affirmed, that the French Canadian population contain a greater proportion of illiterates than any other race in Canada. I have always thought that, if we know how to apply justice, if we know how to deal with questions of that kind in such a way as to deserve the compliment of being the province which

has understood better than any other the spirit of the Canadian Confederation, possibly it was because many of our men had given some time to the study of the treaties and to the study of our constitution and of such books as would instruct them in the science of justice. But even if we have to admit that there are among us so great a number of illiterates, compliment my race all the more, because then it has not acquired that science of justice by tuition or by education, but has possessed it naturally from birth.

The best test to apply to this regulation is to transpose it. I would recommend every member from Ontario who does not share my views to take a copy of this regulation to-night and to make just a few amendments in it. First, instead of Ontario legislation, make it Quebec legislation, and instead of the word "French" insert the word "English," and read it. If you are satisfied after perusing only once the regulation so amended—, I will be very much surprised.

Mr. BRODER: Have you any bilingual schools in Quebec?

Mr. LAMARCHE: Yes, sir. We have bilingual schools; we have bilingual statesmen; we have bilingual homes; and we have bilingual justice. Is the abolition of the French language useful, necessary, or desirable in any way in the interest of the welfare of this Dominion? For there must be a reason for gradually abolishing the French language, as is proposed. This reason I will try to find. Is it the French language that is objectionable? I do not believe so. The time would not be well chosen to object to such a language as the French language. At present the whole world is taking its hat off to the French nation. The French language is adaptable, I believe, to the study of literature, of science, of art, of any other subject of study. The French language is spoken the world over. It is spoken in the highest courts of the world. It is recognized as an accomplishment for an educated man to be able to talk French. It is spoken by the King of England; it is spoken in the palace of the King of England; it is spoken at Rideau Hall. We do not need to be ashamed of the French language, Mr. Speaker. At present we are engaged in a great struggle, a war between Germany and her Allies on one side, all speaking different languages, and, on the other side, five or six other nations speaking other languages. I hope that the treaty of peace will be signed shortly. I hope it will be signed in the city of Berlin. But I can assure you that, no matter where it is signed, it is going to be drafted in the French language; and, no matter what adjustments appear in that treaty, those who will have to give something or those who will have to receive something, in either money, property or liberties, will find it, if they know French, in the French language of the treaty. If they do not know French, they will have to wait a few hours until somebody else translates it into some other language. If it is not the French language which is objectionable, is it because in this country French is a political obstacle?—and in using the word "political" I use it in the large sense of the word, that is, so far as the relations of this country to other countries are concerned. I do not believe so, and I do not need to delay very long in dealing with this aspect of the question. One has only to read the history of British rule in Canada. The French Canadians have always been loyal. They have always been ready to repel the invader. They have always been ready to refuse offers from wealthy neighbours, even when some others were ready to accept them. Mr. Speaker, the children who are asking the Government of Ontario to-day to let them speak their mother tongue, and to let them be educated in their mother tongue, are the sons of a great nation. Without their ancestors—and I state this without fear of contradiction—without their ancestors of French origin, instead of paying our taxes into the Canadian treasury, you and I would be paying taxes into the treasury at Washington.

Mr. HUGH CLARK: Would you have had bilingual schools then?

Mr. LAMARCHE: I can answer the question of my hon. friend. I do not know the laws of the United States, but I have been in certain parts of that country and I know that there they give privileges to the French schools which are denied to-day by the province of Ontario, and that notwithstanding the fact that the French were not the founders of the United States. The authority for the statement I make is not commonly known. The statement came from the lips, or rather from the pen of Sir Guy Carleton, Governor of Canada for many years. He stated that without the French Canadians

it would have been utterly impossible to keep this Dominion under the British Crown. Those who have read history know that. It has been written not only in French books, but in all Canadian histories worthy of the name. We pride ourselves upon it. We do not like to brag about it too often; but under circumstances like these I believe it is not only our right but our bounden duty to do so.

Is it to perfect the system of education that the regulation was passed? I always thought that the possession of two languages was an achievement compared with the possession of only one, and until it is proven that to learn French is an absolute obstacle to the acquisition of a knowledge of English I will maintain that the striking out of one of the two languages, instead of perfecting the system of education, is handicapping it. I will go further. It is a well known principle of pedagogy that in order to get the best results in a school it is not sufficient to pour instruction into the mind of a pupil. Some other things must be done. The teacher must first ascertain the adaptability of that child to receive instruction, and the adaptability of the child to receive instruction is always found in following the law of nature, in following racial inclinations. That principle has been laid down by men of experience and of world-wide fame. It is interesting to read a page from the works of perhaps one of the greatest philosophers of the world, and surely one of the greatest philosophers of the English nation—Herbert Spencer. I do not think that Herbert Spencer could be prejudiced by this school question. He was dead long before this by-law was passed. Here is what he says:

> The education of the child must accord both in mode and arrangement with the education of mankind as considered historically; or in other words, the genesis of knowledge in the individual must follow the same course as the genesis of knowledge in the race. In support of this doctrine two reasons may be assigned, either of them sufficient to establish it. One is deducible from the law of hereditary transmission as considered in its wider consequences. For if it be true that men exhibit likeness to ancestry both in aspect and character,—if, passing from individual cases in which the traits of many dead ancestors mixing with those of a few living ones greatly obscure the law, we turn to national types, and remark how the contrasts between them are persistent from age to age—if we remember that these respective types came from a common stock, and that hence the present marked differences between them must have arisen from the action of modifying circumstances upon successive generations who severally transmitted the accumulated effects to their descendants—if we find the differences to be now organic, so that the French child grows into a French man even when brought up among strangers—and if the general fact thus illustrated is true of the whole nature, intellect inclusive; then it follows that if there be an order in which the human race has mastered its various kinds of knowledge, there will arise in every child an aptitude to acquire these kinds of knowledge in the same order. So that even were the order intrinsically indifferent, it would facilitate education to lead the individual mind through the steps traversed by the general mind. But the order is not intrinsically indifferent; and hence the fundamental reason why education should be a repetition of civilisation in little. It is alike provable that the historical sequence was, in its main outlines, a necessary one; and that the causes which determined it apply to the child as to the race.

At six o'clock House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LAMARCHE: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was trying to demonstrate that any attempt to abolish the French language, gradually or otherwise, could not be justified on the ground that the language itself is objectionable; furthermore, that its abolition could not be urged because it is a political obstacle in this country, and also that such a policy could not be invoked in the interest of making the system of education more perfect. Is assimilation in the interest of harmony in any country in the world and, in particular, in this country? International law has no fixed code but we find its principles in the different authors, in the reports of different conferences, and in the meetings of great men from different nations who from time to time gather around the same table and discuss dispassionately the causes of international trouble and also the means of preventing it. The last movement in that respect emanates from The Hague and it was inaugurated not before but since the war began. I have received, in my capacity of secretary of the Canadian branch of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, several documents of great importance. The last that I have received is a document entitled:

> Durable Peace—Official Commentaries on the Minimum Programme.

I believe some explanations are necessary to indicate to this House what the purpose of this association is. Since the beginning of the war, many peace articles have appeared in the press and in the Parliaments of belligerent nations, as well as in those of neutral nations, talks about peace have been heard. We have also read reports of discussions as to what should be the treaty

of peace at the end of this war. The members of this Association are representative of most of the civilized nations of the earth. I will tell you what nationalities are represented officially or otherwise, on the International Board of this Association. There are the United States of America, Germany, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Spain, France, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Italy, Mexico, Norway, the Netherlands, Portugal, Roumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay and Venezuela. I am translating because this document is written in French, that being the diplomatic language of the world. These people got together and worked out what is called the "Programme Minimum" containing five different propositions. These people maintain that if the treaty of peace which is to be signed at the end of this war is to provide for a durable peace and not a temporary one, no matter what the different clauses are, at least these five conditions have to be embodied in it. What is the first article? I will translate:

> The states shall guarantee the nationalities comprised within the limits of their territory civil equality, religious liberty and the free usage of their language.

And the free usage of their language. In the minds of these great men, of these unprejudiced patriots of different countries, the free usage of their language is to be a source of peace, harmony and happiness amongst the nations and amongst the different nationalities composing those nations. They also believe that the absence of these guarantees, or the non-respect of these guarantees, would be a source of trouble, discord and war. Are we in this country to be deaf to such appeals? I was glad this afternoon to hear one of the speakers who preceded me quote certain extracts showing that England and France had made proposals for the adoption of both the English and French languages in both countries as soon as possible. That idea is only in harmony with the wishes of this conference which is representative of all nationalities and all civilized countries. If that is true of any national minority in any country, I believe that here in this country we have more than one reason to adopt this principle of international law as developed in later years. We have other reasons because here not only would it be in the interest of peace and harmony, not only would it prevent discord and trouble and ill-feeling, but it would be the best way for the English majority to show that they not only ruled the country but that they appreciated what was in it. It would also enable the English majority to be in harmony with all English majorities throughout the whole Empire. After listening to this argument, moderately presented to this House and submitted to the public opinion of this country, I believe that the province of Ontario should hestitate before deciding to continue to be the exception in the British Empire and that it will readily abide by this principle of international law, of natural law, of British fair play, and will do its bit towards harmony in this country just as in the province of Quebec we have always done our bit to promote harmony amongst the people of our Dominion.

If I have touched upon all these subjects, if I have brought forward all these reasons, I do not wish to have anybody believe that we French Canadians in this country think that this Regulation 17 is the last stroke at our language in this country, that our language will perish and that our national identity will disappear. I am confident that the French language is in this country to stay forever. Why? No matter how many laws are passed by Provincial Legislatures, no matter how many regulations are passed, I maintain that you cannot turn a Frenchman into an Englishman by process of legislation. I maintain that you cannot muffle a whole race by statute and that you cannot gag a rising generation by enacting a regulation on education—why? Simply because nature is stronger than the will of man. This is a natural law. We follow the law of nature, even when we do not think it; the work is being done even without an effort. Having read the history of this country and learned that at the Conquest there were in this country only 60,000 French-speaking citizens, and remembering the many efforts that have been made to have the French language disappear from our laws and from our practice, who can say with any appearance of sense, now that we are a people of two million and a half, that a by-law will endanger our national identity! No, Mr. Speaker, no man believes that. But this by-law does render less happy the lives of a number of law-abiding citizens of this country, and when you take away happiness from a portion of the people you are taking it away from the country at large, and you are doing an unpatriotic act. I believe that the more obstacles you put in

the way of the the expansion of a nation, or in the way of its retaining its identity, the more you assure to it its perpetuation. This has been shown in the history of most nations where this problem has been dealt with. Do you want an example? Centuries ago descendants from the same stock, men of French origin, came into the new world. Part of them went towards what is now called Canada; the other part towards what is now called New Orleans. Both these parties were surrounded later on by an Anglo-Saxon population, and both encountered the same dangers of assimilation. And what was the result? In New Orleans the French language and the French identity of the early French settlers has practically disappeared. On the other hand, in this country the French language and the French identity of the first settlers is stronger and more robust than it was at the time of the foundation of this country. What is the reason for this? It is because the settlers in New Orleans had no obstacles in their way, and because our national life has found the food that has given it its robustness and its strength. From the time of the Conquest the French language has been preserved, only because those who possessed and loved it have fought tooth and nail to keep it intact for themselves and their children.

Some of our Ontario friends say that English ought to be known by every person in this Dominion, and I entirely agree with that. Let me in a few words state our position in regard to the English and French languages. We consider a French education as a duty, and the acquisition of the English language as a necessity. We will not budge from our duty; we will remain Frenchmen. But we realize the necessity of a knowledge of English in all walks of life. The lack of it would be a serious handicap in the race for material success in life, not only in this country, but on the whole continent of America. We want every one of our children to know as much as possible of the beautiful English language. But we also want the country at large to know that, no matter what it costs, we will learn and keep learning the language that we have inherited from our fathers and mothers. Some speaker said yesterday: In matters of education, hands off Ontario, hands off Manitoba. I agree with that. But the legislature should also preserve untrammelled the rights of the subjects of a British country, no matter of what origin they are. We who are in possession of the French language, who consider it a treasure from the Atlantic to the Pacific, say to every one that the possession of that language is not limited by physical or by legal boundaries. We who are French Canadians also say: Hands off the French language.

A great deal has been said about this matter having been brought up as a political question. I am not here to speak for any one except myself. As far as I am concerned I would consider it a crime for any one to mix with the petty questions of politics a cause which to every French Canadian is sacred. From the high plane of the speeches that have been delivered in this House yesterday and to-day, I do not believe it has been in the mind of any one in this House to make this a question of politics. Personally I have been taken to task by certain papers that I respect in our sister province, and whose main asset seems to be the great imagination of their editors. They have said that I had a resolution ready to put before the House, and that this was done because the leader of the Opposition was forced by a wing of his party to abstain from moving one, and that I was going to talk as the agent of the leader of the Opposition, and as the agent of the Liberal party. Let me tell you, Sir, that I am no more the agent of the Liberal party than I am a piece of the Tory machine. I am an Independent in this House, and I am an Independent because these are my convictions, and because this was my programme when I faced my electorate. I was elected here on condition that I would judge every question on its merits, and vote in favour of any motion, Bill or measure of any kind coming from the Liberal party, if it was good, and against any motion, Bill or measure coming from the Conservative party if I considered it bad. The small place I occupy in this House as representative of the county of Nicolet belongs to me. My vote also belongs to me, and I shall use both the way I please, without consulting any one. My judges will be the people whom I represent, the people of my race, and the public opinion of Canada. I am satisfied with them as judges, no matter how my words may be construed in this House to-night. But if I am an Independent, whether I support or combat any motion, measure or Bill coming from the Liberal or Conservative party, I have no hesitation in declaring that my hand is extended loyally to any public man in this House who has the

strength and the courage to get upon his feet and defend his race and his language, and that my hand shall be withdrawn the moment I discover that others are ready to betray their race and their language. That is my position so far as politics are concerned.

Before closing my speech, I wish frankly and sincerely to make a moderate but forceful appeal—first, to my compatriots both on your left and on your right, Mr. Speaker, and ask them by their votes, if not by their speeches, to show that they sympathize with those of their own race who are suffering. Only a few days ago I received a letter, which cannot be read without the greatest emotion, from one of the members of this House who unfortunately is too sick to come here. I refer to our friend the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Guilbault). Our poor friend has no longer the use of his limbs, but his big heart is strong enough to drag his sick body into this House in order that he may vote in favour of the resolution of my hon. friend from Kamouraska. He begged me in his letter to make arrangements to have him carried here even if the consequences should be fatal. I went to see him in the hospital and endeavoured to dissuade him from that idea, but I promised him I would be his interpreter in this House in favour of the resolution when he wanted to support by his vote. I am telling you this, Sir, because I want to commend this example of one of my compatriots to my other compatriots in this House, especially to those who perhaps are inclined to be weak-kneed. This is an example that they ought to follow, and when they hear that a man who is not physically strong enough to stand up has the courage to ask to be carried here in order to give his vote in support of the resolution, those who are of more robust health will surely do no less.

Since yesterady it has been gossiped around the House that the great objection to voting for this resolution on the part of those who are sincere supporters of the Government, is that the resolution is not in the proper form, because, being moved as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply, it may be considered as a motion of non-confidence in the Government. So far as I am concerned, even if that were the case, I would sooner vote non-confidence in any government than vote non-confidence in the French language. But it is not the case, and those interested will find the proper authorities in Hansard of 1900, under date of the 13th of March, page 1824, and also in Hansard of 1893, in the debate of the 21st of March, page 2401.

I wish also to make an appeal to all generous English-speaking members of this House, whether on the Conservative side or on the Liberal side, representing any of the provinces of Canada, to show their broad-mindedness towards the French minority by supporting this resolution. I make a special appeal to those English-speaking members who owe their seats in this House to a generous French-Canadian majority.

In a few months from now we shall be called upon to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation. The buildings erected for the purpose of enabling the nation to send its representatives there to debate on serious questions has been destroyed. Let us not permit the country or the world to understand that the same disaster has happened to the principles laid down by the Fathers of Confederation.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that this debate is to be brought to a close to-night, I will not take up the time of the House for more than a few minutes.

The resolution under discussion is the result of an agitation outside of this House, an agitation which has caused a great deal of bitter feeling in the province of Quebec, and which, from its inception, as judged by the platform utterances and the newspaper comments, was in pursuance of a principle which it was contended was based upon a legal right which the French-Canadian people of Ontario claimed were being taken away from them. Although the agitation was promoted and fanned throughout the country upon that claim, I notice that the resolution itself makes no claim to a legal right; but that it is absolutely admitted by the speakers on both sides of the House that there can be no just claim by the French Canadian people of Ontario to any legal right to the use of their language in the school system of that province. That being so, we have made it clear that those agitators outside of the House who have been pretending that there has been a deprivation of right have not stated the fact; and up to this time in this debate no speaker has contended that such a right exists, but every one who has spoken of it has admitted that there is no such right. The next thing that we have made

clear is that the resolution is brought into this House, the Federal Parliament of this country, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and is fathered by the right hon. leader of the Opposition under circumstances in which the admission is made by that right hon. gentleman and all his followers that this Parliament cannot legislate upon the matter in question.

Next, the assertion is made that what the resolution means is that there is a natural right to a privilege of which the French people of Ontario have been deprived by the legislature of that province. But is seems somewhat strange to me that, where there was no right before—no legal right, no legal privilege—enjoyed by the French people of the province of Ontario, to be taught in their own language in the schools, that the Legislature of Ontario having officially recognized the French, having put it on the statute-book that it should be recognized where it was not recognized before, this country is to have the spectacle of a party being pushed in here by an outside agitation and coming to this House asking for a declaration that a natural right is violated. Assuming the natural right, that natural right can be claimed by every nationality that speaks a foreign tongue. But I wish to say to hon. gentlemen opposite—and I do not say it in any scolding way, but simply as a matter of opinion—it has been said before in this House, and I wish to repeat it—that, in my opinion, the forum for the discussion of this particular resolution is not here. On the admission made, it is not here. The forum for the discussion of this resolution is in the city of Toronto and before the Legislative Assembly there, that legislature which, with its English and its French members, both Tory and Grit, unanimously passed a resolution to put upon the statute-book the law that is here attacked. The door was open in Toronto until two weeks ago to the hon. gentleman and his friends. They could have taken their petitions there; they could have made their applications there. But they wait until that Parliament is prorogued—the Parliament that is seized of the matter, the Parliament that enacted the law—and then, when that Parliament is out of the way, they bring in a resolution here to deal with a subject about which they themselves declare this Parliament has no power to enact anything. I submit that a party that will, on a question of language, take such a course, that will be pushed in here by an agitation that is shaking the country to its foundations—in some parts, that is to say, for the province of Ontario is not much troubled about it yet—is taking a course which cannot be justified by any standard held in honour among our people. I will not debate that, but I will say that an agitation about language makes for dissension and disintegration rather than for harmony, union, and tolerance. It is a dangerous kind of resolution to bring into any parliament where the statutory rights have already been fixed by the Confederation Act of this country.

There is a great responsibility, to my mind, resting on the shoulders of these agitators. They have entered upon a propaganda in which they have organized and publicly paraded children of tender years through the city of Ottawa. They have instilled into the minds of these children false premises and statements not based on facts, or upon legal rights. They have paraded these children bearing banners indicating their French nationality. No one objects to that; we wish to see the tricolour waved in its proper place. But it is not right that this plea of nationality should be made in this way, to bolster up and foment an agitation brought about by the seniors of these children. On these banners were inscribed the legend, "Pay our teachers," those who were responsible for it knowing well that the children were too young to understand the situation. The older heads who were directing this agitation were willing, in this free Canada, to parade these youngsters through the city with these banners to instil in their minds the thought that it is virtuous to disobey the law. My further comment is the diligence with which these agitators promote this propaganda while this terrible war is still going on. Of all the disturbing factors of our life, this question is one of the most disturbing. Yet these agitators have no hesitation in stirring it up, bringing it before Parliament, so that it may spread all over the Dominion, so that the press may take it up and waft it abroad. I leave it there, so far as I am concerned. The forum, as I have said, is Toronto; it is not here. But we are asked as a Parliament to send forward some sort of a decree without legislation, impugning the conduct of the legislature before whom no complaint has ever yet been put, no appeal for consideration has ever been

made; no plea like the eloquent plea of my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) has ever been made. This Parliament is actually asked to commit an impertinence by two parties in this House who say they believe in provincial rights. I submit that an agitation of this kind can be well described by certain words that I wish to quote, which were uttered in a debate in this House in the year 1890:

> The honourable gentleman may mean nothing more than a mere party device, but he is opening the flood-gates to passions which, once aroused, perhaps no human power may be able to restrain. He is appealing to national and religious passions, the most inflexible of all passions, and—whatever his purpose—his movement cannot be characterized by any other language than that of a national crime.

These are the words of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, applied in this House to a gentleman who in his day and generation was trying to foment strife similar to that which the right hon. gentleman himself is attempting to foment in this country to-day.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon): This debate on education can do no harm if it helps to stir up a greater interest in education, not only in Ontario and Quebec but throughout the whole of Canada. I think the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) who spoke this afternoon was not quite fair to my province. In quoting statistics, I think he proved too much. He brought home forcibly to this Parliament what has been debated in the different Protestant church assemblies throughout the country for the last few years, and that is the fact that the Anglo-Saxon birth rate in this country is not as great as the French Canadian birth rate—or, as the figures show it, that the birth rate of the province of Quebec is greater than that of any other province. Consequently, there are more children between the age of one and five years in the province of Quebec, in proportion to population, than there are in any other province. Everybody knows that children between one and five years of age can neither read nor write. That is the explanation of the statistics which the hon. gentleman gave this afternoon.

Mr. GLASS: Did not the hon. member state that this percentage applied to those of school age, and not to all children including those from one to five years?

Mr. ROBB: I did not so understand him. Nor can that be right. I noticed that the hon. gentleman quoted the census of 1901. But the census of 1911 gives the percentage for the whole Dominion of children between the ages of seven and fourteen years who did not attend school at all as 20.17. The province of Prince Edward Island has the smallest number. The province of Ontario comes next, Nova Scotia next, and Quebec comes next. Quebec is only fourth in the list of all the nine provinces in the percentage of children between the ages of 7 and 14 who do not attend school. Or in other words, we stand fourth in general education in the Dominion of Canada. The province of British Columbia has 24 per cent; Alberta, 37·17 per cent; Saskatchewan, 33·29 per cent; Manitoba, 25 per cent; Ontario, 15 per cent; and Quebec, 19 per cent, between the ages of 7 and 14 not attending school. But the commissioners, after reviewing these statistics, make this reference to education throughout Canada, which is very interesting and very satisfactory to the people of the province of Quebec:

> In table 6 the percentage of the population 5 to 20 years of age attending school is given by age, periods and by sex for Canada and the provinces. For children under 6 years of age, Quebec, Nova Scotia and Ontario show the greatest proportion attending school, and the smallest percentage is shown by British Columbia and Alberta and New Brunswick in the order named.

In a country where over 20 per cent of the children between the ages of 7 and 14 never enter a school door, there is much to be done, and no apology need be offered for introducing a school debate in this House. During the few days prior to the introduction of this resolution, some very good friends wanted to know what attitude I would take, and they advised me that it would be well for me to keep out of it; but that is not my conception of the duty of a public man. I want to say that neither in this House nor out of it has any one of my French-Canadian fellow-citizens asked me what attitude I would take upon this proposed resolution that was to come before Parliament; and if I take an attitude here to-night it is not because of any idea of how it will affect me politically, but because I consider it is a duty to my fellow-citizens of French-Canadian origin, with whom I have lived for 40 years, and lived upon the best of terms, and whom I have found to be good neighbours and good friends. I would be an unworthy representative in this House if I were afraid to take a stand upon an issue of such importance. After having listened to the debate, the introductory speeches of those

who proposed and seconded the resolution, and the speeches made yesterday and to-day, I am encouraged to believe that the spirit of conciliation will prevail and that here in the capital city of Canada, where for some months children of school age who should have been attending school, have been walking and playing on the streets, the parents of these children will be satisfied and the children will be able to return to school and obtain such education as will qualify them for the duties of citizenship Every person admits that an uneducated people are a menace to the state, that children, to become useful citizens, must have such education as will qualify them to discharge their duties not only in their native province, but in all the provinces of Canada. I have had an experience of 20 years in school work in my home city, where I have been connected with the school board, and where the Protestants have a splendid system of elementary and advanced education; where our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, our French-speaking fellow-citizens, have a college for boys, a normal school for girls and a system of primary and elementary education that would be creditable to any city or town in the Dominion of Canada. You, Mr. Speaker, are a product of the Valleyfield schools, and I want to say here to this House that the people of Valleyfield, irrespective of race or religion or political sympathies, are proud to know that you, one of our boys, educated in our schools, have been qualified to take a position which to-day places you as the first commoner of the land.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBB: Now, Sir, I am not going to discuss this from a legal or a constitutional point of view. I am not a lawyer. I want to discuss it from an experience of 40 years in a bilingual community, where the people live together and try to respect each other's principles and prejudices. We hear many people in Canada who say that we should have but one language and one school. But when you ask them what language or what school, invariably they say: "Our language." Now, I want to speak frankly, in the few observations I have to make, to my friends from the great province of Ontario; what would be the position of the English-speaking minority in the province of Quebec if the influence and example of the English-speaking majority in the sister provinces should appeal to the French-speaking majority of the province of Quebec, and they should start in to hamper and to hinder the education of the English-speaking minority of that province? This school trouble, so acute in Ontario, is largely between the Irish or English-speaking Catholics and the French-speaking Catholics. I, a Protestant, a Presbyterian, want to appeal to my English-speaking Roman Catholic friends of the province of Ontario, I want them to remember that in the province of Quebec there is an English-speaking minority, where in many places the English-speaking and the French Catholics are about evenly divided. I want to ask them if they expect that their compatriots, the English-speaking Catholics in the province of Quebec, can hope for any better treatment from the French-speaking majority of that province than is given to their compatriots, the French-speaking minority in the province of Ontario?

The census of 1911 gives Ontario a population of 212,442 French-speaking citizens. They are the descendants of the pioneers of civilization in this country. When the redman roamed at will, did as he liked, for the redman's law at that time was might is right, I want my friends to remember that many of the French Canadian missionaries sacrificed their lives because they were freely offering education to the redman, who had as little regard for education as he had for life. In the opinion of the red man, I repeat, might was right. Unfortunately, that theory is not yet altogether extinct as we have witnessed in Alsace-Lorraine, and in Poland, where the Germans, as well as the Russians, have deprived the people of those countries of their rights, their liberties, and their language. It is because we do not believe in that theory or principle because our British ideals are those of freedom and liberty that we are to-day at war, and that 300,000 Canadians, representing the best blood of our nation, are to-day in arms ready to sacrifice their lives that they may restore to Belgium, to France, and to Alsace their rights and their liberties. Can we who remain at home here in Canada not do as much? Can we who remain at home here not give and take? Is it not possible for sober-minded citizens to sit down together and settle this acute difficulty which, as one speaker has said, might break out into rebellion. I think our French Canadian citizens have presented their claims very moderately. As a liberal and a supporter of the Liberal party, I stand upon

this issue exactly where my distinguished leader stands; where the Liberal party stood in 1896. We stand for provincial rights. As a citizen of the province of Quebec I have no right, nor do I desire, to dictate to the province of Ontario, or to meddle at all in the domestic affairs of that province. But, as a representative of the English-speaking Protestant minority of Quebec, I wish to appeal to my English speaking fellow-citizens in the province of Ontario. I wish them to remember that we, who are the great majority in the province of Ontario, are but a minority in the province of Quebec. Can we hope to expect any better treatment for our children from the French speaking majority in the province of Quebec than we, who are the English speaking majority in the province of Ontario, are ready to give to our French speaking fellow-citizens who go to that province? I am encouraged by the debate here to-day to hope that the people will take a sober view of this trouble, and that before this Parliament meets again this subject will be settled to the satisfaction of all interests. Let us remember, we who are the majority in the Dominion of Canada, the golden rule, and do to others as you would that others should do to you. Those who say that there should be but one language will remember that the Book of Genesis tells us that at one time in the history of the world, after the flood, there was but one language and one speech throughout the earth. Was the world any better then? Is it a disadvantage for men to have two languages? Happily, here in Canada, we have the English language which is the language of commerce, and the French language, which is the language of diplomacy.

I appeal to this Parliament, to men upon both sides, to English-speaking people and French-speaking people, to cease our bickerings. Let us take an example from our brothers who have gone to fight the battles of freedom and liberty. Each day the casualty list that comes to this country registers the names of English-speaking Canadians and French-speaking Canadians who have given their lives for freedom and liberty. Let us take an example from those men who are standing shoulder to shoulder for these principles. Let us try to sit down together and see if we cannot settle once and for all this question, and do away with this language agitation which surely is not to the benefit of this country.

Mr. Oliver (Edmonton) and Mr. Macdonell (South Toronto) rising together,

Mr. SPEAKER: It is customary for the Speaker, when he sees an hon. member, to have some idea as to whether he is in favour of the resolution before the House or opposed to it. I do not know what the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) will do, nor do I know what the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) will do. I promised the hon. member for Edmonton to see him after the hon. member for Huntingdon, and if the question can be settled this way, I can promise the hon. member for South Toronto that I will see him next.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): I intended to say that I took part in this debate with very great regret, but, in view of what has just occurred, it would seem as if I were somewhat insistent in taking part, thanks to your kind decision. It is a fact, however, that I do regret most sincerely being compelled to take part in this debate, because I am compelled to oppose the resolution offered in such eloquent terms by my hon. friend from Kamouraska. I regret the fact from many points of view. I did what I could to prevent the question from coming before this House. I voted to keep it from coming before the House.

9 p.m. I noticed that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) agreed with me that it was undesirable that it should come before the House, but, unfortunately while they spoke one way, they voted the other; and the question is here to be dealt with.

One of the reasons why I regret so much having to take part in the debate is that the question is one which might very well be accompanied by acrimonious discussion. That was the reason why I did not desire to have it come before the House. I am bound to say, however, that in view of the tone which was given to the debate by the mover of the resolution, by his seconder, by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and indeed, I may say, by all those who have taken part in it, it does not appear to me that the result which I feared is likely. Instead of injury arising from the free discussion of this matter, by a frank consideration of the facts of the case from different points of view, as suggested by my honoured leader, we shall in all probability arrive at a better mutual understanding of what must be admitted to be a very difficult question.

I do not wish it to be understood that I take the ground that was taken by some of those who have spoken, that because

this is a provincial matter it should not be discussed in this House. I take it that this Parliament is the highest law in this Dominion, and that nothing can occur in any part of the Dominion but that this Parliament has the right to discuss it, and, if a substantial injustice is being done, then it is the duty of this Parliament to discuss it. So far as the question that is immediately before the House is concerned, I am not prepared to say that it is of such a character, or that it is not of such a character. I do not propose to deal with it from that point of view. I have been greatly impressed by the eloquence with which the cause of those who supported the resolution has been presented, and I can assure them of my most sincere sympathy in the views they have expressed and the reasons that are behind those views. They are influenced by tradition, by sentiment, by every feeling of the human heart that is entitled to respect. For that reason it is still more my regret that I cannot see as they do. This Canada is a big country, and being a big country, there are various conditions in its various and distant parts. So, while the principles of toleration, of conciliation, even the principles of liberalism which have been appealed to so eloquently by my friends, may be entirely applicable to the conditions existing in one part of the country, as they propose to apply them, they may be altogether inapplicable to the different conditions existing in another part of the country, supposing we wanted to apply them in the same way. I would like if, when they speak of conciliation, when they speak of toleration, they would be good enough to remember that the conditions here are not the conditions there, and that a certain set of principles which might be perfectly right and good, as they propose to apply them to conditions here, may be entirely wrong and to the disadvantage of the country, if they were to be applied in the same way under conditions that exist yonder.

I am here as a representative of the West, as those who have spoken up to the present time are representatives of the East. There could be nothing brought out more clearly than that which has been brought out by this debate and that is the difference between the east and the west. The claims that have been made on behalf of this resolution have been based upon conditions as they exist here, the result of occupation and settlement for hundreds of years. Certain conditions have grown up, with or without the sanction of law, which are entitled to be respected by every one, which secure the reverence of many and which are to be defended as earnestly and as honestly as these gentlemen have defended them to-day. This outlook that sees the past, and looks at the future only in the light of the past, fails to take note of the fact that in the West we have an entirely different condition. It seemed good to the men of light and leading, in what is now eastern Canada, many years ago that they should not be compelled to restrict their activities to the valley of the St. Lawrence or to the shores of the Gulf, but that they should extend their dominion to the western sea. That brought about their control of the prairies and the distant mountains in order that there might be built up a greater Canada, a Canada that would be worthy the ambitions, the energies and the activities of those men already settled on the banks of the St. Lawrence and on the Gulf. It is as one of the representatives of the conditions that have arisen in the West, as the result of the foresight and enterprise of the men who played their part here, that I desire to speak to-night and it is because of the difference in conditions that I am compelled to refuse to support the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe).

Speaking of population, stress has been laid on the number of French speaking people in Quebec and of the French speaking population of Ontario. There is a population west of the lakes to be considered, and if I have the support of other representatives from that part of the country, and I believe I have, then in what I desire to say, I, as well as they, speak for nearly 2,000,000 people. We speak for more than a quarter of the population of this Dominion at the present time. But that is not the heavy part of our responsibility. We speak for a part of the people of Canada, but we speak for a part of Canada which in time to come will be the heart of Canada and where the greatness of Canada will be built and demonstrated, if ever it is demonstrated. The heart of Canada for generations, for centuries, has been on the banks of the St. Lawrence and along the lakes. But, it is only a truism to say that in the years to come the heart of Canada will lie between the Red river and the Rocky Mountains. It is on the population that will occupy that country, it is on the conditions under which they will occupy that country, the

conditions under which they carry on their affairs in that country, that the greatness of Canada will depend. That fact is based upon the material possibilities which, by the bounty of the Creator, exist there to an extent and to a degree to which they do not exist in other parts of Canada; and because of that condition we must expect occupation and development to correspond. The development of the country is the result of the exertions of the people, and the success of the people depends in everything upon the education of the children. And so this question, which is so important to the minds of our friends here from eastern Canada—and they are certainly able to express that importance in the most eloquent language—is no less important to us who are charged with the responsibility of directing in some measure the development of that western country, the heart of Canada that is to be.

I do not wish to take exception to what my hon. friends have said, but if I took exception at all it would be to the attitude they have assumed, that theirs is the only point of view. There is another point of view, the point of view that I have feebly tried to express; and it is entitled to just as much consideration—I say it boldly and unshrinkingly—entitled to just as much consideration, and is just as sacred a point of view in the interests of this great country as is theirs, let them express it with all the eloquence they may, and though my expression be as feeble as it is.

The provinces west of the Great Lakes—I will take the liberty of speaking of the four provinces, and if I should trespass in any way there are plenty of representatives of those provinces here to-night to correct me—I speak of the four provinces with their possibilities of population, and the need of education amongst that population. Surely, if the task that is before the handful of people scattered over those prairies and through the mountain valleys is to be discharged to the credit of themselves and to the benefit of this great Dominion, we must have educational efficiency to the last degree. We cannot achieve the success we ought to achieve, or realize the expectations we hold regarding the success of our efforts, unless we have the highest mark of educational efficiency amongst the population that is born and bred and reared in that country. That is an idea that is absodutely grounded in and—may I say—dominates the mind of the people of that country. It is as sacred to them as are the language and the traditions of their race to our friends from the East who have spoken here yesterday and to-day. What is it that strikes the eye of any traveller through the Northwest as he passes by train or by road through the country? Wherever he finds a knot of people settled in village, town or city, the landmark that strikes his eye is the school, the biggest building in the place, and the best that the money of the people can afford. It is just as much the landmark in our western provinces as are those beautiful churches and spires in the province of Quebec, and represents, again I repeat, just as sacred an idea. The problem of securing efficient education to the population born and raised in that country is the greatest, the most important, the most pressing and the most thoroughly appreciated problem that is before those who are charged with the leading of public thought in that country. Unless the settler who goes into that country with ambition, with energy, with hope and expectation for his own material success—but still more, in the huge majority of cases, for the success, material and moral of his children—unless he gets reasonable facilities for their fair education he will not submit to the disabilities of pioneer life. He will find some easier way; he will drift into the towns for the sake of the education of his children. So I say that the problem of establishing facilities for the efficient education of the rural population of those Prairie Provinces is the great problem, not only for those provinces, but, in the long run, for this Dominion itself. I appeal to all men of fair mind in this House if the men who are charged with the responsibility of providing those facilities should be hampered or hindered in any way; if, on the contrary, they should not be encouraged and supported in every way possible. The man who leaves his original location and moves on to the western prairies in the expectation of establishing himself with prosperity for himself and his family there, has ambition, energy and hope, and he leaves the old condition, wherever it may be, with the intention of securing and establishing a new condition in the country to which he goes. Therefore may I say to our friends who have spoken so eloquently and so ably of traditions, of historic rights, that many of the people of the West—I do not say all, because there are exceptions to every rule—but I would not hesitate to say that the vast majority

of them have gone there in the hope of getting away from many of the traditions that hampered or hindered them, or that they found distasteful in the country from which they came. They did not go to the West to perpetuate disabilities under which they suffered elsewhere.

To speak of school problems as they exist there, may I take the liberty of saying that I have the right to speak with some degree of authority so far as the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are concerned? I was a member of the Northwest Council that put into force the first school law in those two provinces. I may say that I personally drafted the first School Bill that was submitted to the Northwest Council; I was a subscriber to the first public school —not a legally-sanctioned school—erected in those two prairie provinces; I was a member of the Northwest Legislature when the school law that was passed in 1884 was changed in form and substance at a later date. So that I may claim to have some knowledge of conditions as they exist there in the matter of education, and particularly of rural education, because I have been most of my life in the West, and, although living actually in a village, town, or city as the place has grown, I have been in absolutely close touch with the pioneers, and to-day represent a constituency of pioneers.

The problem that has to be dealt with is rendered difficult on account of many reasons. You must have the children or you cannot have schools, and you must have money or you cannot have schools. The large majority of people go into that western country to settle, not because they have money, but because they have no money; and, owing to the system of apportionment of the land, they are settled very far apart as judged by the standards that prevail in this part of the country. Therefore you have a scattered population of poor people who are anxiously desirous of the education of their children, and the problem is how to provide them with that education in such a way that it shall be efficient. Besides that, let it be remembered that, owing to climatic conditions and this sparseness of settlement, many of the schools can be conducted only during the summer season, so that the children throughout a vast portion of that prairie area have only six months in each year in which they have an opportunity of attending school. That is the condition as I find it. I ask: how are you going to accommodate that condition to the demands that are made, not in the resolution but in the speeches that have been made in support of it, to secure to each race and tongue that settles in that country the teaching in its own language?

There is another condition in which the features differ. While in eastern Canada you will find the people settled very largely in communities of similar speech and race, a French settlement here and an English settlement there, when men go into the prairies to pick out their land they choose the land rather than their neighbours. The first man who takes a quarter-section in a township does not know who the next man is going to be who will take a quarter-section in that township. There is no possibility of segregating the different languages and races and nationalities. You are crying for people to develop the land, and as they come you give them the land. The consequence is that in no part of the country with which I am familiar do you find any considerable population of only one race or nationality except in the large part of the country that is occupied by English-speaking people. You will find people of different races and nationalities in almost every school district where the people are not English-speaking.

The regrettable feature of this debate, so far as it has gone, has been the suggestion that those who are not prepared to subscribe to this resolution are of that mind because they are not willing to accord to the French language or to the French nation that consideration to which they are entitled. I want to say for myself—and, I am sure, for those who think with me—that we take no second place to anybody in our admiration for the French language or in our appreciation of the French race, of what it is, of what it has been, of what it is doing to-day, or of what it will do.

And I want it to be distinctly and thoroughly understood that there is no question of race antagonism or race opposition because of the conditions we find in these prairie provinces, and which we must meet if we are to do justice to the people who are there, of whatever race they may be.

The conditions in the province of Manitoba resemble in large measure those in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta; they are not identical, but in some degree similar. In the province of Manitoba, under the regulation that was made, —that which was called the Laurier-

Greenway agreement, an arrangement made in the very best of faith and with the very best intentions,—it was provided that there might be teaching of French or any other language where there were ten children of that language in the district able to attend school. That agreement was made at a time when there was no question of any other languages than French and English. The words " any other language " were put in, but, as I understand the matter, the object in view was simply to remove a grievance of our French-speaking fellow-citizens of the province of Manitoba, that we might have peace and co-operation in the building up of the country. But circumstances arose which were not contemplated when this agreement was made. There came a large immigration of people speaking other languages. There was an inflow of people of Austrian nationality, speaking the Russian language. There was already there a considerable German population which, no doubt, was augmented in the general inrush from Europe. There were Poles, and—I am not able to call the whole list. Many nationalities came into the province of Manitoba, and all these made their demands upon the Government of that province for recognition of their rights as conveyed in that Laurier-Greenway agreement which had been primarily intended as a recognition of the French language, but which they claimed covered their own demands as well—and I am bound to say that, as I understand the wording, it did. The Government of the province of Manitoba saw fit to accede to these demands. I do not wish to introduce anything controversial here; I do not wish to find fault at the moment with what the Government of Manitoba did, nor do I wish to justify it, but only to state the fact. The fact is that the Government of Manitoba of that day, if I may be excused the word, went the limit in meeting the conditions of bilingual and polylingual education. They provided for training schools, I believe, for French, Germans, Ruthenians, Poles—it is not necessary to go over the whole list. They did everything to fulfil the idea expressed so eloquently by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) to-day, in giving everybody everything he wanted in the way of education. Now, that policy was tried out, and, for the sake of argument, I will assume that it was tried out in good faith. But the result was simply inefficiency and confusion. There resulted in Manitoba an educational condition that was certainly unfortunate and that was not beneficial to the people of the province at large, much less was it beneficial to the people who were supposed to be benefited by the so-called advantages of education in their own language.

It has been argued here to-day that it is possible to give a competent education in two languages at the same time. I am perfectly willing to admit that it is possible, under certain circumstances. Given competent teachers, given ample opportunities and facilities, given clever pupils, there is no manner of doubt that it can be done. But, under the conditions that prevail in the province of Manitoba, especially in the rural or village schools, where the population is small to begin with; where the people are not well off—poor, I may say—where the term of teaching is very short; where it is not possible to secure teachers of high class who can teach both languages, and where the people are so scattered that they cannot get together, the only result that can follow is the result that did follow—absolute inefficiency in education. It is not a question, to my mind, of racial preference or racial perpetuation that is at issue in that province. That may be the issue in Ontario, or Quebec, or any other province; but, as a representative of the West, I want to say it is not the issue in the western province. The issue is, to fit the children born in or coming to these provinces to fight the battle of life on equal terms with others. And to my mind and I believe this is the way it appeals to the people of the West, whether the child be of French or German parentage, or any other, whatever the conditions may be behind that child— and they may be as great and as noble as any of our friends can claim, and as I am willing to admit—if that child is not sufficiently and efficiently educated to stand on an equality with other children in other localities, it is unduly handicapped in the race of life and has not received justice or fair play at the hands of those who are in authority and who are responsible for its education. That is the principle that underlies the administration of school matters in the prairie provinces and British Columbia to-day.

The injustice of the Manitoba Government as it stands to-day has been alluded to. I regret that these expressions should have been used, because they might lead to a very contentious argument here. I will not make my statement contentious, although

I must say that I am inclined to resent the imputations that are passed against that government for its action. Nor do I wish the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) to think that I am desirous of making imputations against him or against the provincial government of which he was a member. I merely wish to state the fact that, whereas the Norris Government, when it came to power, found an absolutely impossible position in regard to the non-English-speaking public schools and population of the province of Manitoba, and the public needs demanded that they should make a change in that condition. The public interests demanded it; the interests of the children, the interests of the people, the interests of the province, and the interests of the whole Dominion of Canada, demanded that they should take such measures as would give to the children born or being reared in that province the best education that they could be given, and they could not do that by attempting to give two educations when they had not either the time or the money to enable them to give one effectively. I do not know how the action of the Norris Government will turn out, but I can only say that it was taken in absolute good faith, with the intention of doing the best that could be done for the interests that were placed in the hands of that government. And may I go so far as to say this, that if the action of the Norris Government does not turn out as successfully as we might hope, it will be because of a lack of that appreciation of the necessities of the situation and that co-operation which the Government should receive at the hands of the people who are most deeply interested in the efficient education of their children?

In the province of Alberta, the conditions have been somewhat different. The provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan formed the old Northwest territories, and under the legislation of the Northwest Council and legislature a certain school system was adopted; and, whether by accident or design I am not going to say, in that part of the old Northwest territories which now forms the province of Alberta, the education of the children has been carried on in the English language from the beginning of the establishment of schools in that province. We have in that province large and important settlements of French-speaking people. A large majority of them, I think, have come from the United States, and the large majority of those people speak English quite as well as I do. There are large settlements of German speaking people, most of them coming from the Empire of Austria. These people came without any knowledge of the English language. There are also large settlements of Russian-speaking people, coming from Austria but of Russian race. When they came they had no knowledge of the English language. There are also very large settlements of Scandinavian folk. They mostly came from the United States and they, of course, mostly had a good knowledge of English before they came, and so I hardly speak of a language problem in their case. But we have, at any rate, those four non-English speaking nationalities in Alberta in very large numbers, so that we are in identically the same position as Manitoba is, having a multi-language problem on our hands in our Department of Education. What occurred was this: When the German settlers came in they were poor; they were desirous of education. When the Russian settlers came in they were poor; they were desirous of education. School teachers were difficult to get, and only English-speaking teachers could be secured. English speaking teachers went into the German settlements and the Russian settlements where the parents knew no English, and they began to teach the schools there in the English language. The result is that you can travel through those German and Russian settlements to-day, and you will find that while the old people cannot speak English, the young people, both German and Russian, speak English just as well as you and I do, without an accent. The child who learns any language correctly has a vast advantage in all its after-life over the child who learns that language incorrectly.

I have heard much as to the necessity of teaching children through the medium of their own language, and I am not going to dispute the desirability of doing that where it is practicable. I am not arguing against that at all where it is practicable; but I am saying that the experience of the province of Alberta is that where it is not practicable it is not necessary, and the ultimate result is to the advantage of the children in that they learn the language from teachers who speak it correctly, and so they learn to speak it correctly. If my hon. friend the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Weichel) is not present I will take the liberty of making an allusion. Reference has been made to

our German settlers in the province of Ontario and their special privileges in the matter of language. We have in Alberta, in my constituency—and I hope I will not lose any votes by what I am going to say, although I may—we have a large settlement of German-speaking people from Austria, and we have also in that great settlement some of the friends of my hon. friend from North Waterloo, who come from the county of Waterloo, Ont., who were born and raised in that good county, and certainly they are most desirable settlers and most desirable citizens from every point of view. But, when it comes to a question of language, they are associated with the German-speaking people from Austria, of whom I have spoken, whose children have learned English in that particular locality, and have learned it correctly. These people say of our friends from Waterloo: "Why, they have not any language; they do not speak German and they cannot speak English." Now, this is the condition that exists, and it is a result of the fact that the so-called English teaching in the Edmonton district was English teaching, and I presume that the so-called English teaching in the county of Waterloo in the early days was not purely English teaching; it was probably teaching by persons who had not a good knowledge of the English language. That is without racial prejudice, without reflection on anybody; it is a statement of fact; and, when our friends here complain about certain regulations in the province of Ontario—and I am not going to say that their complaints, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, are not absolutely well founded, nor do I say that they are well founded, I am not arguing that point—I say that if they transfer their criticism of the conditions in Ontario to the conditions in the prairies of the West, and make the same objections to them as they do to the conditions here, in my humble judgment they are entirely wrong, and it is for that reason that I am compelled to disagree with the resolution which they have brought before the House and with the arguments which they have made in respect to it.

The province of Alberta has always held to the principle of English schools, of teaching English in the schools, of using the English language to teach English in the schools, and the result has been that we have made a success of it for those of our citizens who did not originally speak English, as well as for those who do. The child whose father came from Galicia, whether of German or of Russian race, starts out in the battle of life just as well equipped as the child whose father came from the province of Ontario. That is the purpose we have in view, and I submit that we are not trespassing on the rights of anybody when we achieve that purpose. I maintain that we are fulfilling the obligation that is laid upon us to do the best we can for the people that we have and for the country that we want to build up.

In the province of British Columbia the conditions are somewhat different; the members of that province will pardon me if I refer to them. There have never been any but English schools there; there has never been any question about any other language than English being used in the schools, so far as my information goes, and the reasons are very much the same as those which prevail in the prairie country, although in the one case the country is mountainous and in the other prairie. In the interior valleys of the province of British Columbia the population is necessarily small in many cases, and the people are in such a financial condition that it would be an imposition to impose a bilingual education upon them. As a consequence, it has never been done, and I do not imagine that even the most extreme up-

10 p.m. holder of bilingual schools would say it should be done, once he realized the situation as it exists in the interior of that province. Of course, in the cities in that province, as in the cities of any other western province, we can give any kind of education we like. We can adopt any of the languages in our schools if we so desire. But that is not the great question. The great question is the education of the people on the land, in the rural school, the satisfying of the legitimate ambition of the men who are making the country; and it would be a cruel thing to say to those men, whether they spoke French, Russian, German, or any other language, that they who have gone there to stake their labour, their money, their prospects, and indeed their lives and those of their families in making a success in that country, should be debarred from achieving that success on behalf of their children, by imposing upon them a double language, or a treble or quadruple language, instead of only one language, the only language they

can afford, under such circumstances, to have imparted successfully to their children.

Mr. Speaker, I have already stated, and I will repeat, that I do not wish, in anything I have said, to suggest interference in the discussion of school questions in the province of Ontario, in the province of Quebec, or in any other of the eastern provinces. I recognize that under the conditions which prevail in these provinces they have their difficulties, their limitations, and their frictions that must be allayed and adjusted. I do not propose to discuss them; I leave them to those who are better posted and more interested than I am, although, of course, I am interested in the wellbeing of eastern Canada just as the people of eastern Canada are interested in the wellbeing of western Canada. But while I am willing to accept the conditions, as discussed, in regard to the school systems of eastern Canada, I appeal to our friends who have brought this resolution forward to recognize the limitations, the conditions, the aspirations, and the ambitions of western Canada, and to give us the same consideration in dealing with the problems that are under our administration as we are willing to give them in regard to the problems that are under their administration. If they insist on applying the standards which they maintain, and which may be perfectly applicable to the conditions prevailing in the country with which they are familiar, to our country, where the conditions are entirely different; or, if they accuse us of intolerance, of sectionalism, or of a desire to wipe out or injure anybody, I say they are not fair, and they are not entitled to adopt that attitude towards us, as we do not wish to adopt that attitude towards them. Let the problems of eastern Canada be dealt with as they may be, but let the problems of western Canada be dealt with as they may be; that is all we ask. If we cannot agree, all I suggest is that we agree to disagree, because I do not wish that any man should have it in his heart or mind to suggest that I am guilty of any intolerance, or of any racial or sectional prejudice of any kind. Our friends on this side of the House have proclaimed themselves as Liberals. They are Liberals, very good Liberals. I claim to be a Liberal, too; just as good a Liberal as they are, and just as strong for conciliation as against coercion, and for the maintenance of the rights of minorities where those rights can be maintained without becoming wrongs, either of the majority or of a minority. I am just as ready to go as far as they will go in maintaining rights; but I am not prepared to maintain what I believe to be a wrong because it is called a right.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I apologise to the House for rising at this late moment in the debate to add a few words to what has been so well said on both sides. I may say at the outset that I very greatly regret the necessity for speaking on a resolution of this kind. To my mind it is to be doubly regretted that this resolution is now before the House. I think it is untimely and inappropriate, both because of the undesirability of raising the cry that this motion will raise and has raised in the country, and because a matter of still more importance, and one that I think we all have at heart, is engaging our attention and that is the purpose of prosecuting this war with a single aim and a single idea. It is no time for the people of Canada, much less those who are in the Parliament of Canada, to have their attention distracted from the one object of pursuing the prosecution of this war with every possible diligence until we meet with that final triumph which we believe is in store and which will no doubt come to pass provided our united energies are bent in that direction.

I have no desire to censure anybody. I am going to give you my opinion and I believe it is the opinion of a great majority of the people of this country whether they come from Quebec or Ontario or whether they come from the West. The ineptitude of this resolution has been pointed out in this debate by many speakers. I do not desire to go over the arguments which have been presented but they are very apparent. The legislature was sitting at Toronto for months this winter and almost immediately after that House adjourns we find the appearance of this mischief maker in the House. It seems to me that that was the proper place, and that the time to take the case up, discuss it, and fight it if need be, even if conditions existed which would have justified bringing into that House such a resolution as this. If anything were needed to confirm me in the belief that there is no justification for the introduction of this question into this House, it is the fact that, although the question has been discussed for two whole days, it is quite evident that

members of this House are still very much in the dark. We are at the present time trying a government behind the back of that government. We are making an investigation into matters that we know not of. The Government that we are asked to censure, because that is virtually the tenor of this resolution, are not here, they have no representative here, and no means of meeting this argument. I appeal to business men, to professional men, to fair-minded men. Is it right, is it fair, to proceed farther with this investigation behind the back of the Ontario Government without a knowledge on their part of what is being done, without an opportunity of meeting what is being said, because, as has been said in this debate, it may be a matter for conciliation, a matter for getting together? No one knows what the argument of the Ontario Government may be. They may have an argument which will convince my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, if they had a chance of presenting it—I do not know. But, it must be remembered that the leader of the Opposition said: Let us face this matter, let us investigate it, let us get to the bottom of it. What kind of an ex parte investigation are we engaged in here? It is purely and simply an ex parte investigation. This afternoon my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) was discussing something that took place at Windsor, where, apparently, the schools were disfranchised. They were, he represented, not allowed to proceed with the operations of the schools and they were either closed up or threatened with being closed up because of certain objections that were made by the Ontario Government. The hon. gentleman, prefaced his remarks in regard to the situation at Windsor, by the statement that these schools were closed up under Regulation 17. I happen to have a statement of the Minister of Education of Ontario, which appeared in the public press a few days ago, in regard to these very schools at Windsor: He says:

> It has been contended, that the position of the French language in the Windsor Separate Schools is a proof that the department is preventing French-speaking children in those schools from learning their own language. These schools are not under Regulation 17 and accordingly the right to introduce French teaching into them, whether they were schools in which French had never hitherto been taught, or schools where it had been taught for a time and then abandoned, would be determined by Regulation 12 (2) which does not apply unless where French is the prevailing language. French is not the prevailing language in Windsor, according to every test which can be applied in such matters.

So that after my hon. friend spent a great amount of time and much eloquence in relation to these Windsor schools, we find that they were not under Regulation 17 at all. I do not desire to go into the details of these various classes in which the French language may be taught. We have the one class in which small children who are not acquainted with the English language are taught in French until they can learn English. As they grow older they learn English and they continue under English tuition in the higher forms of the schools. It is the duty of the teacher to instruct them in that way. I will quote from the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1914, chapter 266, the provision as to what the duties of the teacher are; they are all stated there. Section 84 says:

> It shall be the duty of every teacher—

And so on . Subsection b:

> —to use the English language in instruction and in all communications with the pupils in regard to the discipline and the management of the school, except where it is impracticable to do so by reason of the pupil not understanding English, but recitations requiring the use of a text-book may be conducted in the language of the text-book.

The Government seems to have done all they could to meet conditions where the pupils are not able to understand the English language. It does seem to me that, having regard to the fact that Ontario is an English-speaking province, and that the English language is in use there, they have gone as far as they could to meet the condition of French children who are not familiar with the English language.

The hon. member for Nicolet this afternoon spoke about other languages in other countries. He made out a great case of hardship for the French language in Ontario by citing Wales and I think Poland and other countries. He pointed out that those countries had their own languages. Of course they have, and so has Quebec her French language; but the Welsh people, or the Poles, do not ask that their language should follow them into any land to which they go in any part of the world. They have their own language at their own home, and so it is with our French people of Quebec; they have their own language there.

Mr. MARCIL: Is a Frenchman in Ontario away from his own country?

Mr. MACDONELL: No more than a Welshman when he goes to England?

Mr. MARCIL: Is the descendant of a Frenchman whose family has lived in the Detroit river settlement for a hundred and fifty years a newcomer to Ontario?

Mr. MACDONELL: He is entitled to only such rights and privileges as the constitution of the province of Ontario allows him. Beyond a mere scattering, however, there was no settlement of French Canadian people at Windsor or elsewhere in Ontario until recent years. I will come later on to what my hon. friend has in mind with regard to the so-called settlement of parts of the province of Ontario in the early days by French Canadians. The French of Ontario are amply protected in the use of their own language in the schools by regulation 15 of the present Ontario law. Paragraph 12 of the regulation reads:

12. (2) In school sections where the French or German language prevails, the board may, in addition to the courses of study prescribed herein, require instruction to be given in French or German reading, grammar and composition to such pupils as are directed by their parents or guardians to study either of these languages, and in all such cases the authorized textbooks in French and German shall be used.

Surely that is amply protecting their privileges. Where they do not speak English they can use their own text books. I do not desire to labour at length the Constitutional question. But as a matter of fact the motion of my hon. friend rests on nothing that gives it fundamental strength. The Constitutional rights on which it is alleged to be founded do not exist. I think the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution went back as far as the Treaty of 1763, after the conquest of Canada, and the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) followed him on practically the same line, pointing out that the language was secured to the French people at the time Canada was ceded to Great Britain by the French King. Every matter that required consideration at that time was dealt with in that Treaty, and although it preserved to the French people their laws and customs, their property, and liberty, and so on, the Treaty made no mention whatever of anything in connection with the French language. I have not been able to find any authority for the statement that the French language was mentioned at that time. It does seem to me that the only thing giving the French language any status in Canada is to be found in the British North America Act. We are all familiar with section 133 of that Act, which simply gives the rights that are so well known. It in no way, shape or form relates to the French or any other language, or includes education, and when we come to the clauses in the British North America Act dealing with education, we find that the provinces have exclusive jurisdiction. Provision is made there for whatever action the Parliament of Canada thinks it necessary to take under the Constitution. Cases of this kind, no doubt, were in the minds of the Fathers of Confederation. It was conceded that the provinces should have exclusive jurisdiction over education. It was carefully provided, however, that denominational schools were not to be prejudicially affected, and that the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Ontario and the Protestant minority in Quebec were to be protected. Provision was also made for remedial legislation. So the whole question was dealt with and considered at length, and no doubt every provision was included that it was thought wise and proper to include. There was no thought of giving the Dominion jurisdiction over educational legislation, and no thought of permitting interference by the Dominion with the provinces with regard to education, with the exception of the matters I have already mentioned, which are dealt with in subsections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of section 93. The very fact that these exceptions are mentioned by the Act—that the denominational schools should not be affected, that the Roman Catholic minority in Ontario and the Protestant minority in Quebec should be protected, and the provision regarding remedial legislation shows conclusively that these things were all considered at that time, and the fact that the exceptions are mentioned is a good reason for saying that everything else in the nature of Dominion interference is excluded; what is mentioned remains, and what is not mentioned is excluded. The general language of the Act is perfectly clear as to that. The motion of my hon. friend is introduced simply on the ad misericordiam plea. It is simply a plea for better terms and consideration, that has been set forth by the mover and seconder of the motion, and by other hon. gentlemen who have backed them up.

With regard to the provincial legislation, we are asked to exercise a measure of control over the province of Ontario, whether it be by direction, by admonition, or by appeal. We are asked to issue some kind of

a mandate to the province of Ontario. Now, under our Constitution, what control, if any, has the Dominion over the provinces? It has a certain control: the power of disallowance, for instance, of legislation that is objectionable to the Dominion; and, in matters of administration, the Governor General has a certain control over the Lieutenant Governors of the provinces, and in concurrent legislation, on certain matters the Dominion has also a certain control. The power of the Dominion Government is specifically laid down in the British North America Act. Perhaps here I might make a quotation from that very admirable book of Dr. Todd's on Parliamentary Government. On page 623, dealing with Dominion interference in provincial matters, he says:

> The Houses of Parliament ought to refrain from any overt acts and even from the formal enunciation of any opinion in respect to matters which do not come within the sphere of their jurisdiction as a Federal Legislature.

We have here an authority on the Constitution giving a word of caution against any interference with the provinces by the Dominion. He makes it plain that there should be no interference except in matters that are authorized by the provisions of the British North America Act.

Reference has been made to the early introduction of the French language into Canada, and the earliest reference was to the treaty generally known as the Treaty of Paris in 1763.

Mr. MARCIL: The treaty of 1763 is the Treaty of Versailles.

Mr. MACDONELL: Some hon. gentleman, I think the hon. member for Nicolet, stated that in 1774, by the Quebec Act, the French language was introduced into and took a root in the province of Ontario. The answer to that is very plain. Whatever reference there is in the Quebec Act to the French language, that Act has no reference to what is now the province of Ontario, because there was no such thing then as Ontario, scarcely even a bare settlement in that part of the country. Even had there been we find that, as soon as Upper Canada and Lower Canada were separated and the province of Upper Canada was founded, the very first Act of the first session of the first legislature of that province in 1791 declared that it was a British province and that the laws of England were to be brought into force in Upper Canada in regard to property, civil rights, and so on. So that even if it could be said by implication that the French language was introduced into that territory by the Quebec Act of 1774, that Act was certainly made of no avail by the Act of 1791 which I have just mentioned.

The remark made a moment ago by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) brings to mind the fact that some French people settled in the province of Ontario. Far be it from me to detract for one minute from the courage, the heroism, the adventurous spirit, the enterprise and the splendid character, generally of the French in the early days of this country. They were the great pioneers who opened up this country. To-day, however, we are dealing with living facts; we are dealing, as representatives of the people, with this resolution, and we cannot have our minds led away by our emotions; we must deal with the question according to the necessities and the facts and law of the case. It is very interesting to listen to the story of the settlement of Ontario by the voyageurs and other French settlers; but, as a matter of fact, the province of Ontario was settled by the United Empire Loyalists who came to Upper Canada after the outbreak of the American revolutionary war, and there were very few, if any French in Upper Canada at that time and very few came for a long time afterwards. As the right hon. leader of the Opposition said yesterday, they used the great waterways of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes to go to the far West, but they did not use the shores of the Great Lakes for the purpose of settlement. Although the French came there in certain numbers, the settlement was very scattered, a few going to Windsor. The French settlement in Ontario is of later date, and I suppose that is why the question of the French language in the schools has not become acute until the present time.

Let us consider the history of the school question in the province of Ontario, because that is the place where the claim in regard to the rights of the French is made, and it is according to the laws of that province and the laws of the Dominion governing the provinces that we have to decide all rights with regard to education and language. Prior to 1840 there were very few educational facilities in the province of Ontario; it was not until 1863 that the school laws took any definite shape. It is of some importance to understand the facts in connection with the passing of the school law of 1863, and I therefore state the facts concerning it:

> In this Bill, that is, the Act of 1863, as accepted and passed were two principal stipu-

lations: First, that Catholics in their schools should have the right of instruction in their own religious principles; second, that these Catholic schools should be as completely subject to governmental regulations as the public schools.—The Bill proved acceptable to its distinguished authors.

What was done in 1863 was the establishment of separate schools in the province of Ontario, with those two principles: that the minority should have the right to teach their religion, but subject always to governmental inspection. That Act was passed by the Government of the United Provinces, and that legislation, as hon. gentlemen no doubt know, was made the basis of the school clauses in the British North America Act: and it is worthy of note that that school law of 1863 was agreed to by all the Catholic bishops of the then United Provinces, including the bishops of Kingston, Toronto, and Ottawa, in Ontario, and Quebec, Montreal, and Three Rivers, in the province of Quebec.

The right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition yesterday mentioned the fact that it was in 1885 that the trouble with regard to the use of the French language in the province of Ontario first arose. That was when Sir Oliver Mowat was in power in that province. Conditions were not satisfactory then, and a commission was appointed in 1889 to inquire into the question. Another commission was appointed in 1893, and another in 1910, and these difficulties were grappled with and largely overcome. In 1910, Dr. F. W. Merchant, Chief Inspector of Public and Separate Schools, was appointed a commissioner to investigate and report upon the English-French schools, public and separate, of the province, and this is a synopsis of his report from a statement given by the Minister of Education of Ontario:

The report of Dr. Merchant, which was completed in 1912, was based upon personal inspection of 269 schools in which the French language was either a subject of study or was used by the teacher as the medium of communication or instruction. The report dealt with the whole subject as an educational problem. The conditions found to exist have probably not changed materially in the four years that have elapsed since. A summary of this report will, therefore, be a fair index of the problem as it exists at present. The conditions were not satisfactory. Many uncertificated teachers without any professional training, were in the schools; and of those who held temporary certificates, about 50 per cent came from the province of Quebec. The attendance was irregular, the younger pupils being kept at home during the severe winter weather, the older pupils in spring and autumn.

That was the condition when the legislature dealt with the matter and passed the following resolution in the session of 1911. which is the basis of the portions of the school law of Ontario with regard to the French language. I will read that resolution, because it is important; it was carried unanimously, there not being one dissenting vote:

Resolved, that the English language shall be the language of instruction and of all communications with the pupils in the public and separate schools of the province, except where, in the opinion of the Department of Education, it is impracticable by reason of pupils not understanding English.

The French members of the legislature voted for that, and this is verbatim the language of the French school laws of Ontario.

Mr. MARCIL: With the hon. gentleman's permission, I desire, with a view to eliciting information, to put to him the same question as I put to the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) last night. Did Mr. Racine, who represented Russell, inquire whether the adoption of this resolution would change in any way the regulations with regard to the French minority?

Mr. MACDONELL: I do not know anything about Mr. Racine. What the hon. gentleman has said affords me another argument. It proves the unfairness of bringing into this arena matters that belong to the province of Ontario. Sir James Whitney is dead, and the records of these proceedings are in Toronto. No doubt the hon. gentleman would be answered if the Government of Ontario were asked the question he asks me. I am not familiar with the details of these matters I was not a member of the legislature. Had this discussion come on in the proper way, had the resolution been put on the Order Paper and hon. members given an opportunity to consider it and prepare themselves, I believe that the discussion would have been more informing and useful than this which has been thrust thus suddenly upon the House. I desire to read a telegram which has been received from Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, Acting Minister of Education:

Toronto, Ont., May 9.

Under our regulations there are only two classes of schools, namely, public and separate. By special regulation, however, the minister is given authority to designate annually the schools to which Regulation 17 shall apply and these are called English-French schools. The reason for this, you will observe, is that a school formerly designated and operated under 17 may have acquired a sufficient English training and adopted such methods of teaching that it would not be necessary longer to desig-

nate it as an English-French school. On the other hand, a school that obeyed the requirements of our regulations last year may have changed its attitude this year, and the minister would feel it necessary to designate it so as to bring it under Regulation 17. In other words, Regulation 17 is only made to apply to schools where it is found French children are not given proper opportunity to acquire knowledge of English. You will therefore see why it is that the particular schools and the number of them may change from year to year. Section 12, subsection 2, applies generally to all bilingual schools, and provides that where French language prevails inspector may permit use of French under certain restrictions, as provided. Necessarily the designated class, which comes under Regulation 17, is excluded from those that come under section 12, subsection 2. Take the case of a new school section growing up. It begins as an English section. With the influx of French people the prevailing language in the locality may change from English to French. When that becomes the case the school has the right to operate under section 12, subsection 2. If it grows intensely French and the tendency is to deprive children of chance to learn English, then the minister would designate it under 17. It is all wrong to say it is impossible for the French people to secure instruction in their mother tongue in case they immigrate into districts where no bilingual schools had prevously prevailed. As a practical possibility such a thing is scarcely likely to happen because if the French people begin to move into an English community, they pick up so much of the English language by intermingling with the people that it would scarcely be necessary to use any other than the English language for instruction purposes. If you can imagine a whole French community settling down isolated from opportunities of learning English, that school would be designated by the minister as an English-French school and the department would see that ample facilities were provided for pupils to acquire English through the medium of their mother tongue and at same time be given in that tongue.

G. H. Ferguson.

That explains the matter very fully, and I will not attempt to add anything to it. I leave it to the House and to the country, merely saying that for myself, for the reasons that I have tried to give I will vote against this amendment. I believe it is not in the interest of Canada, nor in the interests of the province of Quebec, nor in the interests of the province of Ontario. I believe nothing more unfortunate could have happened to our friends in the province of Quebec than the introduction of this resolution. The nature of the resolution and the way it is put makes it plain to the people that its introduction at this time is entirely inadvisable.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): I can sympathize somewhat with the statement of the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) yesterday that he possibly was not acting as many of the people in his own province would think it better for him to act. There are such times in the life of every public man; in fact that time is always present with him. But the older he grows the more he is impressed with the necessity of hewing straight to the line in his public conduct. It has been suggested to me many times during the past three weeks that were I to vote for any resolution touching on this delicate question I should be preparing material for a first-class political funeral. If so, blessed are the dead.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Only on one condition.

Mr. GRAHAM: I submit that a man's conscience is the guide to him whether the conditions are fulfilled or not. While I prize the opinion of my friends as highly as any man can possibly do, while I am heartily thankful for the confidence that has been reposed in me by the people of my native province for a great many years, yet, Sir, I consider that my conscientious duty is paramount to anything else, and in the performance of that duty I am both going to speak and vote on this question. Were I looking for the plaudits of friends, or possibly for political preferment, I might take some other course; but I have in my mind, after associations of the past year and a half in certain parts of this Dominion, something which to me is more paramount than either of these, great and desirable as they may be. If, Sir, by my action, by anything I can say, I can in the slightest degree assist in bringing together the warring factions in Ontario, and thus add to the warring forces of the Allies in the old land even but ten men, I am accomplishing something for the Empire and for the Dominion of Canada. Sir, I go further. If, by the sinking, if that be the case, of any ambition I may have, I can take away from any number of men in Canada the excuse for not enlisting, I feel that my duty has been performed and I am fully repaid. I know of what I speak, without going into any further details; and if, as the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Macdonell) has rightly said, the prosecution of this war is the paramount issue now before the Canadian people, I submit that by my action to-night I am taking the strongest step I possibly could to do my best towards the achievement of that end.

My hon. friend spoke as if this resolution were intended to coerce the people of On-

tario, or to advise them, or to interfere with them. No such thought is in the mind of any man in this House, and I think the high plane of the discussion on this most delicate question, in which the issues at stake appeal to the very sinews, to the very fibre of men's being, and the fact that there has been such a complete absence of words that might annoy, of sentences that might irritate, is a striking tribute to the ability and the calibre of the men who form the Canadian House of Commons. A firebrand on either side on a question of this kind, might have led men of ordinarily mild temperament to say things which they would not say in cool moments, but which they would always regret. That has not been the case; but we have discussed in this House up to the present moment a question of the most delicate nature without a harsh word being said, and without anything escaping the lips of members that would bring any blush to those who come after us when they come to read the debates on this question at the present time.

But, Sir, we have no intention of dictating to the province of Ontario. It is merely through this resolution, as the most direct means of exercising our right of expressing our opinions upon an alleged grievance, that the authority, and the only authority that has power to deal with this grievance, may learn what our viewpoint is, and, if it be in their minds, can remedy the grievance which is said to exist. You, Sir, made it very plain that this was the case, and I am not sorry now, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling was challenged, because some people might have said that in your ruling you leaned to virtue's side—or the contrary. But your ruling having been approved by the vast majority of this House, we are discussing this matter because the House of Commons, nearly to a man said that we had a perfect right to discuss it. But I want to refer to the words which you, Mr. Speaker, used which were approved of nearly unanimously, and which must convince the members of the attitude of those who are discussing it that it is not their intention, that they have no desire, to interfere with the rights of the province, but merely to express an opinion. The Speaker used these words:

> By ruling that this amendment is in order, I mean that this House has the right to discuss it, not with the view of depriving a province of what may have been enacted by its Legislature, but merely with the view of allowing the House to express its opinion.

That is merely what those who proposed this resolution, as I understand it, desired to do. Now that the question is here, I am free to admit that I should have preferred that it had not been brought here. Personally, being a citizen of Ontario, I had intended to address a few meetings in this province on this very point, to express to the people my own viewpoint—whether it would have been approved or not is another question. That being my intention, I should have preferred to have taken up the discussion outside of this House rather than to have it brought here. But it is here, we must face it, and I propose to do so for a few moments and tell the House why I am taking the attitude which I now take. I hope in doing so not to offend any person, though I may say a few plain things to people in both provinces on this question. Perhaps I should not say the people in both provinces; I mean the people speaking both languages; because this is an Ontario affair, and while you gentlemen from outside may discuss it, remember that we in this province are the ones to settle it, and the only ones who can settle it, or who have the right to settle it. My own view is that defiance of law is not the proper way to go about getting a remedy of a grievance.

But I will go further, and say that the cause of this irritation is not all one-sided. Let me be frank. I have been through discussions of this kind for a good many years. I have been in the Ontario Legislature, and, perhaps, I know as well as any man on the other side of the House the outlook from that angle on all these questions. Ontario is very jealous of her right to manage her own affairs, and rightly so. Certain laws were passed under the Mowat Administration after heated discussions on this question and on the question of separate schools in two or three elections. Had those laws been adhered to I believe that we would not now have the irritation which exists. One of the difficulties arose, and I say it advisedly, not from the enactments of the Mowat Government and of the Legislature of Ontario, but from the fact that the people interested did not obey the laws of the Ontario Legislature. I could cite several instances. Thus the irritation began. Speaking as a man from Ontario, who has been in the Ontario Legislature, who knows that viewpoint, I say without hesitation that in some schools in the province of Ontario the law was not only ignored, but defied. I do not refer to

the situation of recent date in Ottawa I am not referring to that at the present moment. Irritation consequently arose. It is possible that the authorities of that day were a little too lenient in not compelling compliance with the law, but this is such a delicate question to deal with that in a measure they may be excused. But it is the fact nevertheless that had not some schools that should have remained bilingual at least been made absolutely and totally French, there would not have been the cause for much of the irritation that has taken place in Ontario. I am not saying who is to blame I am simply saying that I know that to have been the case.

Coming to the city of Ottawa, I want to say plainly again that I do not believe that defiance of the law is the proper way to go about getting any grievances remedied. We have certain extremists in Ontario, I admit, but I do not want the people of the province of Quebec to judge the province of Ontario by a few ranters in this province. There are extremists in the province of Quebec, and I ask the Ontario people not to judge the good people of the province of Quebec by ranters in that province. The men who keep in the middle of the road represent the best men in both provinces, and by these the people in each province are to be judged, and by these alone. Ontario people are sensitive. Perhaps I am not as sensitive as some people about the things which are said about the province from which I come, in which I was born, and in which I live. We are not a lot of bigots in the province of Ontario. I resent any suggestion of that kind. We have some; they creep into the best of society. If you could take ours in Ontario with yours in Quebec, and send them to the front where we would be sure they would stay, it would be a good thing for both provinces. But, in dealing with these questions, while we are irritated in each province by the extreme words of ranters in the other, we must keep our heads, and remember that the best in each province is not represented by men of that stamp.

I want to reiterate that, so far as I am concerned, I would not vote for a resolution, much less speak for it, which had even the semblance of interfering with the rights of this province or of any other province. If I thought that my action was construed in that way by those who have moved this resolution—I know it is not—I would not—I would not vote for the resolution at all, because Ontario is the only power that can deal with this question. Some person may say to me—I have seen the insinuation in some newspapers in Quebec and in some in Ottawa that the Ontario Government is made up of bigots and fanatics, and that the legislature in general is of the same calibre. I have no brief for the Ontario Government, as you can well understand; but I know Premier Hearst, and nobody can make me believe that Hearst has the least semblance of a bigot in his make-up. I am acquainted with the man. I know the Hon. Thomas McGarry, and I know him to be broad-minded, a man who hews to the line and tries to do the right thing. I was associated for years with the Hon. W. J. Hanna in the Provincial Legislature, and there is not a man in Canada who can make me believe that Hanna is a fanatic, or has the semblance of a fanatic in his anatomy, or is a man who would do anything wrong as between men in the way of encroaching upon their rights. These men are not bigots. These men have a duty to perform. But, lest I may be misunderstood—I have mentioned only three because they are the three I know best—the others, I have every reason to believe, are in the same category. Coming to the Opposition, I know N. W. Rowell. Rowell is not a bigot; he is one of the broadest-minded men in the Dominion, and one of the ablest men as well. I know many of his followers who were in the Ontario Legislature when I was there. I know Charles Bowman, a man of German descent, who, like his father, is a credit to the province of Ontario. There is not an iota of bigotry in the make-up of Mr. Bowman. Another I think of is Mr. Sam. Clark, of Cobourg, a man of all men, open-hearted, broad-minded, and with a heart that would take in everybody in the Dominion of Canada and have some room left. This question must not be discussed on the supposition that the men in the Ontario Government or in the Ontario Legislature are narrow-minded. I do not admit that; I resent it, because, knowing these men, I know they do not view their public duty from that standpoint.

11 p.m.

Let me deal for a moment with the question of disallowance. I need not say that I am not in favour of the disallowance of this Act. There have been very few Acts passed the disallowance of which I would favour. Sir Allen Aylesworth, Minister of Justice in the former Government, once made the statement that in his opinion a

province had a right to do wrong if it wanted to. That was possibly putting it broadly, but to a large extent, the powers given to the provinces under the Act of Confederation enables them to do that, so long as some great public right is not interfered with. I know of legislation for the disallowance of which petitions came to the federal authority in the time of the Administration of my right hon. leader that bore upon their face evidences of injustice. The Minister of Justice then took the ground that the people of Ontario had the power to punish a Government that would pass that kind of a law and that the matter was their business and not ours. I think that is fairly sound logic and sound constitutional practice, although the law would allow them to take another view. But, there is another reason in this case why I would be absolutely against disallowance. If the grievance now claimed does really exist, disallowance would not help one iota. Those of us who are older remember the disallowance of provincial Acts many years ago, with what result, Sir? These Acts were immediately re-enacted by the Ontario Legislature, disallowed again, and re-enacted again, until they went to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. No real remedy could be afforded, particularly in a case of this kind, by disallowance. It would only add to the irritation, and the Government did exactly right in not thinking of disallowing this Act. Further than that, they would have been compelled to take the strong ground that this Act was so injurious that it should be disallowed, although it was absolutely within the purview of the Ontario Legislature, which nobody does dispute, or nobody can dispute, if he looks upon the matter dispassionately.

But you say: "Then, that being the case, this question should have been referred to the courts and finally decided." If this were a question of commerce, if this were a question of some minor importance, of something that dealt only with the heads and not the hearts of people, I would say that a decision by the courts would settle it. But this is a question far and beyond and above anything in the way of a commercial transaction or of a commercial dispute. It is something that touches the beings of men, something that touches their history and their traditions, and no decision of any court, no matter what it may be, can alleviate the irritation that exists. I say to those who are prosecuting that case and taking it to the courts that, no matter what the decision may be, the people of Ontario will have to deal with the question ultimately.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask the hon. gentleman if he means that it would be desirable to test the opinion of the country at large upon this matter?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not objecting to it, but I do not suggest it. My hon. friend has a constituency where he thinks he could use this question fairly well, as he did the ne temere decree. I say that a decision of the court, no matter on which side it was, would not alleviate the condition or remove the irritation. Why do I say that? Supposing that those who make the complaint of this law were upheld and the decision were in their favour, think you that, if the Ontario Legislature did not believe in the justice or wisdom of the decision, they would not and could not find a hundred ways of getting around it without violating it? Everyone knows that. They need not pass any legislation to implement the decision. They could do several things, refuse to grant money and that kind of thing. That would not help. I say to the French people of Ontario: suppose the decision were against you, then where would you be? I am not a lawyer, but my judgment is that if the case goes to court it will be decided in favor of the Ontario government. This being so, an appeal to the courts would not lessen the irritation; it would but add to it, no matter what the decision might be.

What is the only remedy? You say to me: "Why should we have anything to do with this question in the federal Parliament"? That has been decided by almost the unanimous vote of the House, and I will not discuss it. But, if there be a grievance, I do not know. Is it claimed that there is a grievance? It is. If any man imagines that he has a grievance, he is as much troubled in his heart as if he had a real grievance, because to him it is a real grievance. One thing I do know is that for some reason hundreds of children to whom we owe an education are walking the streets, or have been, and are not getting it. I do not know what the situation is to-day. We owe a duty to these children, and those on either side who are preventing an arrangement being brought about by which these children can proceed on their course to manhood and womanhood are taking a grave responsibility. There is a grievance, or an alleged grievance, I am not sure which it is. It exists in the minds of a lot of people

at least, and we in Ontario ought to be big enough to find some way to do justice to the children of Ontario if not to the children in the other parts of the country. What is to be that way? It cannot be by law, it cannot be by coercion, it cannot be by disallowance, it cannot be by court decision; it must be through some friendly and conciliatory method on the part of both parties. It will not do to say: "You have no grievance; there is the law." That makes no difference to the man who thinks he has a grievance. Something ought to be done. Are we not big enough in Ontario to devise a method by which a remedy can be found?

I said that I did not know whether there was a just cause for a grievance or not. This much I do know, that, having sat in this House, I have heard men, learned in the law, on each side if the House say there is no cause for a grievance because the amendment to the Ontario law does not mean that those who claimed to have a grievance insist it does mean. The acting Minister of Education said that these amendments to the Act are not intended to deprive children of French-speaking parents of any privilège they had. Mr. Rowell has said the same thing. Their remarks appeared in the same newspapers. That is the Ontario side of it. Hon. gentlemen in this House have said the same thing. Eminent men on this side of the House, whose ability both as statesmen and lawyers no person will question, declare just as emphatically that these amendments can bear an interpretation which does deprive the children of French-speaking parents of the privileges that they have always enjoyed. Who is right? I do not know. There should be some person to say who is right as between these two opinions. I know a most eminent lawyer in Canada who has said that this Regulation 17 is weak, and if it is apparently capable of two constructions, surely there is some method by which that weakness can be removed and the law made clear so that there can be no dispute that it means what the Ontario Government and legislature say it means. If that be done the cause of grievance is removed, so far as I am concerned. If some enactment can be passed that will make it so clear that lawyers cannot differ, and everybody will know that this legislation means what the Ontario Government says it means, there will be no cause, I think, for the grievance among those who are now complaining. Lawyers may laugh at that, but lawyers make good fees out of these very differences. If these differences did not get into legislation we should have fewer lawyers. Not being of that profession myself, I cannot appreciate these technicalities but I do know that they exist. Prominent legal men have said to me that the interpretation put upon these amendments by the leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for Kamouraska is not a strained one. Now, this resolution only suggests, nothing more. It does not ask; it does not advise; it merely expresses the opinion that, that being the case, it would be wise if all doubt were removed by having the legislation of Ontario made so clear that nobody could say that it did not mean what the Ontario Government says it means. That is not a very big demand. Knowing the members of the Ontario Government, I believe that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the member for East Toronto, and the member for South Toronto—Ontario men, who have the right to sit down and discuss it directly with the Ontario Government—I believe that if they were to sit down and discuss this matter with Premier Hearst, this grievance would be removed in twenty-four hours. I know the men of whom I speak, and I say in all fairness to the members of the Ontario Government that I have never found any of them showing the least symptom of bigotry, or a desire to interfere with any man on account of his religion or origin. That being true, I urge upon the Government and the members from Ontario the wisdom of sitting down quietly with the members of the Ontario Government, and pointing out that if they will make clear what they say is their intention, much of the trouble will be removed. If that can be done—and it seems to me very simple—there will have been accomplished by this discussion, conducted as it has been without any irritation, harshness or abuse, something that will be worth all the money that has been expended in the holding of this session of Parliament, if it accomplished nothing else. Let us look at our hearts at the present moment. The greatest necessity in this hour, in the face of an enemy who has appeared almost unbeatable, is that all hearts in Canada should beat as one. If friendly conference by men from Ontario with the authorities in Ontario can bring about a state of affairs whereby the present friction, no matter from what cause, will

no longer exist, and hundreds of children now going uneducated will return to the schools, and we in Canada, no matter from what part we come or what our race or origin, can say that we have no grievance against each other, we shall be in a better position than we have been in for the last eighteen months to face and overcome the enemy, because the people of the Empire will be united.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have a very few words to say in connection with the question that has been debated now for two days, and the discussion of which, I suppose, is now nearing its end.

I have listened attentively to every speech that has been made, including the speech which has been made by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Graham); and I acknowledge to this House and to myself that now, just at this moment, I am more mystified as to why this resolution was ever brought here than I have been at any other time during this debate. I have been trying to find out what it was brought here for, I have diligently scanned the arguments, and listened to most of them as they have proceeded from those who have spoken; and I cannot yet see, from anything that has been said by my right hon. friend who is the father of the resolution, or by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat—taking them as the two principal exponents—what in the wide world this resolution was ever brought here for, if it was not brought here for mischief. It seems to me like the foolish prank of a mischievous boy. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat spoke of firebrands. He has been on tenterhooks ever since this resolution came into this House lest some word should be spoken which would set a fire going that would blaze up all over this country. Was it necessary, in order to make a protest to the Ontario Government, that you should contemplate firebrands and conflagrations, and bring tinder into this House which would contribute to it?

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says: "I do not want to dictate; I have not the least idea of giving Ontario advice; all I want to do is to make a plea and have a hearing." Good gracious, Mr. Speaker! Could he not have made the same plea without a resolution? Could not everybody in this House have said what everybody has said on a motion to go into Supply, without bringing in any resolution at all as an amendment to that motion? Then why was the resolution brought? That is what mystifies me. How is it with the rest of you on each side of this House?

An hon. MEMBER: It synchronizes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is another thing which shows the absurdity of trying to try out a question of this kind in a forum which is uninformed, and cannot possibly be informed on the very kernel of the question. My hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), in that excellent speech of his as to form and clearness, although I do not agree with everything he has said here this afternoon, charged the Ontario Government with various wrongdoings. Who is there here to answer for the Ontario Government? Is the Ontario Government at the bar of this House when charges are made that deeply affect its honour, its spirit of fairness, and its objects? Is there any one at the bar of this House to speak on behalf of the Ontario Government, to give the reason for its acts, to explain what is not clear or defend what is wrongly attacked? I am satisfied that there is an answer to every charge that has been made; but no man in this House who has not grown up in the atmosphere of the Ontario Legislature, who has not gone from an Ontario constituency to enact the legislation which pertains to that House under our Constitution, no matter how able he is, can take up a question like this, which has a growth of thirty years in the province, and be at even advantage with reference to it, know its genesis, its development and the truth that is in it. A lawyer can take a brief and make a very good case out of it; but there is no man on either side of this House—and the debate we have had here has shown it—who is capable of taking this educational problem, that has been before the Legislature of Ontario and the various Governments of Ontario for these many years, and thoroughly understanding it, can do it justice or speak with authority with reference to it. So almost every man who has spoken has had a different idea of its purport, none know certainly.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is consumed with a spirit which impels him to make a plea. To what God is he praying? If he wants to make a plea which shall be an effective one, let

him put his plea upon the altar of the being who is able to grant it or refuse it. My right hon. friend the other night seemed to be under the impression that such a deity was my hon. friend who sits here by my right (Mr. Rogers). At the very end of one of his most impassioned pleas, he said, turning to my hon. friend: "Will you grant me that?" The man to whom he ought to have gone was that good, fair, impartial man, Mr Hearst, the Premier of Ontario, by long knowledge of whom my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) felt himself justified in saying with reference to him:

He is no bigot; he is an honest man who tries to do even justice to every one in his province."

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid my hon. friend is going further than I said.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is the man to whom you should have gone with your plea, and not to my hard-hearted though large-hearted friend who comes from Manitoba. That is the one thing that seems to me to show the absurdity of bringing this question here, where there is nobody to answer for it or to say whether or not he can or will grant the plea.

Now, I want to pick a bone with my hon. friend (Mr. Graham). In the interest of the very people whom he has been championing here to-night, was it a fair estimate to make of that French-Canadian character which began to develop upon the shores of Canada 150 years ago, for him to say that because a French child somewhere in Ontario is alleged, for a little while, in learning grammar and geography, to be kept from using his own language or having his own language uttered to him, therefore that grand race shall refuse to fight for the country that they have adopted and the country that they love? I have formed no such opinion of my French Canadian friends in this House or in this country of Canada, and I think that my hon. friend was ill-advised when he supposed that before you could get recruits in Quebec you must fix up this small trouble on the streets of Ottawa, where the children are pacing the streets instead of being in the schools—on account of whose fault? Because somebody chose to be disobedient to the law—nothing less and nothing more than that. The greatest crime that a man can commit in a democratic country is to refuse to obey the laws that the democracy imposes upon him.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is what I said.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is done in the streets of Ottawa; and yet I have not heard a single expression of regret as to that side of the question from my right hon. friend who had so much to say with reference to the faults of many people in Ontario.

My hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) uttered, I think, a heresy this afternoon when he stated that the law should not be appealed to, that the courts should not be appealed to, in order to get rid of a law which was oppressive, because by doing so you proclaimed your adhesion to the law. There are only three ways of getting rid of a law. One is to go to the law-giver and convince him that the law is an improper one and get him to amend it or to get it out of the way.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend said: "hear, hear". A brave man and a man who honestly wants to get what he says he wants to get goes to the man who has the power of giving it, and does not stand three or four hundred miles off and make long shots through a foreign substance and wait until by similar long shots in the opposite direction, he gets a reply from somebody who has nothing to do with the matter. In my boyhood days, if I wanted something from my mother, I went straight to her and asked her for it and I got it; I did not run around to all the Aunt Sallys in the neighbourhood.

The other ways of getting rid of an obnoxious law is either to have it annulled in the courts if it is illegal or to reverse it through the electors.

There was another little heresy of my hon. friend, and I think a heresy uttered by one or two others, including the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe). Just here let me state what I thought while this debate was going on. If I were a young man like some of those English-speaking men, around me, I would study from this very moment straightforward until I could speak French just as well as some of my French friends speak English in this House. The ability to speak two languages gives a man power. I am, however digressing a little; what I wanted to do was to compliment my hon. friend from Kamouraska on the excellent English in which he addressed himself to his subject. My hon. freind, however, as to that little heresy of his, has taken comfort to himself and solace for his conscience in try-

ing to find a reason for the bringing of this question into this House. "We have a right to bring it here", he says; and it is here properly, because the Speaker said they had the right to bring it here.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said more than that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I remember a lesson of my Sunday-school days to the effect that there are some things that are right, but which may not be expedient. Some scripture character gave utterance to that many long years ago. Because the Speaker said that under the rules of Parliament, when a motion is made to go into Supply you can bring in an amendment with regard to almost anything under the sun, that does not excuse my hon. friend from bringing in a firebrand motion; and I think he felt a little of that fire burning in his own conscience when he turned to the Speaker's decision and the support given to the Speaker in this House as a solace to him for having this firebrand question brought into this House.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend, perhaps, does not mean to be unfair—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will not be unfair.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was answering the argument of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) that we were trying to do something in the way of giving advice or instruction to the Ontario Legislature which we should not do, and I read the paragraph of the Speaker's ruling based on the fact that we were merely asked to express an opinion. I did not give the reasons that the hon. gentleman has given at all.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation and if I have done him an injustice I am sorry for it. But the hon. gentleman said he would rather the resolution were not here. Why did he say that?

Mr. GRAHAM: For the same reason that I said a good many other things—because it is true.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is true my hon. friend would rather it was not here. Will he say that, in order to make the plea which he has made, a very effective and straightforward plea, it was necessary that this motion should have been introduced? Could not he have said every word he has said even if this resolution had not been introduced.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Does my hon. friend want an answer?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: That answer was given in almost the next sentence I spoke, when I said that as a citizen of Ontario I would have preferred to go elsewhere to discuss this matter, and I intended to do it. But, as it is here, I propose to support it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What kind of a soldier is my hon. friend, to load himself up with unnecessary impedimenta when he goes into the field? He could have done all the fighting he had to do without this resolution. He did not wish it, he did not need it; and yet he has lugged it in. My hon. friend paid a high compliment—and not too high—to the members of the Government and Legislature of Ontario. I know these men, and I believe what he said, that they are honest men; they are not bigots, but fair-minded men. These, then, it seems to me, are the men to whom he should go. He never has expressed such high confidence in the men who sit on the treasury benches in this House. And yet, desiring honestly to do a great thing for the cause which, he says, commands his sympathy, he deliberately turns away from the men in whom he has confidence and comes to press an impossible task upon men in whom, he has expressly declared over and over again, he has no confidence.

Disallowance is no good, he says; disallowance is no good, said my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) over and over again; disallowance will not do what is desired, said others in this debate, over and over again. How is it—and here is a question that troubles me—that for week after week, for month after month, an agitation has been carried on, paper and ink have been freely used, and thousands upon thousands of people were led to sign a petition to this Parliament, asking for disallowance as a remedy for a grievance which is alleged? My right hon. friend, whose hand is upon the strings of the whole country, and especially upon the strings of Quebec, should have advised his friends that this was only provocation and embarrassment. But all that time there was no word from him advising—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, no.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: —those in whom—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, I never advised, because I never was consulted, and never knew. If I had been consulted a different course would have been taken.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My right hon. friend is about as innocent a youth for an old politician as I have met in a long time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I will admit no such imputation. I say here on my honour that I never heard of these petitions, I never was consulted about them. The hon. gentleman can take my word or not as he chooses.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My right hon. friend is quite wrong: I had no intention of suggesting doubt of his statement that he did not know these things. But the mystery deepens. How a man like my right hon. friend, who has been forty years in politics, who knows the ropes, who keeps even with the current of public thought—how all these things could have gone on and he never have heard of it surprises me. There is another thing with regard to my right hon. friend. In all his speech I did not hear a single word of condemnation for the firebrands, for the violators of law on the other side of the question, and not only the violation, but the denial, and and the flouting of it under my right hon. friend's front windows. He must have known that. Where, in Ottawa or elsewhere, did my right hon. friend say a word on behalf of the majesty of the denied law, a word as to the short-sightedness of the men who fight the law on any such lines?

My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham)—I must get back to him because I like him so well—I think, has got on strange ground to-night. With long years of experience, with high standing in his party—some time, it is rumoured, to be the leader of his party—what strange heresy is this he has been preaching here to-night? He has invited both sides to this dispute to evade the judgments of the courts of the land and pay no heed to them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not invited them, but I have stated facts which everybody knows.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What solid ground can we go upon if we are to follow the hon. gentleman? Up to the present time I think we have had solid ground in this, that whenever legislation was enacted which was supposed to be wrong, gradually it went up from court to court until at last it got to the highest tribunal, and when that highest tribunal pronounced its judgment every citizen bowed to that judgment. Is that not the only safety that we have in a country like this? My hon. friend to-night scouts such doctrine as that, goes to the one side, the enacting power, and says: "If the Privy Council says you are wrong, you will evade their judgment, and you will find some way of perpetrating that wrong again." He goes to the aggrieved party, and says: "If the judgment goes against your wishes, you will not be satisfied, and you will not bow to the law." That is not good doctrine in a country like ours, but perhaps it is only a temporary aberration in my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is all.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I know he will come back to his right mind.

Mr. GRAHAM: Ask any lawyer, and he will tell you it is true, just the same.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am sorry, myself, that this resolution ever came into this House. I say that for all purposes which have been avowed by my right hon. friend and my hon. friend who has just spoken, for all purposes of making a plea, of expressing their sentiments, there was no necessity for bringing this resolution. But the resolution was brought, and just the last few words of my hon. friend gave me a clue as to why it was brought. He has been pointing the moral and adorning the tale. Nothing in that resolution of advice, or anything of the kind he says; but when he comes to apply it, as he did a moment or two ago, he says: "Just let the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Finance or one or two other members of the Government take this message from us and go down and use their influence with the Ontario Government, and they can settle it in a minute." And, if they do not happen to be able to settle it and the Ontario Government say, "We stand by what we have done," then my hon. friend would have got what he wanted—a chance to blame the Government and to trumpet it all over this country that they did not do what they might have done. That gives a pretty good indication of why this resolution was brought in.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does the hon. gentleman really mean to say that was my motive in making that suggestion? I absolutely deny

that I had anything of the kind in my mind; I treated this question from a higher standpoint.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Then my hon. friend is very unfortunate in making the application in the way he did, because his last argument included laying this burden of duty on certain members of the Government, and that if they would take it up and go down to Toronto the whole matter would be fixed and everybody would be satisfied.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will go with them if they will take me.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We would be glad of your company.

I listened to the speech that was delivered here by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) with a good deal of interest. The position of the west was strongly put by him. I am sorry this resolution was brought, because it makes a pathway for succeeding resolutions. Once you open the pathway to a resolution which involves an interference with a legislature which is acknowledged by hon. gentlemen themselves to have enacted within its powers a law which they would not ask to be disallowed, the very moment you open a path with reference to the province of Ontario, you open it for every province in this wide country. I repeat what my right hon. friend the leader of this Government (Sir Robert Borden) said, that if that is to become a habit and a practice in this House, no province is safe from the reproof, the admonition and the interference of a majority in this House which may choose to interfere with its just rights of legislation. If it is possible to do that with the province of Ontario, it is possible to do it with the province of Quebec, and the province of Quebec is the last province in this Dominion which, from its own standpoint and holding to its own ideals, should have helped to brush out a path for action such as that into this Dominion Parliament, into this House of Commons—the very last. Here, with reference to the other provinces, we may be divided; but something might occur with reference to the province of Quebec on which the vast majority of the Dominion would feel one way, whilst Quebec had felt and legislated another way, and then you would have, not a resolution which can be defeated as this will be defeated in this House, but a resolution which might pass this House and impose interference with the action of the province of Quebec.

Then, what in the wide world is the use of framing a resolution with a mandate in it unless you are determined to carry out the mandate? A mandate looks for a remedy. The remedy in this case is the amendment of the law. We pass the mandate—put it as mildly as you please, we pass it. We are no men, we have not been serious and in earnest, if, having commenced, having put our hand to the plough, we do not see the end of the furrow; and, if the Government of Ontario does not take our suggestion, then there will be a duty laid upon us to use something more than suggestion. Otherwise it is futile to bring a resolution of that kind, and futility is the chief characteristic of this action of my right hon. friend.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): Mr. Speaker, the subject which is before this House is so important that, although there has been some considerable discussion of this resolution, I feel it due to myself as a member from the province of Ontario that I should not cast a silent vote upon this question. Let me say further, Sir, that I propose to give reasons, as shortly and clearly as I may, why, in my opinion this resolution is properly here, and why, in my opinion it should be supported.

The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who has just sat down, has found fault with the fact that this resolution is here. Why is it, he says, that a resolution of this kind should be before this House? Let me say to him that, in the first place, this House can only speak by resolutions. Let me say to him, in the second place, that we are here as representatives of the whole of the Dominion of Canada, and as such we have a right to have put before us and to have aired any grievance which any portion of the people of the Dominion of Canada may suffer; and it is for us to say then whether or not, that grievance having been put before us as representatives, not of any province but of the whole Dominion, it is fit and meet that we should take some action in regard to it.

The resolution that is presented to the House to-night by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe) is not without precedent, and I would give to the House a precedent established in 1872, which I take from the Journals of this House. At that time Mr. Colby, a Con-

servative membber for Stanstead, there having been some trouble with regard to a school law in the province of New Brunswick, moved:

> That this House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that province, and hopes that it may be so modified during the next session of the Legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any just grounds of discontent that now exist.

The question went to a vote, and in those days they were no pigmies as they are not to-day, but big broad-minded men, who sat in the House of Commons representing this Dominion, men who had quite as much appreciation of provincial rights as any man in this House has to-day. Amongst the men who voted for that resolution, I find, were Blake, Cartwright, Hincks, Howe, Mackenzie, Tilley, Tupper, and Sir John A. Macdonald. Could we, I ask, in all sincerity, have a better precedent than was there laid down by the very men who were responsible for the foundation and confederation of the Dominion of Canada. There you had men, who recognized that a grievance existed in a certain portion of the Dominion, who were here as representatives collectively of the whole Dominion, bringing the matter before the Legislative Council of New Brunswick, and asking, as this resolution to-night asks, with all humility and with all respect that the Legislature look into the grievance, and give at least some aid towards its removal.

Sir, there are two things in the Dominion of Canada that are uppermost to-day. One is the winning of this war, and the other is the unity of the races in the Dominion of Canada. No country can be great, no country can prosper, where there is not unity among the inhabitants. Of provincial rights, let me say this: I was brought up in the cradle of provincial rights, and my father before me. No man ever held stronger views about provincial rights than he, and those views he translated into positive and concrete action in the province of Ontario. I inherited them, and I feel as strongly in regard to them as any man could feel. But I challenge any man on the other side of the House to show me wherein provincial rights are by one jot or tittle infringed in this resolution. Further, I say that to raise the question of provincial rights in this debate is to go far afield of the question at issue. The hon. member for Kamouraska, the mover of this resolution, stated his position in language so plain that nobody could misunderstand his meaning. He started his speech by stating that had disallowance been moved in this House he would have been one of the first to oppose it. He further said:

> Indeed, I personally believe that disallowance would have been unwise; the remedy might, perhaps, have increased the disease. Coercion of any kind will not settle the difficulties. I am a true Liberal and a believer in provincial rights. I will go so far as to admit that to be effective and successful any final settlement of this question must be made in Ontario and by Ontario herself. But, Sir, is it not the right of this Parliament, while declining to interfere with the provincial legislation of Ontario by the exercise of the power of disallowance or otherwise, to appeal to the rulers of that province for a generous and peaceful settlement of this disturbing question and for a redress of the grievances of the minority?

I ask, could anything be more simple, and at the same time more forcible, or could anything show a greater appreciation of what the mover of the resolution conceived his position to be? Granting all the provincial rights that Ontario possesses, he said, will you not consent to make some effort towards the peaceable settlement of the grievance which we think exists. That is all he asks. It is plain, simple, direct, and is the plea of a minority to a vast majority. It puts in words a plea to which the House surely cannot fail to pay heed, so far as the passing of this resolution is concerned, a plea for some effort towards settlement of this very great difficulty.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has talked about a mandate, and the right hon. the Prime Minister has talked about admonition and direction. I defy any man who reads that resolution through to show me where the mandate is, where the admonition is, or where the direction, or even the hint of direction to the province of Ontario or to its Legislative Assembly is. The resolution reads:

> That this House especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with.'

A grievance there undoubtedly is. Everybody in the province of Ontario knows that that grievance exists. I am not saying that it is right or that it is wrong, but I do say that to pass this resolution would only do justice to those who suppose that they have a grievance. If it should be proved, after due inquiry, that

they had no grievance, the passing of this resolution would prejudice nobody. If that is so, then why cavil? Why not at least let us say as men, having the best interests of the country at heart, that it being a matter of common knowledge that the grievance is there, we will pass this resolution, and if we do, can we possibly, in any way whatever, or by any stretch of imagination, be said to be admonishing the Ontario Government or infringing upon provincial rights? Although no man will uphold provincial rights more strongly than I, where provincial rights are not being entrenched upon, and where a civil request is made, no demand, it would not in the least prejudice the best interests of our country, which we are supposed to be here to uphold, if we adopt this resolution. May I say to some hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, that were they to vote for the resolution as it stands, they would only be upholding the traditions of Sir John Macdonald, whose principles they profess to so greatly admire? The passing of that resolution will mean that there will be greater unity in Canada and a closer adhesion of races and peoples.

I have been told by my friends, some of them political, some of them otherwise, that, as a member for an Ontario constituency, for me to vote for the resolution means political oblivion. All I have to say is that if the time ever comes in this House why I cannot give good reasons for the faith that is in me, for the measures I support, I sincerely hope that I shall not continue to be here. I can do little less than satisfy my own conscience as a man, and if I do vote for the resolution, and if it does mean political oblivion, I only have to say that the passing of political parties, or the passing of any one member of a political party, makes little difference, as they are sure that they have done full and complete justice to the cause which they are supposed to have at heart, and if they pass out they do so feeling satisfied with the course which they have pursued. Ever since I have been in public life—and it is not a matter of yesterday—at periodical times, there have been raised racial and religious questions within the province of Ontario. Well do I know whereof I speak, but I want to say this, that if we here to-night, with this resolution before us, can, by the exercise of a little moderation, and by setting aside all party associations, pass this resolution and bring about a stifling of these racial cries which are rending Canada from time to time, we will have done full justice to ourselves, and we will have done a benefit to Canada as a whole and to the provinces collectively and individually.

Mr. HUGH CLARK (North Bruce): Mr. Speaker, it does not often happen, but when it does happen I doubt if there is anything more solemn than to hear a man delivering his own funeral oration. There has been more solemnity in the funeral oration just delivered than there was in that of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). That hon. gentleman took a melancholy pleasure in the prospect that his attitude upon this question was going to mean his political funeral. I think he hopes to escape the funeral by getting away to some place where that funeral is not going to occur. Any person reading the resolution before the House must marvel at the character of the speeches that have been made in support of it. We heard a great deal yesterday, last night and to-day, about the right—the inalienable right —of the French Canadians to the use of their language in the public schools of Ontario. There is not one solitary word in the resolution about rights. The word is "privileges". I venture to say that if the minority have enjoyed these privileges, as quoted in the resolution, in a province such as Ontario, that province surely is not open to the censure of being intolerant and that this Parliament is not in a position to advise the legislature to exercise justice and tolerance. The fact that these privileges have been enjoyed so long shows that the Government of Ontario has always been tolerant or these privileges would not have existed so long as they did as privileges.

We are asked to convey an admonition to the Ontario Government. Why? Not because there is a grievance. The resolution does not say there is a grievance. The hon. member (Mr. Pardee), who sat down just now, said that there is a grievance but the resolution does not say there is a grievance. The resolution says that some people say there is a grievance and because some people say there is a grievance we are asked to give an admonition to the Ontario Government. I know some people say there is a grievance. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) must have heard of this grievance but why should we be asked to adjudicate upon this matter upon hearsay evidence of that sort? The hon. member (Mr. Lapointe), who introduced the subject, should have been sure that there was a grievance, he should have made the reso-

lution state there was a grievance, but instead of that he simply states that some people in the province of Ontario say there is a grievance. I am not going to deal with the question at any length. This is a difficult question of long duration. As long ago as 1885 complaints were made of the bilingual schools in Ontario. In 1885 first, and in 1889 next, the Government of Sir Oliver Mowat, who was praised yesterday by the leader of the Opposition as a man of great breadth of view and toleration, had to take the matter in hand through his Minister of Education, Sir Geo. W. Ross. No man questioned the toleration of these men. The question had to come before them and it did come before them. It was brought up in the House and an attempt—a rather feeble attempt indeed—was made to remedy it. The condition of these schools became worse instead of better.

When the present Government of Ontario came into power these conditions had to be met. Representations were made. It was not that the Protestants were suffering to any great extent. As a matter of fact it was Bishop Fallon who complained that efficient education was not being given in these English-French schools in his diocese of Essex. A commissioner, Dr. Merchant, was appointed. No man will say that he was a man of intolerant views. He examined into these schools, and his report bore out the contention of His Lordship Bishop Fallon. And the conditions were met. I was glad to hear my hon. friend from South Renfrew pay so high a tribute to two or three members of the Ontatrio Government. He might have added that at that time there was at the head of the Ontario Government Sir James Whitney, a man whom French Canadians have certainly no right to regard as intolerant. No man had a finer regard for French Canadian character than Sir James Whitney. It was under him that French Canadians in Ontario received representation in the Ontario Cabinet, with full ministerial powers. That did not argue that Sir James Whitney was an intolerant man by any means. And it was while the French enjoyed this privilege of having a representative in the Government of Ontario that Regulation 17 was passed, in June, 1912. At that time Sir James was Premier, and Hon. Dr. Reaume was his Minister of Public Works, acting also in an advisory capacity with Sir James. I hope, therefore, that no one will allege that this Regulation was passed with any idea of being intolerant in any degree whatever.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition expressed regret that this Government had not appealed to the province of Ontario to remedy this legislation. Similar legislation is in effect in Manitoba. My right hon. friend has considerable influence with the leader of the Government there. It is a Liberal Government and friendly to himself politically. I should like to know whether he has used his good offices with Premier Norris of Manitoba to prevent the French-Canadians of Manitoba being placed under worse disabilities, as they call them, than the French in Ontario. If he has not done this in Manitoba why does he regret that this Government have not used their good offices with the Government of Ontario? I do not believe there is one solitary government in the Dominion of Canada, outside of that of the province of Quebec, that would pass such legislation and regulations as the Government of Ontario have passed with respect to the teaching in bilingual schools. I should like my right hon. friend to use his influence in having similar legislation passed in Alberta or Saskatchewan. I know the answer he would get from Saskatchewan and other provinces in this country, where he has more influence perhaps than in Ontario. I say it does not lie in the mouth of any hon. gentleman opposite to charge the Ontario Government with being intolerant in any degree whatever. If we liked to make an appeal against certain legislation passed by the Government of Quebec this session I do not think the Speaker could rule us out of order. We should have a mighty good precedent anyway. Reference has already been made to that Act of the Government of Quebec, by which the School Boards in the province of Quebec were allowed to contribute up to five per cent of their taxes towards opposing educational legislation in the province of Ontario. The legislation could properly be disallowed by this Government. And yet I have no intention in the world of asking to have that done. I do not care what the province of Quebec does with their money. They collect it, and they can spend it amongst newspapers and lawyers, fighting this legislation, if they like. I am not going to object to that at all. At the very time that legislation was being passed in Quebec, a Quebec minister, the Minister of Justice, was passing through this House legislation the object of which was to make it a crime for any man in one province to assist in the violation of the law of any

other province. While we were passing that, the Government of Quebec were passing legislation allowing funds to be raised for the violation of the legislation of Ontario; for that legislation can have no other meaning.

My right hon. friend has great admiration for his people, and I do not blame him for it; it is very creditable to him. He wants to see this thing righted. He brought in this resolution, or the hon. member for Kamouraska did, as a motion of want of confidence in this Government, and then he asked the people behind him to vote as they pleased. Is he doing his full duty by the French Canadians of Ontario when he does that sort of thing? Why does he not command his whole force on the other side of the House to vote for the resolution? He could, if he would. I never saw the time yet when his will was not law with his followers on that side of the House. They always vote at his command. They "live in his mild, magnificent eye." There is nothing that he can ask that they would not do. If he demands their support for this resolution he will get it. And if he is sincere in trying to have this resolution passed and remedial legislation enacted, for the benefit of his compatriots in Ontario, he will command the full support of his followers on that side of the House.

My hon. friend the member from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) has declared that this law is ultra vires. I think it is too late to do that now. He should have told it to the courts before they declared that it was not ultra vires. It was up to him to do it. With his superior judgment one would have thought he had foresight enough to offer his opinion to the court before judgment was delivered.

It is too late to-night for me to speak at any great length, and I am not going to do it. I hope I shall not be accused of having any grudge against the French language, because I have not. I like the French language. Its music, its melody, its poetry and its rhythm appeal to me. But I like it as a language. I do not accept it as a fetish, or revere it as a religion, as my hon. friends from Kamouraska and Wright apparently do. French is a language that all of us on both sides of the House ought to know, no matter what our nationality. But I will say this, that hon. gentlemen who attempt to make capital against the Government of the province of Ontario by alleging that the French Canadian people have grievances in that province, are not doing themselves any good and are stirring up strife which they will find it very hard to subdue later on.

Mr. E. PROULX (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on this question, and, as the hour is getting late, I will be very brief. I do not purpose discussing constitutional rights; I will take the broad ground taken yesterday by my right hon. leader, that by the law of nations the French race—call it a conquered race if you like; I prefer to say that this country was ceded by France to England—had the right to keep its language. When the question was discussed in 1890 on a motion to abolish the French language in the legislature of the Northwest Territories, an eminent lawyer, a man who later became Minister of Justice and afterwards a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, Hon. David Mills, said that he thought it was not necessary for Chevalier de Levis to stipulate in the articles of capitulation anything with regard to the French language; that when their usages and civil and religious liberty were accorded to the French people, that meant also their language, because those usages and that civil and religious liberty were preserved in that language.

In regard to the question of the teaching of French in this province, the French language was taught many years before Confederation, and, although the Confederation Act does not expressly stipulate that the French language has a legal status in Ontario, still section 133 states that French is an official language in the country, and, that being the case, it should certainly have a right to be taught to the citizens of that province. That was the interpretation held by the Council of Public Instruction before 1867. As my hon. friend from Wright (Mr. Devlin) mentioned yesterday, the following letter was written on the 24th of April, 1857, by the Superintendent of Education, Dr. Ryerson, to the trustees of a school section in the township of Charlottenburg in the county of Glengarry:

Gentlemen:

I have the honour to state in reply to your letter of the 16th instant that, as the French is the recognized language of the country, as well as the English, it is quite proper and lawful for the trustees to allow both languages to be taught in their schools to children whose parents may desire them to learn both.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain) read last night a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Upper Can-

ada in 1792 ordering that the records of the legislature and the statutes of the province should be published in French as well as in English. The French language has always been taught in the schools of the province, public and separate.

My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) this afternoon said that Regulation 17 gave a concession to the French people of Ontario, that it was not a restriction. I differ from him in regard to that. Before Regulation 17 was promulgated full scope was given to the teaching of French in the separate schools of the province. There is nothing in the Separate School Act limiting the teaching of French. In the Public Schools Act there is a section which says that the teaching must be in the English language unless the pupil cannot understand that language, in which case the teacher can impart instruction in the mother tongue of the pupil. Regulation 17, however, applies both to public and separate schools, and it applies more to separate schools in practice, because all the schools that were classified in 1912 as English-French schools were separate schools, which were inspected before 1912 by a French Canadian inspector. The list of schools which was made in 1912 for the inspectors was never enlarged, and there is no public school included in that list. Therefore Regulation 17 limits the teaching of French in the separate schools of Ontario, whereas, before the promulgation of that regulation, there was no limitation and the teacher could impart all the instruction necessary in the mother tongue of the pupil.

My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) last night put a wrong interpretation upon paragraph 4 of Regulation 17. He contended that the word "hitherto" did not imply that French could not be taught in a school established since 1912. To appreciate Regulation 17, we must see how it operates, and I can give two cases of schools established in my county since 1912 which are not attended by any English-speaking pupils, and still the Department of Education will not recognize them as schools where French can be taught, because they are not schools where French was a subject of study before 1912 when Regulation 17 was promulgated. The trustees of those schools appoint teachers who impart instruction in French, but as those schools are considered to be outside the law, they do not receive the legislative grants nor the grants from the county council.

My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) this afternoon tried to create the impression that the Government was bonusing the English-French schools of Ontario. Instead of bonusing them, the Government is starving them, becauses, since 1912, some of the English-French schools of Ontario have not received any grants from the Government nor any grants from the county council, because the latter grants are paid on the reports of the inspectors; and, the inspectors not reporting, the county treasurer has no authority to pay the grants collected by the county council. It is true that the last paragraph of Regulation 17 permits the Government to make a special grant to a school on the report of all the inspectors approved by the chief inspector. (Reading):

> An English-French school, which is unable to provide the salary necessary to secure a teacher with the aforesaid qualifications, shall receive a special grant in order to assist in doing so.

I do not, however, know of a case since 1912 where such a grant has been made by the department. When this regulation was promulgated, the Government appointed two sets of inspectors, English-speaking inspectors and French-speaking inspectors. There was no necessity for this. Before 1912 the bilingual schools were inspected by bilingual inspectors, but when this regulation was made inspectors were appointed, as I have stated, and precedence was given to the English-speaking inspectors. I say that the French-speaking inspectors were better qualified to visit these schools because they knew English as well as French. When the Government made all inspectors equal in 1913 they gave control to the chief inspector of the province. For a teacher to teach French outside of the first course he must have the approval of the chief inspector. This puts the English-French schools under the control of the chief inspector, and he is the only person who can say, outside the first grade, whether there should be one hour or one minute devoted to French teaching in the schools. I will not go into the question whether it is preferable to teach the child in its mother tongue or not—that has been very well discussed by my right hon. leader and others. But perhaps I might give my own experience. My family moved to Ontario when I was six years of age. When I began to go to school the only school available was one entirely English. I learned to read English, but I did not know the value of the words. A

few years afterwards, there was a bilingual school established, and I commenced to receive instruction in French as well as in English. I did not know the meaning of words in English until I had got a sufficient training in my own language. I do not give my experience as an authority, but I think that the conclusion I have stated is supported by the best pedagogues of this country and Europe.

Some speakers have tried to make a case against bilingual schools by saying that they are not efficient; and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) says that in the West the object has been to secure efficiency. I admit that some years ago some of the schools in this province may not have been as efficient as we wish them to be, but that was because of the lack of teachers trained in both languages, which must be the case in the western provinces. In Ontario, the number of bilingual teachers has been increased every year, and in a few years I believe there will be a sufficient number of well-trained bilingual teachers to care for every bilingual school in the province. There were teachers teaching in Ottawa who belonged to religious orders, and who were said to be unqualified. But why? They had written on their examinations in 1913, but had never got the results of those examinations. They were required to sign an undertaking that they would obey Regulation 17. But this they would not do, and the department would not grant them their certificates. My hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. H. Clark) has said that the resolution which was passed in 1911 was accepted unanimously, and that there were French-Canadian members sitting in the Legislature at that time. Well, there had been a resolution on the Order Paper for weeks before, standing in the name of the hon. member for Grenville, now the acting Minister of Education, that English was to be the language of instruction and communication in all the schools of the province, and it was afterwards amended so as to provide that English was to be the language of instruction in schools except where the pupils did not know that language. The member for Russell asked the Premier if this would make a change in the law, and was assured by the Premier that it did not make any change, but that it was only affirming what had been provided by the Public Schools Act. So, when it is said that the regulation was based under the resolution passed unanimously in 1911, it is a mistake in fact; it is not based on that resolution, but goes further than the resolution. It was applied to permit the teaching of the language of the pupil in the first course only. Take the case of the city of Ottawa. There were schools here where English language prevailed and others where French language prevailed. The French-speaking trustees attended especially to the schools where the French language prevailed, and French was taught in these schools. But an injunction was sought against the board which was successful and the Legislature passed a law providing for a commission to replace the school board regularly elected by the ratepayers. The law provides that the people shall elect their trustees and that the trustees have full power to decide what kind of schools shall be carried on; but the Government repealed this and the ratepayers of the city of Ottawa sought the privilege of electing their trustees. Last session they passed further legislation depriving the Separate School Board of the city of Ottawa of the taxes paid by the separate school ratepayers and permitting the School Commission appointed by the Government to take possession of the taxes paid by the separate ratepayers. I think we can call this a grievance, and there are many other grievances of which we can complain. I said that the trustees under the Public Schools and Separate Schools Acts have control of the schools and are the judges of the instruction that should be imparted, and we have a warrant for this. We have authority for this in the letter which was written by the Deputy Minister of Education of the 24th of July, 1911, to the Rev. Father Chaine, Parish Priest of Arnprior. This letter was written under the instruction of the Premier himself, the late Sir James Whitney. This letter reads:

Rev. and Dear Sir:

I am directed by the Prime Minister, Sir James Whitney, to acknowledge your letter of the 21st and to state that no change has been made in the school law of the department regulations affecting the study of the French language in the schools.

I am directed to point out that the question is one entirely under the control of the Board of Trustees.

My hon. freind from North Bruce (Mr. Hugh Clark) has said that Sir James Whitney was well disposed towards the French people. I believe he was, and I believe that if Sir James Whitney had

had a free hand, regulation 17 would not have been promulgated. But strong pressure was brought to bear upon him by certain sections of his party, and the Acting Minister of Education is mostly responsible for this regulation. But my hon. freind says that the Acting Minister of Education is also well disposed. I doubt it, because the Acting Minister of Education in 1911 wanted to do away entirely with the teaching of French. If the present acting Minister of Education had had his way then, there would not be a word of French taught in the schools so I submit that we have reason to pass this resolution, and that if it is accepted by this House it will exert a good influence on the Ontario Government, especially on the Acting Minister of Education. Some gentlemen may think that the French are unreasonable, and that they want to convert the bilingual schools into French schools. They have made representations at different times to the Government. Some proposals were made in July, 1913, by the Separate School Board of Ottawa, through their Chairman, and these proposals certainly are very reasonable. They proposed:

> In schools where all or nearly all the pupils are of French origin, the French language will be the language of communication and instruction, and besides the thorough teaching of French, English shall be efficiently taught.
>
> In schools of two or more rooms, attended by pupils of both English and French extraction, besides the thorough teaching of French, English shall be efficiently taught.
>
> In schools of two or more rooms, attended by pupils of both English and French extraction, the pupils shall be grouped in separate rooms, according to either of said nationalities subject always to clauses 3 and 4.
>
> In schools of one room only, where pupils of English and French origin are found, the pupils of French origin shall form a separate section and this section shall be taught in English and French in accordance with 3 and 4.

So you can see that in the proposals made by the French-Canadians to the department they always stipulated that English should be efficiently taught; and it is to the advantage of the French-Canadians that they should learn English. It is the language of the majority of the people of this country; it is the language of commerce, and, if the French-Canadians want to be equipped for the struggle for life, they must certainly be educated in English. But at the same time I think it would be a crime to prevent them from being educated in their mother tongue.

It is recognized in all civilized countries to-day that the French language is one of the leading and most important languages of the world. It is the language of diplomacy, the language most employed in negotiation between different nations. Only the other day, I read in the Manitoba Free Press that there had been a meeting of educationists in the city of Winnipeg at which proposals were made to do away with the teaching of Greek and Latin as requirements for entrance to the university, and to substitute instead the teaching of modern languages, one speaker saying that French is certainly the most useful and important of modern languages, and that it would be to the advantage of the English-speaking people of this country to know French. The only objections that he had to the introduction of French was that he was afraid that the French-Canadian people would insist on French having an equal status in the country with English. Well, that has not been the request of the French-Canadian people. They have asked that their language should be taught in the schools, and they would be satisfied if it were given a place there, so that their children would be sufficiently taught in their mother tongue. In parts of this province it is to the advantage of the English-speaking people to know French. I know that in my county many English-speaking people know the French language; they can speak it and understand it well, and if they did not they would be handicapped in their ordinary callings. An English-speaking friend of mine, an educated man, told me one day that it was not the French-Canadians but the English-speaking people who had a great grievance, because French was not taught in all the schools of the province; and he thought that French should be taught in all our schools. If it was not taught the children of the English-speaking people would be at a disadvantage.

I had hopes when this resolution was introduced that it would be accepted by the Government. There is nothing provoking in the resolution, it is only to express to the Ontario Government our view that in order to promote peace and harmony and goodwill among the different nationalities in this country, it would be well to make clear that the rights of the French-Canadians to have their language shall be not interfered with. That has not been made clear before, and it ought to be made clear. We have only to read the report in 1912 of the six inspectors, three of whom were English-speaking and three French, to see that

I will not go over the whole matter. I will only say that they reported to the department in 1913 that Regulation 17 was taken to mean that French could not be used as the language of communication and that it was regarded as an attempt to gradually eliminate the French language from the schools. So you see Mr. Speaker, it was not clear, and is not clear yet, and it is very important that it should be made clear. I was sorry to see that while some hon. gentlemen opposite, the Postmaster General for example, expresed the opinion that Regulation 17 was unfair, they declined to help us to remonstrate or to induce the Government of Ontario to afford a remedy to the grievances of the minority.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justict): I do not propose to detain the House at this late hour for more than a few moments, but there are one or two things I would like to say before registering my vote upon this resolution.

In the first place, in passing, I would make one observation with regard to some of the things that have been said by the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) in connection with the report addressed to His Royal Highness upon the question of disallowance. I noted that the hon. gentleman premised his observations by saying that he had not carefully read the report. He might have dispensed with the explanation, for when he proceeded it became quite self-evident that he had not done so. He was pleased to criticise some of the reasons advanced in support of the conclusion which was reached. He admitted that he did not think that disallowance would have been of any use, and then in a somewhat extraordinary consequence he said that if he had the responsibility he would have advised disallowance. I think that in face of the numerous opinions which have been expressed upon that question I may safely leave the reasons in that report to the judgment of people who may consider the matter of sufficient importance to carefully read the report before proceeding to discuss it.

Upon the question of the resolution, as it is before the House, we have certainly had an interesting debate. I have listened to the greater part of it with great interest. I have learned a great deal; perhaps I may be among those whom the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition thought would be better and wiser men by reason of this discussion.

1 a.m. I want to point out the one question upon which it seems to me we are called upon to vote, and the one question upon which I desire to make it perfectly clear that I express an opinion by my vote. That is the question of the propriety of this House sitting in judgment upon the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, or of any other province, and proceeding, as has been pointed out so forcibly by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to try that Legislative Assembly and find it guilty without it being heard or had opportunity of being heard of action that has been described in terms of varying degrees of strength. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat described it as a crime. The hon. member for Nicolet said that this was the opportunity to make the injustice which the Legislative Assembly of Ontario had perpetrated ring from one ocean to the other. This House is asked to solemnly pronounce that that injustice has been proved, as has been pointed out, without the slightest opportunity of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, the elected representatives of the people of Ontario, elected with an express mandate to deal with subjects of this kind, having had the slightest opportunity to be heard. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) justified the bringing of this matter before this House on the ground that this House is the high court before which it was proper that all grievances should be tried out, and we are asked in our capacity as members of that high court of Parliament to pronounce that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario had been guilty of grave injustice, though they had not had an opportunity to be heard. I can conceive of nothing more fundamentally unjust than the condemnation of a man, or of a body of men, who have not been heard and who have had no opportunity of being heard, and the clearest demonstration that we are stepping beyond any attribute that belongs to us, when we undertake to pronounce that judgment, is to be found in the fact that there is no possible method by which we could have that alleged culprit before us to say one word on his own behalf.

We have had the Legislative Assembly of Ontario on trial before this House for two days, and the Legislative Assembly has not been represented here and has not been heard, and yet we are asked to pronounce the judgment I have mentioned. The right

hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition says: "' Oh, this is a very harmless thing; this is the mildest of suggestions," and, when honourable gentlemen come to support their motion that this House make this mildest of suggestions, they find it necessary to produce proof of this alleged injustice, of this alleged wrongdoing on the part of the Legis- alleged wrongdoing on the part of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Unless we are prepared to say that they have established it, there is absolutely no basis for us going to the Legislature of Ontario with the suggestion. I must do the justice to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) of saying that he at least tried to avoid the grave responsibility of pronouncing that serious verdict against a party unheard, but in order to do so he found himself reduced to say: "I do not know whether they are right; I do not know whether they are wrong; but we will pass this resolution, and when we have passed it we will go to Toronto and see whether, upon the inquiry we will make, there was any occasion for us to pass it." That is putting this high court of Parliament in a dignified position indeed. I have been elected a member of this Parliament to represent those who send me here and to take my share in the legislation and the administration of those matters that are confided to this Parliament, and therefore I cannot help asking myself what mandate I have to determine, according to my views, what is the proper system of education for the province of Ontario or what the representatives of the people of Ontario, elected with an express mandate, should declare to be the proper system of education for that province.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would my hon. friend be prepared to vote upon a resolution in this House in favour of Home Rule?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman thinks he has struck me on a tender spot; but I would point out to the hon. gentleman that relations between this Parliament and His Majesty the King are somewhat different from the relationship between this Parliament and any of the legislatures of this country. When a Home Rule resolution was passed and this House decided to make a humble address to His Majesty the King, it put before him that in the judgment of this House it was a matter of interest to the Empire as a whole and every one of the Dominions, including Canada, that that particular matter should be taken up and considered. We were really dealing with a question that in a manner affects this entire Empire, but to suggest that there is anything analogous between our then going to His Majesty the King and putting before him that every portion of the Empire was interested in seeing the British constitution given practical effect to throughout the entire Empire, and this Parliament, occupying the position it does, addressing the legislature of the provinces, this Parliament being the creature of the same statute that created those legislatures, and this Parliament having allotted to it an exclusive field of legislation, and they having allotted to them, in the most express terms, another exclusive field, is something that is absolutely without foundation. If the hon. member wants to put me on the horns of a dilemma he will have to ask me another question.

Mr. MARCIL: Before deciding not to disallow this Act, did the Minister not have before him the answer of the Ontario Government on this question?

Mr. DOHERTY: Most assuredly I did.

Mr. MARCIL: The Government therefore has been heard?

Mr. DOHERTY: His Royal Highness in Council heard the Government of Ontario, and hon. gentlemen do not complain of what His Royal Highness in Council did after having heard the Government of Ontario. But they come to this Parliament, that did not hear the Government of Ontario, and they ask Parliament to take action. I think this hon. gentleman also will have to find some other question before I get very much embarrassed.

Mr. MARCIL: I understood the minister to say that the Legislative Assembly of Ontario had been put upon trial without having been heard.

Mr. DOHERTY: In this House most assuredly the Legislative Assembly of Ontario has been put on trial for two days and there has been no opportunity of it being heard, and in the very nature of things it would not be possible to give it that opportunity. And I believe that is a conclusive demonstration of the fact that this high court of Parliament is proceeding to act in a manner that is fundamentally opposed to the most simple rules applicable to any British court of justice.

Now perhaps I shall be permitted to go back to the subject I was endeavouring to

abbreviate as much as I could when I was interrupted. I asked myself what mandate I had to express my views as regards the best system of education for any province, or in that connection my views in regard to the jealous care which should be given to the respect of every right, or every believed right—I am prepared to go so far as to say of every prejudice—that can be reasonably considered without injury to the common weal, of every minority. I am free to say that as a general principle I am not here to judge whether it is complied with in one place or in another place; but I am quite prepared to say that in my judgment there is nothing more sacred than the right of the minority within a democracy unless it be the sacred trust reposed in the majority to see that the right of the minority is preserved. I am not here to apply any principles of that kind although they are principles that I think would meet with general assent. I am not here to apply them in particular cases. There is no case before this Parliament that this Parliament has, properly speaking, any right to pass upon or adjudicate upon. Nor is there any room for us to determine to what extent these principles have been applied, or have failed to be applied in a particular province. But we are asked to take this step in the interest of a minority which is represented as having a grievance. There is no doubt that any possible grievance of any minority is a most important thing. I have always been, I suppose I always shall be, within this country one of the minority. In my own province I am one of the minority from the point of view of language. Throughout this Dominion I am one of the minority from the point of view of religion. Since I have mentioned the fact that I am one of the minority in my own province, I might, perhaps, be permitted to digress one moment just to say that as one of the minority I am proud of my own province, in that I am able to affirm that one does not feel in the province of Quebec that he is subjected to injustice or inconveniences by reason of being in the minority in regard to the recognition of every right to which he is entitled. I say that of course without suggesting that the same is not the case everywhere. I have no case and this House has no case before it to judge.

I have heard much said, and eloquently said, with which I would be in absolute agreement, with regard to systems of education and the consideration that should be given to the feelings of people, in regard to proper matters of education. When I shall find myself in a position where I am entitled to express opinions as to the system of education that should be established or maintained, I shall be glad to express those opinions. But standing here to-night, I, as one member of Parliament, feel that I have no mandate to express opinions with regard to the best system of education for the province of Ontario. I have that right in so far as I am, as a resident of Ottawa, a citizen of Ontario. But, standing here as a member of Parliament, representing the constituency I do, I cannot see that I have any mandate to pronounce any opinion on that question, and I ask what mandate have all the other hon. gentlemen sitting in this House? I do not except even the members who come from the province of Ontario. Certainly those who come from other provinces have no mandate from the people of Ontario, and those who come from Ontario have no mandate to deal with that question of education in this House. So here we are asked to pronounce judgment upon the conduct of a province with regard to its legislation concerning education. We, the members of this House, most of whom have no mandate from anybody competent to give it, and none of whom have any mandate to act upon this matter are asked to pronounce judgment upon that question.

The discussion we have had may have been useful, but as my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has pointed out, all of that discussion might have been had without this resolution. But we are appealed to to pass this resolution because it is to bring harmony and unity in this country. I would go very far in the direction perhaps of risking over-stepping the proper bounds of my authority, or perhaps to join in the overstepping of the bounds of the proper authority of this House, if I could be convinced that the step that is proposed would be conducive in any way to the creation or maintenance, or the increasing of harmony or unity between the people of this country. But I ask you Mr. Speaker, who have listened to this debate, whether you anticipate that an adjudication by this House that the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario has been guilty of an injustice towards the minority in that province,

pronounced in the manner I have described, and conveyed to that Legislative Assembly in the form of a resolution of this House—I ask you whether that is the best method of bringing an appeal to the Legislative Assembly on behalf of the minority in that province? I have always supposed that when you made an appeal you tried to put it in the form that would ensure to yourself the most favourable reception. And what is it that it is proposed to do here on behalf of the minority? It is proposed that there should be presented to that Lgislative Assembly, whose action has been brought in question here, a certificate from the House of Commons of Canada that in the judgment of the House of Commons of Canada that Legislative Assembly had already rendered itself guilty of an absolute injustice to the minority, and that we, this House of Parliament of Canada, seized of the matter in no constitutional way, had been so impressed with that that we had felt called upon to pronounce judgment of condemnation against that Legislative Assembly, and to convey that judgment of condemnation as the best method we could think of of making a plea on behalf of that minority.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has made a most eloquent speech, and several others have made eloquent pleas on behalf of the French minority, and I have no doubt their voices will go beyond the limits of this House. Who can doubt that the plea which has been made by the right hon. gentleman, an outstanding citizen of the province of Ontario will receive consideration when it reaches the ears of that Government? Would it not come to them in much better guise in that form than in the form of a verdict of condemnation which this House is asked to transmit to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as a means of inducing them to remedy such grievances as exist, and, above all, as a means of creating peace and harmony in this Dominion? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what have we to anticipate if the different legislatures of the different provinces and this Parliament proceed to take up their time in discussing their respective conduct, for the purpose of determining whether the one or the other has been guilty of injustice? Do you think that would produce a condition of harmony and unity in Canada? And let me point out that it is just as much within the functions of the legislature of Ontario to introduce a resolution complaining of injustice of some action of this Parliament within its proper sphere, as it is for this Parliament to introduce a similar resolution with regard to the legislation of the province of Ontario. Let us remember that there is no question of superiority or inferiority between this Parliament and the different legislatures. We stand on a footing of perfect equality; but the subject matters with which we may deal are different. The extent of the sway of our laws is more extensive; but, acting within the scope of their proper legislative authority, the legislature stands our equal in every respect. As we all know, the Privy Council has declared that, acting within the scope of their legitimate authority, each one of those legislatures has all the power and authority that the Imperial Parliament itself possesses. What right, then, have we to sit in judgment on them, more than they have to sit in judgment on us? And if we are going to start the fashion, and if it be followed up, what an aid to harmony and unity!

I sometimes think that those whose cause has been championed here with so much eloquence might very well on more than one occasion have asked to be saved from their friends. This resolutionn that the House is asked to pass is the culmination of a series of actions initiated in another legislative body. Let me say this and I think I may say it as one who is as deeply sympathetic with my French Canadian countrymen as it is possible for any man not of their own blood to be; let me say that if I had been one who desired to put obstacles in the way of their having a favourable hearing from the one authority that can remedy the grievances that are claimed to exist, I would have brought about the very things that have been done by their so-called friends.

We are told that a resolution of this House need only to be passed and that at once peace, unity, harmony will prevail. The legislature of one of the provinces of this Dominion attempted to bring about peace, unity, harmony, and the remedy of the grievance alleged, by telling the legislature of the province of Ontario what ought to be done in regard to this question. Any one who knows human nature would have known in advance that that was the last way in the world to bring about the desired result. You projected into this question at once—and this resolution wants to project the same question into it—the question of who governs Ontario. I think that I will find no one in this House to disagree with me when I say that there is

nothing of which the different provinces are more jealous than their own right to be governed by the representatives of their own selection with regard to those matters which fall within the competency of the provincial legislatures, and there is nothing which is more likely to arouse resentment with regard to a request that might otherwise be favourably received than that it should come with the endorsement upon it of a legislative body which steps entirely beyond its sphere when it undertakes to give that endorsement. I say that the people on whose behalf we have heard such eloquent and moving appeals have been badly served by their ostensible friends and that those friends have been badly advised. Speaking in the interest of those on whose behalf these pleas are made and as one who, as I have already said, is thoroughly in sympathy with every legitimate aspiration of the French Canadian people of this country, I do not know of anything more prejudicial that can be done to the cause they have at heart than the methods that have been adopted on their behalf and in their name; and, I think perhaps, not the least prejudicial would be the adoption and production to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario of the assumed authoritative condemnation by this Parliament of their action in this regard, which we are asked to pronounce.

I feel that I have detained the House too long at this stage, but I have been moved to make these remarks because I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that if you open the door to this sort of action on the part of this House—you cannot call it a mere suggestion—it necessarily involves the condemnation that we are asked to pronounce I think the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) has a monopoly of his contention that we should condemn first and inquire afterwards. I cannot conceive how anybody can be so blind as to fail to see that if you initiate to-night the course that is proposed, it is a course that may lead this House very far, a course that will not be in the interest of the province of whom the gentlemen who have championed this course claim to be in a special manner the authorized voices. I too come from that province; I too am proud of my birth in that old province; I am proud of the province and of the people that make up its population; I have passed my life amongst them, and I hope to go back again to die amongst them. There is no man in this House that has at heart more earnestly and more sincerely than myself—however mistaken I may be in my view as to the best method to serve them—the service of the best interests of the people of the province of Quebec, and because that is true, I stand here to register my vote in a moment against this resolution.

The hon. member for West Lambton found a precedent. He had to go nearly as far back as Confederation to find it, and he read a resolution proposed by the late Mr. Colby, then member for Stanstead, and supported by men whose names naturally carry and will always continue to carry very great weight in this Dominion of Canada. After reading that resolution, he said: " Edward Blake, Sir John A. Macdonald, George Cartier voted for that resolution in 1870, and yet in this good year of 1916 there are hon. members who venture to suggest that it is not desirable that a resolution such as this before the House should be passed now." What was that resolution? I have not the exact words, but I do not question that it was a resolution to the effect that that House believed that the Legislature of New Brunswick passed an Act which was not satisfactory to a certain number of people in that province, and expressed the hope that it would be repealed. Let me say two things about that precedent. In the first place, if I am correctly informed—and I think I am—that resolution was adopted at a time when it still was within the power of the Government of this Dominion of Canada to take action with regard to the particular Act in question, and I can conceive under those circumstances that it might perhaps be a proper thing for Parliament to sound a note of warning, to call the attention of the legislature to the fact that possibly the legislation in question might call for some action on the part of the executive Government of this country, an action for which that executive Government would be responsible to that Parliament. I think, in the first place, that distinguishes the two cases, but let us suppose it does not. I yield to no man in my respect for those great men whose names were mentioned; but it is permitted to us in the course of forty or fifty years to learn some things, and there is no subject upon which greater progress has been made from what might be described as almost absolute darkness towards a perfectly clear light than the subject of provincial rights, the subject of the relations between this Parliament and the different legislatures.

Why, Sir, any man who has been called upon to look at the succession of cases in which constitutional questions have come before the highest tribunal of the land, can follow and watch them as they "broaden down from precedent to precedent," until from the starting point in which I, as a law student, heard some of the most distinguished lawyers of this country in their time describe the legislatures of the provinces as "glorified municipal councils," we have reached the point where His Majesty's Privy Council have made the declaration I have mentioned, that these so-called "glorified municipal councils" stood on an equality—so long as they acted within their proper sphere—with the Imperial Parliament itself. That is the progress that has taken place since 1870. I have heard men of the Liberal party—if I am not mistaken I have heard the right hon. gentleman himself—speak of the part the Liberal party has taken in furthering that progress. I am not going to quarrel as to who contributed to bring it about; all I say is, the fact is there—we have progressed; and the fact is that any man who has occasion to take the series of reports dealing with that question of disallowance, as I had occasion to do a short time ago, can watch that progress. The name of Edward Blake has been mentioned. I can watch that progress in Mr. Blake's own reports, from the early time when the people thought that if an act was unconstitutional you necessarily disallowed it, down until 1890, when, in a speech delivered before the House, he declared—and the House with Sir John Macdonald at its head acquiesced—that the fact that a law was ultra vires was, save under very exceptional circumstances, a reason why it should not be disallowed. Because, being ultra vires, it was void, and you did not need to disallow it, and another authority should pass upon that question. I regret that both the late Mr. Blake and myself should find ourselves, on that matter, in disagreement with that distinguished lawyer the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche); but, unfortunately for the memory of Edward Blake and for myself, we do. As I have said, we have made some progress on the subject of provincial rights, and, even if the cases were absolutely analagous, I would still stand firmly for the proposition stated by the leader of the House (Sir Robert Borden), and elaborated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), and which I announced in the opening of my remarks. You may try to avoid it; you may try to whittle it away or minimize it; you may talk about "respectful suggestions," and about only wanting to make peace; but when you sit here solemnly to take action upon the action of a provincial legislature with regard to a matter which is within its scope, I venture to say that you are not very far from the day when you will go forward more boldly to invade the field of provincial rights. I do not want to reiterate that; I have perhaps said it too often. You may try to disguise this as you may, you may call it the exercise of the expressive power, as I believe it was called in the course of this debate, or you may call it, as the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) called it, a judicial action of the high court of Parliament; but, whatever you choose to call it, it is a pronouncement of judgment by this Parliament upon the action of a provincial legislature, a judgment condemning that action, determining that it was wrong; and that judgment, if we are to appreciate its meaning by the argument which was made in support of it, involving a conviction of crime, of gross injustice, of ignoring the clear rights of a minority. And all that, we are told, is a matter of no consequence; all that is merely "venturing to make a suggestion;" it is going to "bring about peace and harmony." That is the way that a Legislative Assembly which, I think we may fairly presume, after some consideration, has come to the conclusion that a particular line of action is right, is to be induced between to-day and to-morrow to change its entire policy, and, in fact, to plead guilty to these very grave accusations upon which this Parliament has pronounced its conclusions. If ever there was a travesty, if ever there was a means represented as being the proper means to an end, but which must necessarily defeat the end for which it is represented they are resorted to, it is the means that this House is asked to take to produce peace and harmony and to bring about the protection of the rights of a minority with regard to whom it is claimed that it is suffering under a serious grievance.

There are other methods. Our provinces, within their scope, are sovereign states; and we are pround to boast that we live under a democratic form of government. Under a democratic form of government the majority must govern. But there are many, many means open to the minority. There are the powerful appeals of my right hon

friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), probably the most distinguished citizen of the Catholic minority in the province of Ontario; there are the appeals of my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham); there are the appeals of other hon. gentlemen who have spoken so eloquently. Why do not they address these appeals to the legislative body that enacted these laws and is responsible for those regulations and can modify them if they are to be modified? Surely their persuasive eloquence would count for a great deal; surely, the case they have made before this House would be listened to there as well as here; and surely, if it were listened to there would be the power there to grant the remedy that is asked for; and if the remedy were obtained in that way it will be obtained in a way that would really conduce not only to the removal of such grievance as may exist, but to the re-establishing upon firm and solid basis of peace and concord where it is threatened, and to maintain peace and harmony in other portions of this Dominion where it might otherwise be disturbed by a belief in the existence of the grievances that are alleged.

As I said at the outset, I have expressed, and desire to express, no opinion of my own upon this legislation of Ontario, nor upon the general question of the best methods of education. I may say this, however. I am a grateful man that I have the good fortune to have been born and brought up in a bilingual province; I am a grateful man that my father saw the advantage it would be for me to be able to speak the two languages that prevail there; I am a grateful man for the possession of the French language and the many treasures that that language has opened to me in the literature of the world. I should like to see everybody else share in these benefits and advantages. But that gives me no right to take upon myself, no capacity as a member of this House particularly, to join with others in pronouncing the condemnation it is asked to pronounce,—and asked to pronounce in the name of a peace that it certainly would not conduce to, in the name of harmony that, it seems to me, to be the most effective means of disrupting, and in the name of the interest of a minority, very dear to me, for whom I feel sure that it would be one of the most serious obstacles to the bringing about of the remedy of such grievances as they suffer from. I do sincerely hope that my friends from the province of Quebec, those of them who may have been disposed to think otherwise, will give a second thought before they vote for this resolution, with all that it is bound to mean in the future to all of our provinces, and to our own dear province of Quebec in particular, before they vote for this resolution, which is but another obstacle placed in the way of the harmonious and just settlement of such questions of difference as may exist between the minority in the province of Ontario and the majority of the population of that province.

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time that I have risen from my seat to say a few words in this House since the declaration of war between Great Britain and Germany, you will pardon me if, even at this late hour, I take at least ten minutes of its valuable time to give a reason for the vote which I intend to cast upon the resolution which is now before this House. I say that this is the first time I have spoken since the declaration of war, and if I now speak it is because I consider that this is the most important question that has been submitted to this House of Commons since the declaration of war, with the exception of the voting of the money and the aid required by the Mother Country. I say that this is the most important question because, as many other speakers have so ably said, it is a question which will do much for peace and harmony among the different peoples of this Dominion. As my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said yesterday, one must not run away from these questions. They are bound to come up, they must be faced fairly and squarely, and from their discussion something will be learned. I feel sure that there are very few hon. gentlemen in this House who have not learned something from this discussion. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his very eloquent and able speech a moment ago, gave us an excellent reason for the introduction of this resolution when he said that many learned lawyers who were members of this House had spoken upon it, and that not one of them had agreed with the other. His exact words, I think, were that a different idea came from every speaker, and that a different interpretation was given by each one of the speakers to the regulation which is being discussed by this House. I expected him to tell us, a better way than this resolution to bring to the

knowledge of the Government of Ontario or to the people of Ontario the wrongs which the French Canadians of that province claim to suffer, and to have the regulation amended. He said there were three ways to get around any law. The first way was a direct appeal to the Government, to the Parliament, or to the party who made the law; and when I made the mistake of saying "hear, hear," those two words of approbation carried him so far away from his subject that he forgot to give us the other two ways.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is a fact.

Mr. BOIVIN: I am very anxious to know what the other two ways were. But I think the way adopted by the hon. member for Kamouraska is the best way, after all, because, in spite of the fact that the Government of Ontario and the members of that Government are 300 miles or more distant from the Capital, as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce pointed out, it did not take long for a reply to come back to some of the remarks made in the discussion yesterday. In the Ottawa Journal of to-night we find an interview given by Mr. Ferguson explaining the working of section 4 of Regulation 17; but for some unfortunate reason, the explanation given by Mr. Ferguson to-day, May 11, is not absolutely the same as the opinion which was read to this House a few hours ago by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), which also came from Mr. Ferguson. So that not only was the Minister of Trade and Commerce right when he said that different men and different lawyers interpret this law in different ways, but he could have gone further and said that the persons who administer this law find it so complicated that they are obliged to interpret it themselves in one way to-day and another to-morrow. Let us see what Mr. Ferguson says:

"The problem that the government of Ontario has to work out is not how the children shall be educated in French, but how the French children may secure an English education," declared Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines, this morning.

Hon. Mr. Ferguson fully answered the query by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the House of Commons yesterday as to why the word "hitherto" should appear in Section 4 of Regulation 17.

Hon. Mr. Ferguson said:

Those who raise objection to the use of the word "hitherto" forget that there is only one official language in this province. The application of the word "hitherto" can best be understood by illustration.

He does not explain the word "hitherto;" he does not say why it is there. He tells us that the application can best be understood by an illustration, and here is the illustration. He continues:

A bilingual school can only arise from one or two conditions—either by the gradual growth of French population in an English community, or if one can imagine such a condition, in a new settlement entirely French and segregated from English surroundings. In the first case, where the French people gradually drift into an English community they acquire a knowledge of the language by intermingling with the English speaking people in everyday life. As a consequence, the children grow up with the knowledge of both French and English. French they learn at home and the English they acquire outside the home. Having this knowledge of English they are capable of being taught in the English tongue in the school of the locality, and it is unnecessary in such a case to make use of any other language than English as a medium of instruction.

In the case of an entire French community isolated from the opportunity of acquiring English, the department extends the privilege of the use of the French tongue to the extent necessary to enable a child to get a knowledge of English. This in effect is what Regulation 17 does. It was framed with that object in view, after the most thorough investigation and consideration by the best experts in the province, and it has been demonstrated that it works admirably in every place where given a fair trial.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier is entirely in error when he says that Regulation 17 interferes with Regulation 12; subsection 2, which he calls Regulation 15. It was the old Regulation 15. Regulation 12 has been in force for a great many years and is the Regulation with which he apparently finds no fault. It provides that where the French language prevails, the board may, in addition to the course of study prescribed, require instruction to be given in French to such pupils as are directed by their parents or guardians to study French. The investigation and report of Dr. Merchant disclosed the fact that in many schools there was little or no attempt to give children a knowledge of English.

It was to meet this situation that Regulation 17 was passed. In schools where the opportunity of learning English was denied the pupils are now designated by the minister for special supervision. It is this class of school that is called the English-French school and by which Regulation 17 appear. In other words the English-French schools designated by the minister are selected from the whole class of bilingual schools and are brought directly under special officials to ensure to the French children an English training. It is apparent therefore that Regulation 17 does not in any way supersede or clash with Regulation 12, subsection 2, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier appears to think.

That is the statement given to the press by Mr. Ferguson; that is what Mr. Ferguson calls the explanation of the word

"hitherto" by illustration. In communities where the French Canadians come in gradually, the French-Canadian children who learn French in their homes can pick up English on the streets, and when they go to school they can get their education in the English language. If it were possible for a French-Canadian community to be suddenly created in any part of Ontario at the present time, our friend Mr. Ferguson, in his great magnanimity, would allow the children of that community to learn French just long enough to be able to read English, and then they could not learn French any more; all their instruction would be received in English. That is the interpretation which he gives of Regulation 17. Paragraph 3 of Regulation 17 says in all schools,

> Where necessary in the case of French-speaking pupils, French may be used as the language of instruction and communication; but such use of French shall not be continued beyond Form 1.

That is two years; it stops there. That covers all schools; that is all the French education that the child can ever get. There is nothing in Paragraph 3 which says that even an inspector can give any more. Paragraph 4 says in schools where French has been hitherto taught:

> Such instruction in French shall not interfere with the adequacy of the instruction in English, and the provision for such instruction in French in the time-table of the school shall be subject to the approval and direction of the Chief Inspector and shall not in any day exceed one hour in each class-room, except where the time is increased upon the order of the Chief Inspector.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the intention of the right thinking people of Ontario, that it is not the intention of the vast majority of the people of that province. to deprive the French minority of its language. That is not what they want in their law. I may be wrong in the interpretation and I do not pretend to be a great constitutional lawyer by any means, but I differ with several of those who have risen on the other side to interpret this law. The law must be interpreted as it reads, you cannot go behind it and search for the intention of the legislators—and that law as it reads means that where French has not hitherto been taught, French will not be taught, and that where hitherto it has been taught it will be taught for an hour a day unless the inspector gives more.

2 a.m.

Mr. LAMARCHE: If my hon. friend will read the section in question he will probably find that the inspector has the right to give less than one hour a day, but not more. One hour is fixed as the maximum.

Mr. BOIVIN: I was referring to paragraph 4, section 2, which reads as follows:

> Such instruction in French shall not interfere with the adequacy of the instruction in English, and the provision for such instruction in French in the time-table of the school shall be subject to the approval and direction of the Chief Inspector and shall not in any day exceed one hour in each class-room, except where the time is increased upon the order of the Chief Inspector.

Mr. LAMARCHE: He could give one minute.

Mr. BOIVIN: I quite recognize that the inspector could give less, but I want to be absolutely fair, and I think that upon the order of the chief inspector more could be given. This is my interpretation; it is a difference of opinion with my hon. friend from Nicolet, which goes to show that the law should be carefully reconsidered by the legislature of Ontario who framed it, and couched in language that everyone will understand.

I say that this appeal should go not only to the Government of Ontario; it should go to the people of Ontario at large. I have had occasion several times to visit different sections of the province of Ontario. I have met many citizens of that province, and I have found the majority of them to be broad-minded men, proud to be living under the British flag, proud of the liberties which they enjoy, and willing to respect the privileges and liberties of the French Canadian minority in that province. I have found them loyal to their King, to their flag, and to their country. They have on many occasions given proof of their loyalty, but some of them are mistaken when they say that the French Canadian who lives in the province of Ontario has not the same right to teach his language to his children in his own schools, paid for by his own money, as he would have in the province of Quebec. When New France was ceded by France to Great Britain, or conquered, if you wish to use that expression, there was no division line at the Ottawa river. The whole territory was ceded to Great Britain. The inhabitants of that territory, which now comprises part of the province of Ontario, as well as the inhabitants of the province of Quebec became British subjects, and were then guaranteed for the future the perpetuation of their religion,

their laws, and their usages. What can the word "usage" mean when it is applied to a people, if it does not mean their language. It certainly does not mean their dress, for we all dress alike. It cannot mean their religion, because religion was specially mentioned. It cannot mean civil laws, because the civil laws were mentioned. What did the word "usage" mean if it did not mean the mode of expression and the language which the people used? They have enjoyed this liberty for years under the British flag, and now a regulation has been passed which they believe takes away from them the right to teach their own language to their own children.

I have been told to-night by some speakers on the other side of the House that the French Canadians of Ontario must not consider that they have the same rights in matters of education as the French Canadians in the province of Quebec. I was told by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) that they have come into this province and that they must accept the laws of the province.

I hope Mr. Speaker, that such a thing will never come to pass as a victory of Germany over Great Britain. I hope that Canada will never become a German colony; but if such a thing could possibly happen, if by any chance the Allied armies could be defeated upon the field of battle, and if Germany, signed a treaty granting to the English-speaking inhabitants of Canada their rights to their religion, their usages and their civil laws, and allowed them to enjoy those rights for fifty or sixty years, and then after that time in a section of Canada that is now very sparsely settled by English speaking Canadians, if German people imported from Germany passed a law wiping out the teaching of the English language in the schools, would not the English Canadians from other provinces assembled in this Canadian Parliament have the right to pass a resolution respectfully requesting the legislature of the province in question to amend their law and grant to the English, the right to teach their own language? That is what is happening to-day.

Speakers like my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), have compared and placed on an equal footing the French Canadians, the Ruthenians, the Swedes, and other nationalities who have come into Canada. We must not forget that the French race were the founders of this country, that we were the discoverers of this country, that we were here first; that after the French had arrived and had hewn their homes out of the forest, that after they had won victories over the savages and had begun to evangelize them, then the English people began to come and take up their residence in this country. The rights of other nationalities and ours are not to be compared. Ours are the rights of a conquered people, the same as the rights of the Dutch in South Africa, and the same as are granted by Great Britain to all the colonies she has conquered.

I shall not speak any longer. I merely wish to say that it is a pleasure for me to support this resolution, because, while the vote given upon it to-night, may be an adverse vote, I feel it will have a moral effect. The people and the members of the Government of Ontario will read the debate in the newspapers, and if they are the men I think they are, imbued with the highest ideals and a desire to give right and justice to the minority that reside in their province, they will in due time amend this law, make it more favourable to the French minority, and thus enable the people of Ontario to enjoy that peace, that understanding and that good fellowship which exists in the eastern townships from which I come. In that part of Quebec some of the counties have English majorities, some have French majorities, and in some the population is about equally divided. We never have school troubles, we never have difficulties over race and religion. Our representatives to the different Houses are generally equally divided, one man representing one race going to Parliament and another man representing the other race going to the legislature. We live in the most perfect peace and harmony. I would like to see the people of Canada from one end of our great Dominion to the other following that example, and that is why I am going to vote in favour of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Kamouraska.

Mr. D. O. L'ESPERANCE (Montmagny): Mr. Speaker, I desire to say just a few words in explanation of the vote I intend to give on the question now before the House. Let me say at once that I have the fullest sympathy with every sentiment that is expressed in the motion moved by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), and which has received such warm support from the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). While listening yesterday to the very eloquent

speech of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, my mind wandered back to the great drama, or rather to the great tragedy that took place in the House of Commons twenty years ago. At that time I happened to visit the capital for the first time and I was much impressed by everything I heard and saw. On that occasion it was my privilege to hear the famous speech, which is still ringing in my ears, which was delivered by the leader of the Opposition, and which proved to be the last nail in the coffin of the Manitoba School Remedial Bill, which was brought into the House by the Tory Administration of the time. Twenty years have passed over the head of the leader of the Opposition, and I am pleased to say that the speech he made yesterday was just as eloquent as the one he delivered twenty years ago. He received just as much support, he was cheered just as much by his supporters from the province of Quebec yesterday as he was at that time. But while my mind dwelt on the tragedy which took place in 1896, and the comedy now being enacted in this House, I could not help thinking that his eloquence at that time served to kill a practical and constitutional measure that would have brought relief to his compatriots in Manitoba, while to-day that eloquence is used for no other purpose than to create political strife in this country. But no doubt to-morrow he will be hailed as a hero in that section of the press that has covered him with obliquy and poured the grossest abuse upon him for the last few years, while I and my colleagues, who refuse to be trapped by this political trickery, will be branded as traitors to our race, as traitors to our creed, as traitors to our religion, perhaps as traitors to our own children. But history will record—and history, I submit, is the final judge, and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will not and cannot escape that judgment—history will record that twenty years ago, when he could have helped his compatriots he refused to do so. And to-day he is not taking the course that is the best calculated to help the minority in Ontario. I do not wish to say more. I refuse to support the present motion, not because I am not in sympathy with the sentiments expressed therein. I regret that my compatriots in Ontario have a serious grievance, and I hope and trust that the great province of Ontario will adopt every means in its power to redress that grievance. I shall vote against this motion because it is unconstitutional, and is introduced in such a way and at such a time that it can effect no good purpose, and may perhaps do mortal harm to the cause I have at heart.

[Mr. L'Espérance.]

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): As I heard the observations of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat I could not but wonder what the verdict of history would be on this Parliament, sitting here at half past two o'clock in the morning to consider a resolution that can result in no action by this Parliament, sitting upon a futile resolution at a time when thousands of our fellow-countrymen are at this very moment offering their lives upon the plains of France and Flanders in defence of this free Parliament. I wonder if it has dawned upon the minds of the men responsible for the introduction of this resolution that the very existence of our institutions is at stake, and that the question for which our fellow Canadians are dying to-night is whether this shall continue to be a British country, or, as the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) has said, a German colony. That seems to me to be the question that we should consider, and I cannot but think that history will weigh very carefully, and determine very accurately, the position of the gentlemen responsible for the introduction into this Parliament at this time of a question that divides race against race, that makes for dissension and not for unity, and that would in the end destroy the Confederation, instead of carrying forward the work of the founders that made possible this Dominion. For the question involved is simply a constitutional one in the first instance. When I think of the labours of the Fathers of Confederation that made possible the uniting of the old provinces and the creation of this Confederation, I realize that that was done by a system of compromise in which each gave up a little of his rights in order that there should be a united Confederation. The rights of minorities and the privileges of majorities have been determined by a statute called the British North America Act, which is the constitution of this country, and that constitution allocated to the several provinces and the Dominion the powers they should possess and the legislative jurisdiction they should exercise. It was determined—and it seems to me very properly—that the power with relation to education should be exercised by the provinces, subject only to the exercise by this

Parliament of that jurisdiction which may become necessary for the purpose of giving remedial legislation to minorities, Protestant or Catholic, that may be affected. The observations that have just been made by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. l'Esperance) recall the fact that in days gone by this Parliament was prevented from taking the only legislative action that could be taken by it under one of the sections of the constitution to remedy wrongs that had been done to minorities in relation to education. The same forces that twenty years ago prevented these remedies from being granted, that in days gone by called out "Hands off Manitoba," are to-day the forces that are crying aloud to the people of this Canada of ours, east, west, north and south, "Hands on Ontario." If it was right that twenty years ago the province of Manitoba should be left to work out its own destiny, and make its own legislation in regard to education, how much more is it right to-day, in the light of twenty years' more experience, that each province should be permitted to work out its own salvation with relation to education of the children within its boundaries.

My hon. friend has referred to a precedent that would indicate that possibly this Parliament in days gone by had interfered with the free exercise of power by the provinces. I was surprised, I was astounded, when the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Pardee) so dared in this free Parliament to inaccurately discuss what took place in it in 1872. If he were not a member of the legal profession and did not understand the language he read, I might not feel so much called upon to say that if he had turned back the page he read from he would have found that every observation and every statement he made to this House on that point was calculated to leave a false impression. I should like him to understand that when a man reads to this House a precedent dating back to 1872, indicating action taken by this Parliament with reference to a matter of this kind, then at least he should read the whole record, and not mangle it. And it ill became a member of the legal profession, with his long parliamentary experience, not to have communicated to the House that the motion before it at that time was a motion moved by Mr. Costigan for the disallowance of the New Brunswick School Act. That was the question that this Parliament was asked to consider. Had he turned back he would have found on page 134 of the Journals of the House for 1872, that Mr. Costigan, on the 20th of May, made a motion, seconded by Mr. Renaud, directing the attention of His Excellency the Governor General to certain allegations regarding the New Brunswick School Act, and calling upon him at the earliest possible period to disallow the said New Brunswick School law. That was a proper subject to bring before this Parliament and for this Parliament to consider. It was within the constitutional rights of any member of the House to ask that a motion should be submitted for the disallowance of the measure. After the debate had proceeded, it was moved in amendment by Mr. Graham, seconded by Mr. Bolton, that the Constitution itself should be amended (Journals of the House, 1872, page 155). Later on, another amendment was submitted, and finally (Journals, 1872, p. 177) the amendment to which reference has been made by my hon. friend from Lambton was submitted, not as a substantive motion, not as a motion asking the House to take direct action, but as an amendment to a motion asking for the disallowance of the statute as a way out, that matter having been properly before the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the hon. member read the amendment which was passed?

Mr. BENNETT: It was not passed except with another amendment, and it was seconded by Mr. Bolton:

That this House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that province and hopes that it may be so modified during the next session of the legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any ground of discontent that now exists.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was that carried?

Mr. BENNETT: That, with another amendment, was carried, and the motion for disallowance, which was the subject matter under discussion in the House, was voted down because the House of Commons, even in that day, declared: "Hands off New Brunswick." The motion that carried declared that hands should be kept off New Brunswick, although hon. gentlemen opposite would vote to-night to strangle Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That motion was stronger than this one.

Mr. BENNETT: It was not only not stronger than this one, but it was not in

the same terms, because the motion submitted asked for an interference with the right to exercise its power on the part of the Legislature of New Brunswick, and the Parliament of Canada, guided alike by the genius of Cartier and Macdonald, and the logic of Dorion and the gentlemen surrounding him, and the great Blake and Tilley and Tupper, said: "Hands off New Brunswick; let New Brunswick work out her own salvation in fear and trembling as best she may, having regard alike to the rights of minorities and the privileges of majorities."

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my hon. friend pretend that Parliament could not have voted down the motion for disallowance without being obliged to adopt the amendment to send a request to the Government and Legislature of New Brunswick to remedy the matter?

Mr. BENNETT: I am not pretending anything. If my hon. friend wants to look for pretence, he will find it with the gentlemen who are moving this resolution. If he wants to look for it, he need not look far either to the right or to the left. So far as that question is concerned, it was not competent, in view of the amendments that had been submitted, for that motion to be voted on at that time, because it was realized by Sir John Abbott, then Mr. Abbott, that the amendments that were submitted involved a change in the British North America Act which, as was pointed out, meant an amendment to the constitution which, as was further pointed out, could not be made by that Parliament, and so Mr. Colby, not in amendment to the proposed motion, but in amendment to the proposed amendment, moved:

That the matter be referred to the law officers of the British Crown and submitted to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for determining the rights and powers alike of the Parliament of Canada and of the legislature of New Brunswck.

The point to be decided was a novel point. If there be any doubt about that, let me read the words of that great statesman, the Hon. Edward Blake, who said, as reported at page 904 of the Hansard of that date:

Mr. Blake had considered from time to time since the early discussion of the subject the very difficult question of the proper interpretation of the Act with reference to the state of the law existing in New Brunswick on the subject of schools and he was quite free to confess that upon that subject his opinion had fluctuated, and any opinion he might then give would be given with much doubt and reservation. There was much to support in the argument put forth by the Minister of Justice in his minute of Council. It was a conclusion at which the hon. gentleman might well have arrived and might possibly be a correct one; but he would point out a few circumstances in connection with the Act which would lead to a different conclusion. He quoted from the British North America and School Acts of New Brunswick and endeavoured to show that, although the system of denominational schools was actually established by law, still denominational teaching in the public schools was practically acknowledged, and deeply regretted the course pursued by the legislature of New Brunswick in inserting in the new School Act a clause providing that every school under that Act shall be non-sectarian.

He then proceeded to point out that the question was properly before the Canadian Parliament to determine what might be the rights of that Parliament to deal with remedial legislation, which is an altogether different matter from that now before the House, on the one hand and the rights of the province of New Brunswick to amend its laws on the other. He proceeds further:

In his opinion it was in that spirit alone that the question could be successfully dealt with; but they had been asked to go a great deal further, and he felt—having been one who, upon former occasions, took an humble part in endeavouring to maintain the integrity of the constitution—bound to say a few words upon that subject. It was one thing for the provincial or the Canadian legislature to pass Act of Parliament beyond its constitutional powers, an action deserving of the highest reprobation, but it was quite another thing for a provincial or a general parliament to propose an amendment to the constitution.

And then he proceeds:

But the rights and interests of the provinces would not be worth the paper on which the constitution was written if it could be said that all rights could, as a matter of course, be altered or changed on addresses alone. The Imperial Government would never take away the rights of the provincial legislature at the instance of the Dominion Parliament alone, and no more dangerous error could be fallen into. The proper mode would be not to ask Her Majesty's Government to take action, but to ask the local Governments to take action.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: Why do hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear" to this when the resolution now proposed violates every principle of constitutional law? The only method by which the constitution of this country could be amended in regard to the rights of provinces would be by a constitutional convention at which all the provinces would unite in asking either for the enlargement or for the curtailment of their powers, and a joint address of this Parliament based upon no such constitutional convention, as Mr. Blake pointed out, would not be heeded

nor obeyed by the Imperial Parliament because the rights that have accrued, the privileges that have been enjoyed and the customs that have grown up under the constitution cannot be taken away merely because this Parliament asks them to be taken away; they can be taken away only by a constitutional convention properly convened for the purpose of considering amendments, which convention would represent the common judgment alike of the representatives of all the provinces, and hon. gentlemen know that that must be so. Mr. Blake says further:

If any constitutional rights were infringed, Parliament had power, under the fourth clause of the Britiesh North America Act, to interfere, and he quoted the provision giving Parliament the right to make remedial laws when necessary.

The question was properly before Parliament. It was a question involving whether or not there should be an exercise by Parliament of its remedial rights under the constitution, the powers that were asserted in the Manitoba School Act in 1890, the powers that were given by which this Parliament, not clothed with original jurisdiction with regard to education, could exercise its powers under the British North America Act for the purpose of remedying wrongs that might have been done to minorities, whether they be Protestant or Catholic, and it was because of that provision in the constitution that Mr. Blake pointed out the necessity not of disallowance—he said no, do not disallow; do not refer back to the provincial legislatures alone, but get the opinion of the law officers of the Crown and of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to the end that it may be determined whether or not a wrong has been done to which the remedial sections of the Act extend. That is what he asked. I will not trouble the House to-night by reading further from the debate the language used by Mr. Dorion, by Mr. afterwards Sir Albert Smith, a very great lawyer from the province of New Brunswick, who said at that time: "The cry must be: Hands off New Brunswick." This is what Mr. Smith said:

This Parliament might have the power to whip that of New-Brunswick into submission, but New-Brunswick in that event would await her opportunity to avenge the wrong.

Those are the words of a great Liberal statesman. I turn to the words of Col. Gray, who afterwards was one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of British Columbia who pointed out what the issue would be. I turn to the words of Mr. Dorion, who pointed out exactly what the difficulties would be and the course that should be pursued. I point out Sir John Macdonald's words with relation to it. I have not time to read them all. But the consensus of opinion was that so far as this Parliament was concerned, it refused to disallow or to intervene, but sent back the Bill that was alleged to have taken away from Catholics their rights, leaving it to the legislature to determine the matter, but first determining by reference to the courts the respective and relative rights and powers, alike of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of New Brunswick.

Now, let me point out what has been done in this case with reference to Ontario. I am not here to argue as to the rights and wrongs of a regulation with regard to education passed by a provincial legislature. The Privy Council has declared that the Legislature of Ontario dealing with a matter within its proper scope, has power as full and plenary as the Imperial Parliament itself may exercise with relation to the same subject matter. That legislature having exercised these powers by passing a statute defining the terms under which English and French shall be taught in their schools, this Parliament has no more power to curtail or enlarge those rights than it would have to declare whether there should be three or four minarets upon a mosque at Constantinople. Let it not be forgotten for a moment by my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Boivin) and my hon. friend from Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) and those other gentlemen who have spoken here, that this very regulation and the powers under which it has been passed are now on their way to the Privy Council for judicial interpretation. The matter is sub judice. The very demand made by Mr. Blake which was acted upon by the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, that the matter should be sent to the courts, is the very remedy which has been sought by hon. gentlemen opposite with relation to this legislation at this present time. Then, if that be the case, why is it here? Are we here to revise the unuttered judgments of the Privy Council? Are we here to decide what the Privy Council shall say? If we seek a legal remedy in this case, why not leave it to the courts?

Why pass resolutions of regret, if the matter is on its way to the foot of the

throne? Since when has it been the settled policy of Parliament to interfere with suits that are being heard? Who cares for the courts? asked the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). He declares in terms that the work of the courts is to be revised alike by the majority and by the minority. The courts that we have been taught to respect and honour from our youth, as has been pointed out by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, are not to be thought of so long as you can get a resolution into Parliament and bring about any action you will. Since when was that a doctrine of the Liberal party? Since when was disregard of constituted authority made the basis of legislative action? It is new doctrine to me that in this twentieth century and in this British country disregard of constituted authority, marchings upon the street, the flying of banners, the defiance of law, shall form the basis of action by the Parliament of Canada? I was appalled when I heard that doctrine asserted in this House. For me, trained in the law —a little—I can only say this; that if that doctrine is to prevail, then to wreck goes every opinion I have as to the security of property and the safety of the rights of individuals in this country. If you can resort to Parliament while a suit is still in progress to determine the constitutionality of a law; if you can pass a resolution in this House to determine whether a statute is ultra vires or intra vires; if you can go to the Privy Council with a resolution of this House to urge upon them in order to influence their judgment, if that is the opinion of gentlemen opposite I say that the sooner that opinion is got rid of the better. I would ask the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who is taking voluminous notes, if, when he was engaged in the steel case, or in the Dominion Coal and Iron case, he would have thought it right for the Legislature of the province of Nova Scotia to meet in solemn session and declare what should be done. At least, such action would have been within the rights of that body—that is the difference between that case and this. Property and civil rights lie within the powers of the Legislature of Nova Scotia but property and civil rights are not within our powers, and neither is education. But, in the midst of a war, it is sought to wring from the House a resolution dealing with a case that is sub judice; a case in which a legal decision has been sought is to be prejudiced by this Parliament. Since when did all the members of this Parliament become trained jurists? Since when did they weigh finely the constitutional points involved? The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) asserts the beautiful doctrine that when two lawyers from Quebec differ about the interpretation of an Ontario statute this Parliament should intervene. Somebody else urges another doctrine, and others still different doctrines. But constituted authority, the courts of this country, are the tribunals to which we must appeal alike for the preservation of our rights and the declaration of their limitations. No worse doctrine can be taught than that in a democracy you can appeal to the Parliament of Canada to contravene and destroy the value of judicial decisions, especially when an appeal to the highest court is under way. I resent it. And the people will resent it. They may not care so much, many of them, whether this or that fine point is at issue; but they will care if this Parliament is asked to declare for a principle that is destructive of security alike for property and of individuals, and one which this Parliament should not for a moment tolerate.

One gentleman asserted that there was an interference with the free right of the people to teach their children in French. But look at the contradiction involved in the very terms of the resolution:

> That this House, especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energy should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, by fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity—

Mark the word.

> —of every child being given a thorough English education—

"Every child"—that includes the French population of Ontario. And "a thorough English education"—how can the child get that without being taught English? And, if it comes down to that, look at the remainder of the resolution:

> —respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with.

If you are not going to interfere with the children of French parentage being taught in the French language, how can they get a thorough knowledge of English?

Mr. MARCIL: There are many examples in this House.

Mr. BENNETT: I am struck with the fact that the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution spoke in English—that is, the language of communication and instruction.

Mr. MARCIL: And I hope the hon. gentleman will some time speak in French.

Mr. BENNETT: I trust I shall some day be able to speak French as eloquently as the hon. gentleman; I should regard it as a distinction indeed. But what I ask the House is, how is it possible for this child to have a thorough knowledge of English while there is no interference with his being taught in French? Some of his time must be taken from being taught French in order that he may be taught English. Therefore, it comes down to this—what would be a just distribution of the time to be given to French and to English? This is the issue and nothing else. Since when did this Parliament undertake to say how long French or English should be taught in the schools of any province? I challenge any constitutional lawyer on the other side to say that this Parliament has the right to say that three hours shall be given to French in Ontario and only two hours in Alberta, or has the right to say how long shall be given to English in Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, or Ontario. Then it gets down to this, that the Legislature of the province of Ontario, and that Legislature alone, has the right to decide and determine what time shall be allotted to the teaching of French, and what time shall be allotted to the teaching of English; and, if that be so which is admitted in the terms of this resolution itself, as explained by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr Marcil), with the applause of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) what right has this resolution in this Parliament? What right has it here at all? Has it any? If, then, you say it must be left to the province of Ontario to determine how many hours must be given to French and how many to English, in order that the child may have a thorough knowledge of English and at the same time his French education may not be interfered with, I ask this House why this resolution is here at all under those circumstances? There is only one reason, and that is a reason which, in the midst of war, one hesitates to mention, and will not mention.

Sir, I am not concerned, then, as to how Ontario exercises her legislative jurisdiction; I am not concerned how, under the constitution, New Brunswick exercises her powers. I come from the West, and I, like the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), am vitally interested in this great question that, while it affects the well-being of the East, affects even more the potential happiness and greatness of a nation yet unborn; for, from the lakes to the Rockies, there will grow up a race of men that will either be divided into the nationalities they represent, or will be taught that the language of communication, of commerce, of business, is English. They must be taught national efficiency, to adopt the words of a friend of mine who sits opposite. National efficiency in this case means that there must be taught, as the language of communication and instruction, in that great undeveloped land between the lakes and the Rockies, the language that we call English. That is all that we demand. The population of French nationality in the province of Saskatchewan is small to-day; but there are 100,000 Austrians and Germans there, meeting together to-day, yesterday, last week, and demanding the right to have their schools taught in German—why? Because of the agitation that is being carried on about bilingualism down here. That is the reason. I happened to visit Regina last year to attend court, and I saw, in a newspaper there, a letter written by the Catholic trustees of a separate school district, resigning their trust and their office, two English-speaking Roman Catholics, because they said they could not longer remain upon a board that had been dominated by the Germans of that community, in which the language of communication and instruction was sought to be made German. That was the outcome of this agitation. Let that responsibility rest where it belongs, with the men who are trying to interfere with the educational powers of the province of Ontario in this Parliament. If you say to the new settlers who come to us from Austria, Germany, Russia, Sweden, Norway, from every nation of the world, that they are to grow each group to a little nationality of their own, with their schools and their languages, their customs, where is your Canada? Where is your Canada? It would be like the Balkan states. Shall this be a state of little nationalities, or shall it be a great union of a great people, with one language, so far as communication and instruction is concerned, subject to the rights guaranteed to the people of Quebec under the con-

stitution, or shall there grow up here a nationality, there a nationality, here a settlement of Germans, there one of Austrians, there one of Slavs, there one of Swedes, there one of Norwegians? That is the problem. Every man in this House from western Canada knows that the largest problem that lies before us is the assimilation of our races and the development of national efficiency. They all know it. There is not a man who studies the question who does not know it, and I appeal to the common sense, I appeal to the patriotism of this House, in this time of stress and pain, not to permit it to be thought that we hold out hopes to these people settling on the plains that there shall be federal interference for the purpose of promoting the growth of little nationalities in this great Confederation.

I should like to tell you some of the perils that are now being experienced in Saskatchewan, some of the evils that are creeping in there by reason of this very thing, and of the splendid efforts that are being made to overcome them or grapple with them. The situation is being faced with the dauntless energy with which men are throwing themselves into the heroic task of assimilating this vast cosmopolitan population; but all this effort fails, all these labours will be in vain, if this Parliament, speaking for the people of the Dominion, not realizing the measure of its responsibilities, says to these new citizens: "If your legislature does thus and so, we will tell them that we want this thing changed and fixed so that you will have a continuation of your national existence."

Sir, at this time of the night I have no right to trespass upon the time of this House, but I should like to summarize my position, speaking, like the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), as one from the West, in these words:

I believe in the maintenance of our Constitution. I believe that the series of compromises that made possible the passing of the British North America Act embodying legislation protecting the rights and privileges of minorities, were wisely made by the Fathers of Confederation. I believe that under that constitutional system, by which plenary powers were given to the legislatures of the provinces to enact laws with relation to education without interference by this Parliament, is to be found the safest and the surest possible remedy for the differences and difficulties that we experience in the growth of national sentiment in this great democracy. I go further: I believe that it is wholly unconstitutional, wholly irrelevant, for this Parliament at this time to be endeavouring to interfere with this matter. I am not concerned with what may be done in these provinces, except in so far as there may be a violation by them of the constitutional powers which have been committed to them; and, if I may appeal to the common sense, to the patriotism, and to the reason of this House, to the men of the East, and especially to the men of Quebec, may I say to them, in the language of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, that nothing could be more dangerous for Quebec than to have it thought that this issue is thrust upon this House at this time, looking towards the coercion of another province, for the advantage of a minority that comes from that province. In my province, where 30,000 men have rushed to the colours, the talk that has already been engendered by reason of this legislation is something to be reckoned with. It makes for bad feeling, it makes for discontent, it makes for lack of harmony, and in the end for the disturbance and destruction of the state. I should like to remind this House, and especially my friends from the province of Quebec who referred to the naturalization laws, that if they lived in the United States they would find that the influence which they exercised upon the body politic would be limited as it is in the New England states, as compared with what it is here under the splendid constitution, which guarantees them a fixed representation in this Parliament and the preservation of their rights, privileges, and liberties. The very debates which I hold in my hand contain a statement by Sir George Cartier in which he pointed out that if once there be an interference by this Parliament with the free rights of the provinces to pass educational legislation, then, as he said, " The rights of my French compatriots in Quebec may one day be interfered with by a Protestant Parliament." So that I do again appeal to them to reflect, to pause, to consider, before they place themselves upon record as being opposed to the doctrine which their fathers who laid the foundations of this Confederation thought right, proper and just. I have no doubt, as a friend of mine said to me tonight, that if the question were only dis-

cussed between some of us who come from the other provinces with some who come from Quebec, much might have been gained, in the way of remedying the grievance if there be a grievance. But when a province endeavours to speak as a whole, when the mass of the population headed and guided by one who for 40 years has sat in this Parliament, then indeed, I say it is evil they do and not good. I am as certain of that as that I stand here this night. Nothing but evil can come from anything that makes the united effort of the great mass of a province project itself against the rights of another province. As individuals we love, we admire, we reverence those who come from the province of Quebec. Our relations have always been most happy and harmonious, and always will be; but it is one thing to deal with the individual and with the pressure that a combination of individuals may exercise in the way I have indicated; an effort combined under the leadership of one who for 40 years has sat in this Parliament and who, as he told us, has been a leader of the Liberal party for 28 years, in good report and ill report is another thing. It is quite another thing for one who leads a great party to ask for the destruction of the rights of a province as they were laid down by the founders of Confederation. In the name of unity of purpose, of harmony, of the greatness of the Dominion that is to be, remember those great plains that are to be peopled by millions, and that one day will say to my friends from Quebec: "We have not forgotten your efforts." I would deprecate it, and so would others; but let this country realize, as my hon. friend from Edmonton said, that the shifting of population is already in progress. It will not be in my day possibly; it will not be in the day possibly of any one in this House, but as certain as the sun shines, those great lands between the lakes and the mountains will have a population as great as that which inhabits the central west of the United States. It will have reached 50,000,000 within a reasonable time and I am perfectly convinced that these 50,000,000 living under the protecting aegis of the Union Jack, as British subjects, securing to them liberty and justice and freedom; securing them from the tyranny of minorities which may be greater than the tyranny of majorities—that must not be forgotten, it is a fact in history—securing them from that, we will, if we are true to the trust that devolves upon us, leave to them a country whose institutions make possible the development of that unity of purpose, that harmony of feeling, that intelligent coordination of effort that brings about national efficiency under one language of communication and instruction which, in this case, must be, because we are part and parcel of the British Empire, the English language.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, at this very late hour of the night I owe an apology to the House for attempting to address it at all. But for the impassioned harangue of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and who has introduced a note into this debate somewhat out of touch with the high plane on which the discussion has been carried on by other hon. gentlemen, I would not have ventured to trespass upon your patience, and I shall do so only for a few moments. When my hon. friend from Calgary, with that assertiveness which he can command with very little justification, says that my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee) misled this House in regard to what took place in this Parliament in 1872, it would not be proper to permit this debate to close without showing conclusively to the House that my hon. friend from Calgary is the one who has attempted to mislead the House. When was it ever said in this or any other Parliament that when a matter for the House had passed a resolution and determined that a certain thing should be done, it was a question as to how the matter had been brought to the attention of the House. My hon. friend laid down a very curious doctrine. I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, never heard of it before. Because in 1872 a certain matter was brought to the attention of this House by virtue of a resolution moved by Mr. Costigan, in which after certain recitals, this House was asked to come to the conclusion that a certain Act of the Province of New Brunswick should be disallowed, and because that resolution was amended and the House came to a subsequent conclusive resolution as the result of debate, my hon. friend from Calgary says that my hon. friend from Lambton misled the House when he told the House what the result was which Parliament arrived at.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: That was not the resolution.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend will find that in his hasty way of looking at this question he has not seen all the books upon the subject. My hon. friend will find on page 179 of the Journals of the House of 1872 the following statement:

Then the main question, as amended, being put, that this House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that Province, and hopes that it may be so modified during the next session of the Legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any just grounds of discontent that now exist.

That was the resolution quoted by my hon. friend from Lambton.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Pardon me: I must correct my hon. friend at once. The resolution quoted by the hon. member for Lambton is on page 177 and is the resolution that Mr. Colby moved. The resolution on page 179, which was passed, was not moved by Mr. Colby because it involved two amendments.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend is certainly indulging in very queer reasoning. On page 177 I find that Mr. Colby moved a resolution in the very words which were read by my hon. friend from Lambton, which I read a moment ago, and which afterwards formed part of the main resolution. Does my hon. friend from Calgary want this House to believe that it was misled when I read the same words on page 179, where, after the words, "Then, the main question, as amended, being put," are to be found the very words contained in the resolution of Mr. Colby, and then, after adding the substantive resolution, the record says: "it was resolved in the affirmative." The fact therefore is that in 1872, as recorded on page 179 of the Journals of that year, the House of Commons passed a resolution which contained the words exactly as read by my hon. friend from Lambton. In 1875 this question came before Parliament again. My hon. friend read what the Hon. Mr. Blake said in regard to the matter at that period. Let me tell my hon. friend that in 1875 the Hon. Edward Blake seconded a resolution, moved by Mr. Cauchon and dealing with this very question of New Brunswick schools. It had no relation to the legislation which my hon. friend conjured up, but was a legitimate and apparently natural sequence to the resolution moved in 1872. For the information of the House, in view of the statement made by my hon. friend from Calgary, I wish to read this resolution which was moved by Mr. Cauchon and seconded by Mr. Blake in 1875, and I want this House to judge whether my hon. friend from Lambton was right when he read the resolution of 1872, or whether my hon. friend from Calgary was right. This is the resolution of 1875:

Mr. Cauchon moved, in amendment to the said proposed amendment, seconded by Mr. Blake, That the words "That on the 29th day of May, 1872, the House of Commons adopted the following Resolution.

This House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick, is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that province, and hopes that it may be so modified during the next session of the legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any just ground of discontent that now exists.

There are the words that my hon. friend from Lambton read. Messrs. Cauchon and Blake, in 1875, refer to this resolution of 1872 in the terms of the following motion:

This House regrets that the hope expressed in the said resolution has not been realized.

That an humble address be presented to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, embodying this resolution, and praying that Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to use her influence with the legislature of New Brunswick to procure such a modification of the said Act, as shall remove such grounds of discontent.

We thus have the resolution of 1875 quoting the very words read by my hon. friend from Lambton to-night and when the hon. member for Calgary, at this hour in the morning, and in such a debate as this, has the assurance to charge one of his colleagues with having made a false statement I say that he has not the right to do it, and that he has no right to trespass upon a debate of this kind for such a purpose. My hon. friend talks about the great West with his usual eloquence, but he knows just as well as every lawyer in this House that this resolution has no bearing whatever, directly or indirectly, on Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, or any other province in this Dominion except Ontario. My hon. friend knows full well that by a resolution which was pressed in this House by a former Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Mr. Monk, in 1905, it was proposed to create certain rights in Alberta and Saskatchewan with respect to the use of the French language and that my right hon. leader at that time, dealing with that question frankly and fairly, called upon his followers to vote down that resolution. It was voted down, and my hon. friend knows that to-day, when he talks about the interference with the English language in Alberta and Saskatchewan, he is talking

beside the mark. No such question can arise there.

Just one word on the general question. Those of us who speak the English tongue, those of us who treasure the memories of the great British race during all the long years of the history of our Empire, must realize that the foundations of the race and of the Empire were laid by men of various races, Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Normans, who came over to England. These men spoke a number of different languages. In the North, and across the channel in Ireland, were the Celts, while in Wales there were the men of the Cymric race. By a consideration of the varying and conflicting interests of the people, and not by acts of hostility, not by speeches such as my hon. friend from Calgary delivered here to-night, but through long years of harmonizing these difficulties and of working together, there grew up the great British race to which we are all so proud to belong, which laid the foundations of our Empire and which carried the British flag to every sea. Whenever a race came under that flag what did they do? Wherever the flag was planted the first essential right that was recognized of the people who came under their government was the right to the language of the people who lived in that land. So the story has come down all through the years. What has occurred in South Africa? After the war, lured by the assurances of the Germans, there trekked up into German territory a great number of Boers. They found an illustration there of the difference between British and German rule, because the Germans enforced the principle of uniformity of languages and the subordination of the rights of the Boers to the dominance of the Germans. These men found their way back to British territory, and under the British flag, where the right of their language was accorded to them, and to-day we have the spectacle of the whole of Africa being saved to the Empire as a result of the recognition of the rights of these Boers to their language in South Africa. When we come to Canada, I know that gentlemen like the hon. member for Calgary tell us that we must have one language in this land from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that.

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not say that my hon. friend said it; I said gentlemen like my hon. friend. We have heard that, and it is a very pleasant thing to say in certain quarters. Men of the dominant race will say we should have one country, with one language, that we should have one flag, and there should be no exception to that proposition. But, we in Canada, are fettered in regard to that matter. We do not control this question of language. Those of the class to which I have referred, like to say there should be only one language in Canada. But that cannot be the case. Why?—because Imperial enactments and treaties have provided conditions in this country by which men of the French race who were here when our fathers came are given in the courts, and in the province of Quebec certain rights and privileges that can never be taken away. Not only in this Parliament can a man come from any part of this Dominion speaking the French language, representing people who speak that language and having the right to expect that a gentleman shall sit in the Speaker's chair who shall know what is being said when he addresses him on behalf of those who elected him to Parliament, but in the Supreme Court any man who speaks the French language has the right to demand that his plaint shall be heard by a court composed of men who understand the French language. You have the Exchequer Court, which travels from the Atlantic to the Pacific under Judge Cassells and under Judge Audette. Every litigant in this country can hire a counsel who does not understand one word of English, under the law created by the Imperial Parliament, he has a right to have his plaint heard.

When my hon. friend talks about conditions in this country, when he talks as if the men of the French race, whose rights are embalmed in the constitution under which we live, are to be told that there is only to be one race in Canada, he must remember that whatever we would like to do, whatever individuals might desire, the hands of the Canadian Parliament and of the Canadian people are indelibly fettered by reason of these conditions imposed by the British Parliament and by the conditions under which our constitution arose. That being so, what are we going to do in this land? Are we to be continually aggressors against each other? Is it by preaching such a doctrine that we are going to attain that peace and unity which are so essential to the upbuilding and the future of this country? Is it by preaching division amongst these races that this unity is to be had? No problem with regard to the French

language in the schools arises in any of the provinces of this Dominion except Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba? And why does it arise in Manitoba? Simply and solely because in 1897 this Parliament chose to create certain rights in that province, which created a condition from which you cannot get away. But in all the other provinces of the Dominion than these three there is no restriction, no danger, for those who worry in regard to this question. The legislatures of every one of our provinces except Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba have absolute, supreme and exclusive rights in regard to every question of education, and this Parliament cannot interfere in any way with those rights, and it does not propose to interfere. What is our situation here? This resolution is not an invasion of provincial rights. This Parliament does not in any way intend to interfere with provincial jurisdiction. On the contrary, it expressly recognizes it. Hon. gentlemen in this House who have spoken in this debate, no matter from which side of the House, have all admitted that there is an agitation and there are grievances. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken most admirably on this question, notably the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who dealt with it in a way that was most interesting to those of us from other provinces who were anxious to know the facts. He declared that the people of Ontario were anxious to encourage the teaching of French as well as the teaching of English, and that they believed these regulations would effect that purpose. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, in utterances which were notably clear, and free from all passion and prejudice, placed before this Parliament statements which indicated that the rights and privileges of the men of the French race which existed before Confederation, and have since been recognized by statute and regulation in Ontario, have been interfered with and abridged. What is to be done? My hon. friend says, "Let this matter go to the Privy Council and be litigated upon." Is there not a better way in which we can arrive at a full and complete understanding on this question? This House is in a splendid temper, a temper I have rarely seen equalled during all my parliamentary experience. This question has been presented fairly and equitably from both sides, and is it not reasonable and natural to expect this Parliament, forgetting all questions of party, to say: If we have in Canada these conditions, everybody should recognize them, and so far as we can, we should model ourselves on the lines laid down by the Imperial Parliament; and both races should go along under this Constitution in amity and friendship. That is the proposition which is made to this House. That is all that is asked for by the mover of the resolution. Realizing to the full that Ontario is supreme on this question, and without any desire to restrict her rights by any legislative action, all we say is that if there are grievances there should be a rehearing of the case, and an investigation of all the facts, and we would then leave it to the good sense of the people of the province of Ontario to recognize the rights that exist, and deal fairly by all classes of the population. That is the intent and meaning of the resolution presented by the hon. member for Kamouraska. If it meant an invasion of provincial rights I should be the first to vote against it, but there is no desire to invade or attack the supremacy of Ontario. All that is asked is a rehearing, full and fair consideration of the exact conditions, free from prejudice. That and that alone is what is sought by this resolution, and I trust that when this question is taken up by the Legislature of Ontario which alone can deal with it, the men who control Ontario and its educational policy will realize these conditions and endeavour to deal with this question fairly and equitably; that the cause of difference between the races of this country may be removed, and the difficulty settled along lines which are just and equitable, and characteristic of the British fair play which we of the British race have boasted of through all the years of our history.

Mr. J. GIRARD: (Chicoutimi-Saguenay) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, I wish to give some explanation of the stand I intend to take on the question now before this House. I wish also to express in my mother tongue the opinion I have formed after perusing the whole of the debate in which the House has been engaged for the last two days. I think a little French, on this question of French, may not be out of place.

The resolution now before the House expresses the unanimous sentiment of every Canadian—be he French or English speaking—because it is a well-known fact that

under the folds of the British flag, of which we are so proud, every subject enjoys the greatest possible measure of freedom; what is going on in the province of Quebec is the best instance.

But in certain of the provinces of the Dominion, educational laws have been enacted, in good faith I presume, which are more or less unsatisfactory to the French Canadians. In the resolution which has now taken two days to discuss, Ontario only has been taken to task for enacting, on the subject of education, laws which are not as complete as they should be. We are all agreed that we must join in an endeavour to obtain the redress of grievances, whatever and wherever they be. I heard no word of dissent as to that. The time has come when the law makers are willing to take action under the law and the constitution.

In Ontario, as I have just stated, there exists a statute which is insufficient as regards French Canadians; but in Manitoba, there was a statute which was also insufficient, but which, such as it was, had been giving our compatriots for some years past a certain measure of satisfaction. Well, a few weeks ago, the Government of that province saw fit to call on the legislature to repeal that statute and, at one fell blow, to deprive the French population of all the privileges they had enjoyed hitherto.

We are appealed to on behalf of the wounded of Ontario, but what about our murdered brethren of Manitoba? Do we really believe that in the latter province so heavy has been the blow that all remedy is hopeless and we must be resigned to have the case buried for evermore? That is the conclusion that may be drawn from our two days' debate. If Parliament is entitled to discuss my hon. friend's resolution was it not open to us a few weeks ago, while the Ontario and Manitoba Legislatures were both in session, to submit at both capitals with some chance of success the humble prayer which this House to-day is asked to formulate? But now there is behind the present resolution no possible sanction, and at any rate any chance of better conditions is retarded a whole year by the delay in presenting such a resolution.

Would it not have yet been time, before the Manitoba guillotine severed whatever rights remained to us in that province, for the promoter of this resolution, by some such measure, to urge on the provincial Prime Minister before letting the knife drop, the desirability of giving a second thought, to ponder over what is legitimate and what is right, and perhaps instil into him some feeling of pity towards our compatriots? Far easier to forestall death than to resurrect. Would it not then have been the part of wisdom to suggest to the Manitoba Government some action along the lines of this resolution; then might have been avoided the massacre of the French race in Manitoba and might have been obtained in Ontario the balance of those rights to which I believe the French Canadians are entitled.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. member allow me a question? Why did not the hon. member himself introduce a resolution to that effect?

Mr. GIRARD: Why not have inserted it in the present resolution?

Mr. MARCIL: If the Government allows me to introduce such a resolution, because as my hon. friend well knows, the rules of the House forbid a second amendment,—but if the Government will consent to suspend the rules, I shall immediately move a resolution, which I shall ask my hon. friend to second.

Mr. GIRARD: I am ready to do anything that is required of me, in order that what is not right may be made so. Like you, I am a French Canadian; like you I am a staunch believer; I have a wife and children; I am a Catholic, and I represent a constituency which is Catholic and French-speaking just like yours. But I wish to know why by taking a very skillful advantage of the rules of the House, we have been precluded from having a regular amendment put to us, when it could have been done in the regular course, if this resolution had not been moved in amendment to a motion that the House go into Supply.

I admit, without hesitation, that we have come to a difficult juncture in our national history, when all fair-minded men, all who feel their responsibilities, should unite in an effort to avert the danger with which we are threatened.

But what reason have we to deal to-day with the schools in Ontario only, where French is being commonly taught, and leaving out of consideration the people of Manitoba, from whom everything has been taken away? Is there a secret motive? Along with my colleagues, I am bound by my oath of office, by my allegiance to my language, my faith and my religion, to de-

vote all my energies to see that the rights of all are respected, especially the rights of minorities. I have laboured alongside men, much higher than I, to help the wounded of Ontario and on behalf of the murdered ones of Manitoba, whom I would bring back to life. Accordingly, I much regret that the resolution which is submitted to us falls so short of what it should contain, and is so unfair as regards those of our compatriots who are suffering the more painful agony, and that the amendment should have come before us through a procedure that precludes its being amended to put it in a more acceptable form, and gives it practically the character of a motion of censure on the Government.

I expected to see the Government censured for not having disallowed the Ontario statute, but I was surprised to hear the chieftains of the Opposition, especially the leader, speak against the principle of disallowance. What purpose did it serve them to trouble so many peaceful citizens all over the country to get them to petition for disallowance, when it must have been known that it was impossible under the circumstances? Why not have introduced the present resolution as a substantive motion that could have been discussed with the same good faith as we are doing now, and modified, if necessary, to make it more comprehensive instead of limited in scope, as is the amendment before us?

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I have just said; we have arrived at a terrible chapter of our annals. Had we not enough on our hands with the abominable war that shakes the world to its very foundations? We are now threatened with a civil war, necessarily brought about by an injustice which, as I understand, depends on a mere word in a regulation. At the present juncture, knowing the danger of the agitation that is being promoted, I feel it is my duty to appeal to the wisdom of the fair-minded men of both parties in this House and out of this House, to join in an attempt to ward off this menace, and as soon as possible re-establish peace in our great Dominion.

With the present widespread perturbation, I should suggest that new men, independent of the present organization, get together and endeavour to bring about a redress of the grievances complained of by peaceful and diplomatic means, which alone will bring back to Canada the quiet it enjoyed heretofore.

In closing, I want it clearly understood that I am, from a sense of duty as well as by common sense, intent on working along with all broad-minded citizens against the perpetration of any wrong; I am as loyal to my race as any of my colleagues and countrymen; I desire to give all my endeavours to secure a remedy for the grievances in Ontario, and especially in Manitoba, but I do not think the resolution before the House expresses these sentiments with any greater force than the declarations I have just made.

I profoundly deplore that the murder of the rights of my compatriots in Manitoba should not have been covered by the resolution, but I hope that the discussion of the last two days will prompt fair-minded men of all classes to go to work and see that permanent justice be granted to those to whom their rights are now denied.

With these words I must state that while I support heart and soul the sentiments expressed in the resolution, I feel that I cannot vote for it on the grounds that it overlooks the rights of a section of our compatriots, because it is too limited in its scope, because it has no sanction behind it, and because, as put before the House, it amounts to a non-confidence motion against the Government, without assigning any reasons therefor.

Mr. A. BELLEMARE: (Maskinongé) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in the province of Ontario, as we are made to understand, strong condemnation is being expressed in certain quarters against our intervention and our protests in connection with the rights of the French Canadian minority in that province.

In this vast Dominion, if one province is guilty of a very great wrong, such as is apt to disturb the harmony between the races that make up the country's population, it seems to me that it is permissible for this Parliament or for a sister province to record some comments, or make suggestions, without being accused of any disloyalty, or of a desire to dominate. The part of a legislator is to maintain here below peace, justice, and truth.

The world war, which is now being waged, is without doubt the outcome of injustices similar to those which are to-day perpetrated in the province of Ontario.

In defiance of all right, our schools may be taken away from us, but never will anyone succeed in extirpating from our bosom our French hearts, no more than we should attempt to instil in the heart of an Irishman, an Orangeman, or a Scotchman, our

French ideals, and national aspirations. If the country is to have peace and prosperity, why not be respectful of our mutual rights?

The claim is heard that the Gospel can be preached and taught in the one language: what an error! What folly! Are we not aware that the Gospel is taught both in Catholic and Protestant churches, in this country and elsewhere, in the language of the people? Was not the gift of tongues bestowed on Peter, the Apostle of Christ, so that his teachings might be understood by all the nations of the world? Alas! that a priest, a Catholic bishop, should be so blind as to make common cause with the Orangemen in their attacks upon our race. Does he not realize that the interests of religion, the welfare of the country, the promotion of peace in Canada, forbid him to assail a minority that has acquired rights and shows respect for his high office?

See what is going on in the province of Quebec; there the Protestant minority enjoys the full control of its school grants, and the use of its language not only in its churches, but also in its educational institutions.

It is objected that we are only a handful. A handful, indeed, when the minority accounts for nearly 250,000 French Canadians! And what if it were true? Not the units and not their wealth give the measure of moral energy. After all, might does not make right, and has not the spectacle been given to the world of twelve apostles, whom we all revere, although despised by all the wealth, the pride and the science of their time, conquering the world.

I do not look forward to our conquering North America, but I claim that justice calls for respect, even when the number of its exponents is insignificant. The brutal element in a wrong is not capable of turning it into a right.

The idea of having only one language spoken in Ontario is a sham and a utopia. It may as well be realized immediately that never will the revindication of our rights be silenced, because the French language was spoken in Ontario long before it was settled by a British majority. In Europe, with the French soldier always pushing forward on the battlefield and the English host never falling back, victory will finally settle with the Allies; likewise in Ontario, where the French Canadian will never give up the rights he has acquired and the fair-minded and honest British who does not recede, we finally will get the majority in this province to understand the respect due to the minority. The different factions who are attacking the French language will give in at last, justice will triumph, because no language has played a nobler part in the world's destinies, in the triumph of civilization in Europe and Canada. It is spoken in all the courts, sovereigns learn it, speak it, and are not ashamed of it. Mr. Speaker, I could speak longer on the beauties of the French language, and the rights of the minority to continue its use in this province; but on account of the late hour, I conclude in stating that my remarks are founded on justice, that they are made on behalf of my province, and of the minority in Ontario. In giving expression to my opinion, I believe I voice the sentiments of all those who wish for peace, justice, harmony, not only in the province of Quebec, but also in the province of Ontario and all the other provinces of the Dominion. I shall then vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Kamouraska.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. E. Lapointe (Kamouraska).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Achim,	Lapointe (Montreal, St.James),
Barrette,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bellemare,	Lemieux,
Boivin,	Loggie,
Boulay,	Macdonald,
Bourassa,	Maclean (Halifax),
Boyer,	McCoig,
Brouillard,	McCrea,
Bureau,	McKenzie,
Cardin,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carvell,	Marcile (Bagot),
Champagne,	Martin (Montreal,Ste.Mary's)
Charlton,	Michaud,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Mondou,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Nesbitt,
Delisle,	Pacaud,
Demers,	Papineau,
Devlin,	Paquet,
Ethier,	Pardee,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),	Pugsley,
Gauvreau,	Rainville,
German,	Robb,
Graham,	Ross,
Kay,	Seguin,
Lachance,	Sinclair,
Lafortune,	Tobin,
Lamarche,	Turgeon,
Lanctot,	Verville,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Wilson (Laval)—60.

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Ames (Sir Herbert),	Lewis,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Macdonell,
Armstrong (York, O.),	Maclean (York, O.),
Arthurs,	MacNutt,
Ball,	McCraney,
Barnard,	McCurdy,
Bennett (Calgary),	McLean
Bennett (Simcoe),	(Queen's, P.E.I.),
Best,	Marshall,
Blain,	Meighen,
Blondin,	Merner,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Middlebro,
Bowman,	Morphy,
Boys,	Morris,
Brabazon,	Morrison,
Broder,	Munson,
Buchanan,	Nicholson,
Burnham,	Nickle,
Casgrain,	Northrup,
Chabot,	Oliver,
Clark (Bruce),	Patenaude,
Clark (Red Deer),	Paul,
Clarke (Wellington),	Porter,
Clements,	Reid,
Cockshutt,	Rhodes,
Cromwell,	Robidoux,
Crothers,	Roche,
Cruise,	Rogers,
Currie,	Schaffner,
Davidson,	Scott,
Descarries,	Sexsmith,
Doherty,	Smith,
Donaldson,	Smyth,
Douglas,	Steele,
Edwards,	Stevens,
Elliott,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Fisher,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),	Sutherland,
Foster (Sir George),	Thoburn,
Fowler,	Thompson (Yukon),
Fripp,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Girard,	Thornton,
Glass,	Truax,
Gray,	Turriff,
Green,	Walker,
Hanna,	Wallace,
Hartt,	Warnock,
Hazen,	Webster,
Henderson,	Weichel,
Jameson,	White (Sir Thomas),
Kemp,	White (Renfrew),
Knowles,	Wilcox,
Lalor,	Wilson (Wentworth),
L'Esperance,	Wright—107.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committe of Supply.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILL.

FIRST READING OF SENATE BILL.

Bill No. 103, for the relief of William Thomas Craig.—Mr. Pardee.

On motion of Sir Robert Borden the House adjourned at 4.10 a.m. Friday.

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Friday, May 12, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income —Grand Trunk Pacific Company—loan not exceeding $8,000,000, repayable on demand with interest payable half-yearly at the rate of six per centum (6 per cent) per annum; to be used for expenditure made or to meet indebtedness incurred in paying interest upon securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to meet deficit in operation and for the purchase of rolling stock; said loan to be secured by mortgage upon the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company containing such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve. The disposition of the loan to be subject to the direction of the Governor in Council, $8,000,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I followed somewhat closely the speech delivered the other day by the former Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) in regard to the proposed aid to the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. What he said was that the present railway situation in this country was not permanent, and that if it had not been for the war and the consequent general dislocation of business all would still be well. His conclusion was that the sun would shine again; that things would come back to their normal; that the railway situation in this country would come all right once more. In other words, he endeavoured to justify the proposition that no fundamental error had occurred in regard to the railway situation. My contention is that the war which is now waging has disclosed the dislocation of the railway situation in this country. Not only may the war have helped to bring on this dislocation, but it has disclosed a railway situation that is unspeakably bad and against the general interest of the country. The situation must be remedied. I disagree with my hon. friend when he says that everything will come back to normal. I say that the people of Canada will have to come to the conclusion that the railway situation in this country is fundamentally bad and must be cured. I am going to prove my contention by pointing out these things to him. The Globe newspaper says: The railway situation is unutterably bad; the people of this country think the same thing, and I will read

the confession of Mr. Smithers, Chairman of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. On the first page of his letter addressed to the Prime Minister are these words:

Sir,—I have brought before the board the result of my conversations with you and some of your colleagues during my recent visit to Canada, as to the financial position of the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific Companies from the 1st of January next.

I told my colleagues that at the interview I had with you on November 25 I disclosed to you very frankly the situation with which the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific Companies would be confronted in the immediate future. I also told them that after full consideration, and with the deepest regret I had proposed to you, as the only safe solution of our difficulties that the Government should take over the Grand Trunk Pacific railway as from the first January next, with all its branch lines, together with its development company, and other subsidiary companies, with all the assets, the Grand Trunk Railway Company to surrender to the Government the whole of the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company on condition of the Government relieving the Grand Trunk Railway Company of all liabilities in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, its branch lines, its development company, and other subsidiary companies, and repaying to the Grand Trunk Railway Company any money advanced by the Grand Trunk Railway Company to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, or its branch lines, and Development Company and other subsidiary companies.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the hon. member allow me? I want to read to the House from the same letter a paragraph which, I submit, proves my contention. This paragraph appears on page 6 of the statement respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company:

If the Government accept the proposition of the Board, I feel confident that whatever the liability the Government may assume will be amply repaid in a few years by the increased traffic arising from the development of the Northwest, and the bringing of new land under cultivation. What that development may mean is foreshadowed in the amount of the record crop just gathered in the Northwest, the production of wheat alone being 320,000,000 bushels, as against only 140,000,000 bushels in 1914; with other crops showing considerable increase in yields. The board feel that they may be severely criticised in a few years for parting with the property, and nothing but the necessity of saving the money which the present investors have put into the property would have induced them to do so. The deficit of the next few years, at a time of unprecedented strain owing to the terrible war in Europe, is the danger to be avoided, but an amount of deficit which is impossible for a company to finance is quite possible for a nation.

Mr. Smithers assures the Government that it will get all the money back and that the investment will be a paying one.

Mr. MACLEAN: My contention is that Mr. Smithers shows by his letter that he has a lame duck upon his hands—

Mr. GRAHAM: For the present.

Mr. MACLEAN: —and he proposes to hand it back to the Canadian people if they will repay him all the money his company have invested in it, and if they will relieve that company from the agreement by which they are bound. I claim that the argument is a double-edged one. Mr. Smithers drunk or Mr. Smithers sober is anxious to put this burden on the shoulders of the people of the country. My main object to-day is not so much to argue that the bargain was bad, as to bring this Parliament to a recognition of this fact disclosed by this company, notwithstanding the conditions attendant upon the war, that the system we have been following in the past, of using the public treasury, and the legislatures and the Parliament of this country, to carry out the ambitions of ambitious men in connection with railways, is bad, is irretrievably bad, and must end here and now. This contention is proven by the words which I have just read from the letter of Mr. Smithers. I ask the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to read the Globe these days on the mistakes which have been made in connection with railways, and to note the attitude it assumes towards the railway situation. As I have said, I do not intend to hand out criticisms, especially in the way of blame; perhaps nearly all of us are more or less to blame in this matter. But the facts have disclosed a situation that cannot be justified, and the facts have done more; they have brought about—and I wish to say this in the way of advice to the Minister of Finance—they have brought about the psychological moment to administer a cure for this condition. There never will be such an opportunity as this to administer the cure, whatever it may be, to this railway situation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the cure?

Mr. MACLEAN: I was just about to deal with that. I hardly need to tell the House what my cure is, my cure is public ownership, and now is the time to apply it. I give the Government credit for saying that public ownership may have to come, and that they intend to look into it by means of a commission appointed to investigate and advise. I do not need any

advice from a commission of this kind on this subject, and the people of Canada have made up their minds what they intend to do. They are ready to assume the responsibility of applying this cure of public ownership to the transportation situation which has arisen at this time, and which has been aggravated by war conditions. Public ownership of railways, when it was first suggested in this House, was described as being almost lunacy; the best that could be said of those who favoured it was that they were enthusiasts. But the whole history of progress in relation to railways is a history of advancing public ownership. Britain to-day is a public ownership country practically, so far as her railways are concerned, and she never intends to part with the control of those railways that she now has. I shall be asked: If we are to have public ownership, what practical suggestion have you to make as to these railways —granted that the time is opportune? A friend behind me says, "That is the point." I say that the worst thing that can befall us in this matter is a continuance of the present system; and the best thing is that, having faith in public ownership, we should try it out. I am told that this would involve an immense sum of money. Perhaps it would. It involves taking over commitments that already exist. But, as a matter of fact, we are committed to these commitments and must assume them whether we will or not. The very reason why this difficulty has arisen is that the railways are in such a state of misfortune that they must be rescued. There is no other way than by the assumption of these liabilities by the country. We are called upon to perform a work of salvage, nothing else and the question is whether we are to make it a temporary salvage or a permanent salvation.

How are we to proceed? I would assume the duty, whatever it involves; but there are various ways of procedure. For my part, I am willing that we should first deal with these two lame ducks, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern. But the really easy way to proceed, the one that should be followed if I had my way, would be to nationalize the Canadian Pacific. I am willing, however, to proceed in the other way for the present. I would treat the Grand Trunk, perhaps, a little differently from the Canadian Northern, for the Grand Trunk has confessed bankruptcy in connection with this proposition. It says it is not able to continue the business and wants to hand the railway back. It wants to get its money back and be forever absolved from the engagements and commitments it has made in connection with the situation. The first thing I would say to the Grand Trunk—that is the Grand Trunk proper—is: "Mr. Grand Trunk, we will not release you from your engagements unless you propose to turn over not only the Grand Trunk Pacific but the old Grand Trunk." This is the Grand Trunk that we know in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario as the greatest railway of its kind in Canada. There is no such fine railway in Canada as this Grand Trunk. It runs through the settled portions of the country and it reaches the factories. It touches the city of Quebec, it runs opposite Three Rivers; it has great facilities in Montreal; it reaches Ottawa, and it runs to Toronto, Hamilton, London and nearly all the cities and towns of southwestern Ontario; it reaches the two international rivers, the Niagara and the Detroit; and it has important terminals on Georgian Bay giving access to the West. This Grand Trunk is so good a railway proposition that, even though it has made some mistakes, it will pay. It was getting out of the woods at the very time it made these commitments in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is the greatest railway in Canada, the one that can earn the most money, if it were administered from Canada, as Mr. Hays had begun to administer it; and it would have achieved success and been a paying proposition to-day, notwithstanding the enormous mistakes made in its early construction, had it not been for these unforeseen difficulties. I would leave the early shareholders to look after themselves. The road is admitted to be bankrupt. If the Grand Trunk Pacific is absolutely hopeless so is the old Grand Trunk proper, facing default, and ready for liquidation.

Mr. GRAHAM: You say that is the old Grand Trunk?

Mr. MACLEAN: It faces default according to this letter and is ready for the knacker if the knacker comes for it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do you mean the Grand Trunk proper?

Mr. MACLEAN: That is the confession. They say: "If you force us to carry out our agreement, we are bankrupt. The lawyers will tell you that when you go to court, and when the bonds come due

the bondholders will go to the Grand Trunk treasury and demand payment. Here is an opportunity which presents itself for the first time, by reason of the war and as the outcome of our policy in the past. For the results of that policy I am putting no more responsibility on one side than on the other. The Grand Trunk Pacific is at our door in the position of a suppliant—and that word " suppliant " to me is the key to every important question of this kind which has arisen in Canada. It always happens that the persons or the companies that are the cause of grievances in this country are here this day and the next day as suppliants, and we miss the whole teaching of our English language and of the progress of liberty if we do not seize the opportunity which is afforded us by the presence of these suppliants seeking a cure of the grievances which they themselves have brought about. The old Grand Trunk is here as a suppliant asking for relief. I do not believe in taking over the Grand Trunk Pacific and relieving the old Grand Trunk of their engagement, letting them go scot free. I say: summon Mr. Smithers to Canada; tell him to bring over his board of directors and to go into session in the city of Montreal, where the head office is. We should say: we will talk with you here and now as to how we are to acquire and take over the Grand Trunk with the Grand Trunk Pacific. They will be glad enough to give it to us in order to be saved from liquidation. I would give them some little compensation in connection even with the old original stock; it would not be much, but it would be a little. But they will lose everything if this Government demands what it has a right to demand of them: that they pay their commitments; that they run the Grand Trunk Pacific; that they take over the Transcontinental, as they are bound to do. It may be argued that the time has not yet arrived for taking over the road, but I say that this is the opportunity to remedy the situation by taking over the old Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is all very fine for these opponents of public ownership when they are in trouble to say to the people of Canada, as they have said in the past: " Take over the dead horses and the lame ducks, and leave us the profitable ends." They have public ownership of telegraphs in almost every country in the world except our own, but whenever there is a weak line in this country for which there is no business and no profit—let the Government build it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Or to be bought.

Mr. MACLEAN: Or if there is a line to be bought, let the Government take it. And the Government takes it. They put the Transcontinental on us; it is not productive just now, although I think it has a great future. I am not going to profess lack of faith in my country so far as the future of the Grand Trunk Pacific is concerned; I hope that even the right hon. gentleman will give me credit for that. But this is the psychological moment to administer a cure to prevent the recurrence of the railway evils that have arisen in the past. In a word, that is my proposal as to dealing with the Grand Trunk. Let us say here and now, when they are suppliants at our door: " All right, gentlemen, we will take this road over and relieve you if you give us the old Grand Trunk upon certain conditions that we will name to you."

Mr. MORPHY: What does the hon. gentleman say as to this being the proper time to finance a proposition of that kind?

Mr. MACLEAN: You do not have to finance it; you have to assume commitments. I made that argument in this House some years ago in connection with the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific. On one or two occasions in this House I have said: "How will you finance it?" The late Minister of Finance thought he was taking a shine out of me when he said: "We should have to raise millions and millions of money." I said: "No, you will have to assume commitments." We will have to assume the commitments of the old Grand Trunk if we take it over. But the last thing that I am in favour of suggesting to the Canadian people—I do not think this Government will suggest it—is that they should relieve the old Grand Trunk and take over the lame duck, the Grand Trunk Pacific. The stars of fortune of these two railways will never again come so close together; rather, there is a conjunction of circumstances affecting the fortunes of these two railways which will never occur again. It is this circumstance which gives us an opportunity to take them over and to use them for the benefit of the people.

Mr. STEVENS: What would the hon. gentleman do with the stockholders of the Grand Trunk?

Mr. MACLEAN: I said a moment ago: notify Mr. Smithers, get his board of directors to come over here by the next boat and hold a meeting in Montreal. Have

them bring some authority from their shareholders in England to negotiate with this Government; otherwise, let them go into court and defend an action for the liquidation of both roads. We do not have to go to them; they are here now as suppliants.

Mr. STEVENS: Supposing they did give you such authority, what would my hon. friend do with these stockholders?

Mr. MACLEAN: Give me the responsibility and I will deal with them. That is my answer to my hon. friend. I am ready to assume that responsibility, or rather to associate myself with gentlemen in this House to appeal to the people of Canada on a programme of that kind. The Minister of Finance and the Government are preparing to assume that responsibility, but the minister wants to take time to consider it. When he has considered it, the opportunity may be lost, and that is what I want to point out to him. That good old Tory organ, that great exponent of private railways, the Montreal Gazette, yesterday, undertook to tell an awful story of the obligations and entanglements and—still more dreadful thing—the great financial difficulty that must be encountered in raising money to take over the railways. The Montreal Gazette says there will be an enormous undertaking in making a flotation. But you do not have to do anything of the kind. You simply have to assume certain of the liabilities and refuse to assume others. The Canadian Government is on record as having come to the relief of this road many years ago. You will find a very large item in the funded debt of Canada for money advanced for the benefit of the shareholders of the old Grand Trunk Railway. We have helped them in times past; some of that old stock is held to-day by families of the original investors, and, largely, by men who are engaged in stock broking in London, and by speculators who use it for their own advantage. Yet these people come here to-day and ask the people of Canada to make a deal with them, to let them out in regard to the dead horse, but to let them have the profitable end of it. I say, no. Make them come here and deal with us; make them give this railway to us, or let them go into liquidation.

What would you do with the Canadian Northern? They also are here as suppliants. The Canadian Northern is a great railway in many ways; of the Transcontinental lines it is probably the best located, traversing the richest and best country. I believe it has potentialities. It is fine to hear capitalists arguing about potentialities. It is fine to hear an ex-minister talk on potentialities. It is a very fine argument.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was filling in the gap which my hon. friend left.

Mr. MACLEAN: But if it comes down to potentialities, they are in the Canadian Northern, and in that condition we are particeps criminis; we are partners in the crime, so to speak. We own 40 per cent of the road, and we are asking ourselves to give enough money to relieve the railroad. We have to relieve both railroads.

An hon. MEMBER: We are responsible for four-tenths of the crime.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, four-tenths of the crime is at our door. But what should we do with the Canadian Northern? It is so easy a proposition compared with the complexity of the Grand Trunk case. I would say to the Canadian Northern: we own 40 per cent of your proposition; it is a good proposition; its potentialities are great; what will you take for your $60,000,000 of stock? If the responsibility were on my shoulders I would make a settlement with them. I would say: What is the lowest you will take? I believe that they would take, perhaps, $6,000,000 or $8,000,000. That is only my own guess, but I have studied the question, and I think they would surrender that $60,000,000 worth of stock for that amount. If I were a financier as is my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, which I am not, I would say: what annuity will you take for twenty years?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understood my hon. friend to suggest that the Grand Trunk railroad could be forced to do a certain thing because of its legal position?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Now my hon. friend says that $6,000,000 should be paid. What about the legal position of the Canadian Northern?

Mr. MACLEAN: I would say that probably they are committed just as much. It is a long story. However, I admit that, perhaps, I am inconsistent.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is nothing new.

Mr. MACLEAN: I never charged anybody with inconsistency. I remember quoting in this House before what Sir Henry Maine said in connection with politics; he referred to the doubtful virtue of consistency. It is a very doubtful virtue, and I may be inconsistent. But I would like to deal with the Canadian Northern in a short and sharp way, and if they could be brought to abandon their position we would have to give them help to tide them over as we propose to give to the Grand Trunk. But it would be on condition of turning the proposition over to this country, and I think you could get the Canadian Northern with all its potentialities, which are very great, though its commitments are also, for a comparatively small sum. I would say 10 per cent of the stock, or say $6,000,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does my hon. friend seriously mean to say that he thinks the controlling interest of the Canadian Northern would sell out to the Government for 10 per cent of their stock?

Mr. MACLEAN: I would offer them that; I would say; what will you do? I would say come into the captain's office when you are a suppliant. The trouble in this country is that nobody ever calls those people who come as suppliants. They come asking money and we say: what can we do for you; what can we do to help you to put it over the Canadian people.

Mr. MACDONALD: What would you do if they would not sell?

Mr. TURRIFF: Foreclose.

Mr. MACLEAN: I take the hon. gentleman's confession that he would foreclose, only, they say it is on record that, when the settlement of 1914 was made, there was an understanding that Mackenzie and Mann as railway builders had something coming to them for their services. I cannot place my finger on that statement, but I think it was made. With all their faults, I do believe that Mackenzie and Mann and the original promoters of the Grand Trunk Pacific were trying to give this country service and to help to build it up. But they are both here now as suppliants, and one of them has great potentialities. The old Grand Trunk is, to my mind, the greatest asset in this country. And now, when they are here in this position, is the time to secure them. This is the psychological moment. It needs courage and faith, but, by taking these roads under Government control now, these potentialities can be developed.

Now, I want to come to the other railroad, the Canadian Pacific, the best transcontinental, or any other railway system, in the world. It is to the credit of the Canadian people and of the members of this House as it was then constituted, both Liberals and Conservatives, that the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway was brought about. For this I give credit all round. This great railway to-day pays its shareholders 10 per cent, partly out of traffic earnings, partly out of revenue from land and from investments in other railways. The Canadian Pacific is not here as a suppliant, but it fears what will happen to the suppliants who are here and that if these roads are taken over by the Government the Canadian Pacific will be greatly damaged and its potentialities jeopardized. What would you do with the Canadian Pacific in connection with this public ownership proposition? I want the members of this House to realize that I am not pressing this matter for the first time. I have been here now for twenty-four years.

Mr. MORPHY: And looking younger every day.

Mr. MACLEAN: Not looking younger, but feeling younger and having greater faith in public ownership than ever I had; and I am still talking, I suppose, as a dreamer; yet I have the example of all Europe ahead of me and I have the example of the things that we have found out in this country.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: How do the conditions in Europe differ from those found in Canada?

Mr. MACLEAN: There are many differences; but I want to tell the hon. member from the plains that the system we have is the worst possible system for the farmers of the West, and that the way to relieve them is to give them the cheapest possible transportation, as the Australians have done, and as we also can do. But what would I do with the Canadian Pacific? I would say to the shareholders of that road: "You are earning 7 per cent on your capital out of traffic and you are earning 3 per cent in profits on lands and other enterprises." They have additional assets—those they desired to have segregated—and they are very profitable. I would summon them here and say: "We will guarantee to you 7 per cent for twenty

or twenty-five years, and then we will refund the securities if you turn the railway over to us." I believe the shareholders would accept that. I have no authority from Lord Shaughnessy or the shareholders to say this; but they fear the situation which is developing in connection with the two other roads.

Mr. MORPHY: You have said that they are already getting 10 per cent in perpetuity.

Mr. MACLEAN: I did not say in perpetuity.

Mr. MORPHY: Well, as long as conditions hold; is that it?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: And you are going to give them 7 per cent?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: And at the end of the 25 years—what?

Mr. MACLEAN: Refund the securities if we see fit to do it. If the market were advantageous at that time, I would refund the obligations, relieve the shareholders, and give them something, if we had the opportunity of doing it, dependent upon the condition of the market.

Mr. MORPHY: Or buy them out?

Mr. MACLEAN: Or buy them out. But I would have a terminable period in connection with the matter. Would the Canadian Pacific shareholders take 7 per cent? I do not know, but I would start negotiations with them and find out what they really wanted. I would say to them: "If we get the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk, and the Canadian Northern on reasonable terms, and if you do not want to have the opposition of the new consolidated Government lines, now is your opportunity to come in, and what will you take if we take you in?" If they should say, "You are sacrificing our assets, you are confiscating our properties," I would say: "No, we will guarantee you dividends at the rate of 7 per cent for twenty-five years, and we will take you over." I do not come here proposing confiscation of any kind. I would even offer to pay something to the old Grand Trunk shareholders, I would give a reasonable amount to the owners of the Canadian Northern, and I would give guarantees to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for their railway.

What would happen if we took over one, two, three, or all of these propositions? In any case we have public ownership and we have opened the way into territory where public ownership will justify itself if it can. It never will justify itself by having ragged ends—lines away on the outskirts not coupled up or connected with the great lines of traffic. What is the fundamental error in the railway situation in Canada? The fundamental error is unnecessary duplication in the construction of lines. We have lines running in duplicate all over this country, which never should have been allowed. I live in Toronto; I come down here, often, as you do; we go to Montreal, the Montreal people come to us; and what do we see? Every night now there are five passenger trains running between Toronto and Montreal when two or three would do the business, give a better service, and save a lot of money? The unnecessary cost of duplication in construction is aggravated by the unnecessary, criminal, duplication of service. We have lost an immense amount of money by unnecessary duplication in construction. But, realizing that fundamental error, why should we aggravate it by insisting on this unnecessary duplication of service? That is something that public ownership will correct. It will not cure the unnecessary duplication of construction, but it will cure the unnecessary duplication of service. There are three lines from Winnipeg to Edmonton and perhaps five to the West. There are three or five trains for the Pacific going out of Toronto every night. There will be the Transcontinental, the Government-owned system, there will be the Canadian Northern,—its trains will soon start to go out every night—and the Canadian Pacific has two trains going out of Toronto for Winnipeg every day. Two trains would do that service better than it has ever been done.

Mr. STEVENS: In winter, but not in summer.

Mr. MACLEAN: So much the better for the system if we can have three or five trains every night. I want to see five trains going out from Toronto to Winnipeg and from Montreal to Toronto if the business calls for them; but I do not want to see an unnecessary duplication, something that I can see every morning when I look out of the window. I live near the railway track, and I can see three, fine express trains all coming over the Canadian Pacific to Toronto, and they run what trainmen call a ghost train.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Do you say there are five transcontinental trains going out of Toronto every night?

Mr. MACLEAN: The Canadian Pacific have two going out of Toronto.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: They have one going out of Montreal.

Mr. MACLEAN: One out of Montreal. Every other night there is one on the Grand Trunk Pacific and every other night one on the Canadian Northern; so that there are four trains and there will soon be more. There is not enough business for all of them to do. I say that this is unnecessary duplication, and that the train service can be reduced.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has it not been reduced?

Mr. MACLEAN: Not very much. They are putting on more trains because of the competition.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know that on the Ottawa line of the Canadian Pacific the service is reduced on account of the war.

Mr. MACLEAN: Not between here and Toronto.

Mr. STEVENS: Between here and Montreal.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And also between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. MACLEAN: So much the better; they see that they have had to reduce the number of their trains.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In New Brunswick we complain of the reduced accommodation.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Because the people generally have to pay for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, because they want the accommodation.

Mr. MACLEAN: You can cut out a lot of unnecessary train services, and you can improve the construction. Take, for instance, the traffic out of Toronto. The Grand Trunk has the worst grade of its system at Scarborough going out of Toronto. Four miles north there is what is called the Wexford grade on the Canadian Pacific. It is one per cent grade at the steepest part and it takes the line over the same elevation. But, strange to say, the Canadian Northern, following in the steps of some of the Canadian Pacific engineers, four or five years ago found between these two lines four miles apart, a one-half of one per cent grade over Scarborough Heights; they have located it, and ultimately it will be built. If there were a consolidation we could wipe out these two expensive grades; we might even transfer the rails and build on this new grade, which would save the situation there forever. All over the country you could make improvements in this way.

Now, I will tell you how a public railway would work with respect to both freight and passenger service. You would get the Intercolonial railway, which is a Government-owned railway to-day, at Halifax, and come to Montreal; you would come to Ottawa and go on to Toronto by the old Grand Trunk; from Toronto you would want to use the best transcontinental railway, and you would take the Canadian Pacific to Sudbury; from Sudbury you would go to lake Nipigon by way of the Canadian Northern; you would build 25 miles from lake Nipigon to the Transcontinental railway; on the fine grade of the Transcontinental you would go on into Winnipeg. Then you would go from Winnipeg to Edmonton over either the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Northern, and you would certainly go to Vancouver by the Canadian Northern. In addition, if you had public ownership, you could link the systems up so as to get the advantages that linking up or grouping would give you, and you would have a real solution of the transportation problem in this country.

Mr. STEVENS: How would the hon. gentleman operate?

Mr. MACLEAN: How do France and Germany operate their systems and how do we operate the system we have? I would put them all together in charge of a board of three or five of the ablest railway men in this country, and we could pick them up in Canada to-day. I know where the men are; we could get them; and these men would run that system as it should be run. There might be a proposition to take the men employed on the road out of politics and deprive them of their votes.

Mr. MORPHY: Would the hon. gentleman double-track one right of way?

Mr. MACLEAN: I would have the railways administered in the public interest. I would take off any unnecessary trains and link up the systems with a view to giving the best service. In that way great savings would be effected and an improved service would be given at lower rates. It may be said that it is impossible to

carry out such a scheme, but I do not think so. Now is the time to take advantage of the situation, and the Government say they are going to take advantage of it. They may come to public ownership. At all events they are going to appoint a commission of three to consider the matter, and, if we can read how others interpret that, we are almost sure to have public ownership if the commission report in favour of it. But I do not propose to surrender my judgment to any three men on this subject; nor will the people of Canada. They have come to the conclusion to have public ownership, and they are going to have it; it is in the air. The success of the Hydro in Ontario is something we can look to with pride, and the success of public ownership in a great many ways leads me to believe that it can be successfully applied to the railway situation, if only we will alter our political system in this country.

In the presence of this war the day has come when we must stop patronage in connection with our public institutions. We must reform our public service, and banish the member of Parliament and the politician from the door of the Minister of Railways, or whoever it may be has to administer the railways of this country. And we can do these things. If there is anything I resent it is a man in public life in Canada saying to me and to this House: "You cannot trust the Canadian people with a railway franchise of their own." The Canadian people are just as big, just as good, and just as clean as the people of any other country. It is we public men who are in the wrong in this country. The people are all right, and I will trust them with the railways. I am not going to put a stigma upon my fellow-countrymen in connection with railways in this country. That is the one thing I have always noticed in these political discussions; it is the answer that is always given to me. Imagine the answer yesterday of the Montreal Gazette, that paragon of political virtue, that we are such a corrupt lot of people that we could not run our railways! I believe we can.

Mr. OLIVER: The Gazette is the spokesman of the Government party.

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not know so much about that. It is certainly the spokesman of the Grand Trunk Railway and of the Canadian Pacific Railway; I am sure of that, but I think I have seen the Gazette turn the Government down on occasions. I have every confidence in my fellow-countrymen. I have confidence that the Canadian people could effect greater economies in the roads, give an improved service, and in that way help to settle the West. By taking over these railways we should remove the greatest danger from our political life, because we should be putting the owners of private-owned railways out of politics in this country. The present system is wrong. I am not going to pass much criticism of what has happened in the past. The charge that has been made is that the owners of railways and railway promoters have broken into our politics and more or less demoralized us. I am not going to repeat that charge now. But I believe our public life would be better and purer, and certainly we should have a better railway service, if we applied public ownership to our railways, and applied it in a proper way. But we do not want any more public ownership of this kind: of the Intercolonial taking up all the lame ducks of the East; helping to build roads and then taking them over because they run through a new country where there is not much local traffic. I do not believe in the policy of taking over the weak spots in the Canadian Northern or any other railway. Let us go the whole hog or none; let us get the productive ends as well as the weak ends, and link the various systems up. The salvation of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and something that will add to the glory of hon. gentlemen opposite, for this road is their child, is to incorporate it into a great public system.

3 p.m.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Into whose hands would my hon. friend put the three transcontinental systems if they were nationalized today?

Mr. MACLEAN: As a democrat, I would say into the hands of the people, represented by a commission.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand that. I am not opposed to nationalization; I advocated it myself the other evening. But what men would my hon. friend choose?

Mr. MACLEAN: The very best I could get; and you can get good men. I still have faith in the railway men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would you take a man like Baron Shaughnessy to administer the roads?

Mr. MACLEAN: I would take him for one, if I could get him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is what will happen.

Mr. MACLEAN: In the past on this American continent, the most able lawyers and capitalists, the able administrators of public services of one kind or another, have gone into the employ of the great corporations, and made money for them and fortunes for themselves. But a strange thing has been happening in the last twenty years in the United States, and I begin to see it coming in this country. They are developing men over there, and we are beginning to do the same here, who see that the greatest opportunity that can come to any man is public service. I know young men in our universities who have had experience as railway men, experience in the financial institutions of this country and with business corporations. I could find you twenty men about thirty-five years of age who have this passion—and it is a grand passion—for devoting their lives to public service. And life is not worth living these days if we have not the vision and the disposition to give ourselves to public service in a great cause. I would have a commission in this country. Yes, I would have Baron Shaughnessy. I do not think, Sir William Mackenzie is a railroad operator, although he is a Napoleon in building; but he has two men in that system both of whom are great railroad men. Mr. Bury is a great operator who would serve the state. Has any one objection to Mr. Gutelius as a great railroad man? Take the roads out of politics and put them in charge of three or five men of this calibre. Take the roads out of politics——

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Saying so will not do it.

Mr. MACLEAN: It is worth while trying to do, and I would sooner try that than go on under the present system. I will trust Canadians every day. I would like to see the hon. member, who challenges the integrity of his fellow countrymen——

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: I repudiate the observation. I did not challenge the integrity of my fellow countrymen. What I said was that, unfortunately, you cannot take the roads out of politics simply by saying so.

Mr. MACLEAN: I adjust myself to the orientation of my hon. friend from Calgary. I have no hesitation in saying that I would nationalize these roads, and I would get Canadians to administer them and to remedy these evils for the benefit of the Canadian people.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does not my hon. friend think that those men whom he would name would be the kings of Canada?

Mr. MACLEAN: Three wise men came from the East, and Heaven be thanked that they recognized something on a certain day in the history of the world, and brought frankincense and myrrh.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who were the other two?

Mr. MACLEAN: Would the hon. gentleman like to be one? He is looking for a job, it is said.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was asking who the other two wise men were to whom my hon. friend referred.

Mr. MACLEAN: There are plenty of wise men in this country, some of whom are supposed to come from the East, and some of whom are in the West. The finest type of man and woman that the world has ever seen is in this day and generation growing up in this country of ours. In my personal acquaintance of the last year or two I have never seen a finer type of youth than the genuine Canadian boys whom I know in my own city and in my own township who are going to the front. The spirit of sacrifice and fidelity and patriotism shown by those boys is what gives me confidence that the Canadian people can run these railroads to the advantage of the nation. I could speak for a week on this subject—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MACLEAN: No. I do not intend to say much more. I am so convinced that this is the psychological moment for the nationalization of the railways of Canada that I think Parliament ought at once to instruct the Government to carry out that project, because the Government can do anything. I wish to warn the Government of the great danger they are in of not seizing the psychological moment to deal with this question. An election is not far away, and there is a temptation to these railway magnates that we know to butt into that election, and if the psychological moment has arrived to absorb the railways, to head it off. I hope the right hon. leader of the Opposition, who is the father of the Grand Trunk Pacific, sees the error of the father, and that he is prepared to assist the Govern-

ment in carrying out this project. There would, of course, be a great temptation to him, as he may have a political triumph ahead of him in the coming election—no one knows what is going to happen in an election—to come back with a programme to restore and carry out the original intention of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the old Grand Trunk and to put them in competition with all the other lines. I do not want to see that, I would like to see both sides of the House do their best to prevent that and deal with this question now. The key of the situation is to take over one railroad—I do not care which one you take if you get a transcontinental system. The Canadian Northern joined up with the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental would be a splendid transcontinental system; it would touch every point but that part of the province of Ontario west of Toronto, and that part is full of railroads.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Terminals.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, I am going to speak about terminals.

Mr. NESBITT: I am very interested in this discussion, and before you go into that, I would like to know what form of commission you would suggest in order to take it out of politics and party patronage.

Mr. MACLEAN: I would take it out of politics, and the people of Canada would see that the men whom they sent to Parliament and the men whom they entrusted with this work would be kept out of politics. Public men can be disciplined. The people of this country from this time on are going to discipline their public men. In England they are to-day making their public men walk the plank if they do not do as the people wish. Every hon. member here to-day knows that he is under the eye of his constituents and subject to their discipline more than he ever was before. The public conscience is aroused; public duty is demanded; consecration of service is demanded and the people will insist on getting that and they will get it. If the leaders of the people advise the people aright, all well and good; if they do not advise the people aright, the people will take the matter into their own hands. In regard to duplication of service, Sir Adam Beck has petitioned this Parliament to aid certain lines that he has in hand in Ontario.

Mr. MORPHY: He says that he does not want any aid.

Mr. MACLEAN: He has petitioned this Parliament and he proposes to build certain lines. In order to work out salvation as he views it, Sir Adam Beck wants to duplicate a line in the province of Ontario. My contention is that we have there all the railroads that are required. When I said that the Canadian Northern had no lines west of Toronto, I knew, of course, that we could take running rights over existing roads in that part of Ontario, and in that way make out of the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental and the Canadian Northern a splendid transcontinental system, by which we would get into every part of this country. That system with the Grand Trunk linked up to it would make a magnificent railroad. The best transcontinental system of all, of course, would be the Canadian Pacific joined up to the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial, and I would be willing to make very liberal terms with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in order to carry out a project of that kind.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The branch lines of the Canadian Pacific are better, but its main line is not as good.

Mr. MACLEAN: The Canadian Pacific is better in Quebec, where railroading started in Canada. The most extravagant of all proposals is this proposal of unnecessary duplication of terminals in Canada. I first want to deal with terminal seaports, and we have room in Canada for seaports at Halifax and St. John and also at Quebec and Montreal. We cannot afford at the present time to have great seaports and all the terminal facilities that go with great seaports in connection with four or more cities, but we could have one, two, or three. We could start with one at the best seaport on the continent of North America, and that seaport should be under the British flag. We are making Halifax a seaport; St. John is here as a suppliant in connection with her port, and she is getting something; we are making Montreal a great port, and, in fact, almost all those seaports could be justified.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Halifax will be the best harbour in the world when present contemplated improvements are completed.

Mr. MACLEAN: The best port in Canada for general business. In regard to city terminals, I believe that the Grand Trunk station at Bonaventure street was burned recently. Mackenzie & Mann are boring a tunnel through Mount Royal for the great terminal station in Montreal. The Canadian

Pacific have built an enormous terminal, recently enlarged, at their Windsor station. There is no room for three terminals in Montreal, but there is room for a great terminal of the largest kind.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Is it not too late now, in view of the expenditure already made?

Mr. MACLEAN: No, I am told they are rebuilding Bonaventure station now.

Mr. GRAHAM: Only temporarily fixing it up.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, but I understand they want to build a great terminal. I have seen plans for a Canadian Northern terminal at Montreal which would involve an expenditure of thirty or forty millions of dollars.

Mr. GRAHAM: They have spent a lot of money.

Mr. MACLEAN: Probably the best entrance to Montreal is by the tunnel of the Canadian Northern, and probably there is room at the city end of that tunnel for a great terminal station. But there ought to be only one terminal in Montreal as there ought to be only one in Toronto, and in every other large city except where there are special advantages to be gained by having sub-terminals, and there are such cities. Why should we be committed to these unnecessary terminals, especially when this is the day of terminals? The termial costs are the great costs in connection with railways to-day. There are two big termials in Winnipeg, and I understand that in Vancouver there is a proposition to have another terminal.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: The bonds are sold to the extent of ten millions.

Mr. MACLEAN: Devote these bonds to the purposes of the war.

Mr. STEVENS: In Vancouver we are bringing four roads into one terminal.

Mr. MACLEAN: So much the better. Surely hon. gentlemen are not saying anything against the concentration of traffic in these days. One of the great causes of expense is the terminal sidings owned by rival lines in our cities. The Railway Commission has succeeded in consolidating these terminal sidings in some places, but surely it is plain what an improvement it would be if all the terminal sidings in a big city like Montreal were under the control of one administration and were used for the service of the people instead of as at present as a means of extortion. One railway cannot use another railway's sidings except on condition of giving them all their freight. One great advantage of public ownership would be in the means it would afford for improved terminal facilities in the leading cities where the economies effected in the collection and distribution of trade are something enormous. The railways have spent immense sums, unnecessarily at times, to acquire terminal and siding facilities in the cities. All these things could be improved. It is a hard thing to do; the problem is great; but there is nothing for you or me as legislators in this country but to take up the burden of these enormous problems that present themselves to-day. They must be dealt with; we cannot sidestep them; the future of the country and its development, and the happiness and harmony of our people, can largely be promoted by improving our system of transportation. We must correct the errors of the past; one thing that stands to the credit of the really penitent man is that not only is he penitent but willing to lead a better life——

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: To bring forth fruits meet for repentance.

Mr. MACLEAN: I accept that—though I do not set myself up as an example. I have stated the case in a broad way, and especially I have tried to tell the Government the danger there is in throwing this proposition over into the election that is coming, and it must come. My appeal to the Government and to the right hon. leader of the Government is that at this stage it should take over one road at least. I do not care which one, but if it is the Grand Trunk then it should be the whole Grand Trunk, or if it is the Canadian Northern it must be the whole of the road, or let it be the Canadian Pacific. You can get the Canadian Pacific to-morrow, and you can get it without one dollar of expenditure. You have only to take it over and guarantee certain dividends on the stock. I know how you can get it. I present myself in this House ready to associate myself with others to go to the people who will authorize such a thing to be done, and it can be carried out; I will undertake to find the men who will do it. That is a rather broad statement. I am not blocking any proposition here to-

day. It is incumbent upon the Government to come to the relief of these railways. It would be bad policy to force them into liquidation if peaceful possession can be obtained. I believe you can obtain it; the danger is in not going at it now, but in putting it over until after an election and the report of the proposed commission. I have no objection to a commission, but I am not going to let the commission make up my mind for me. I would urge upon the leader of the Government and upon the Government as well, that the right hon. gentleman should tell the people that the substitute he was prepared to offer for the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite in relation to the Transcontinental railway was public ownership. There is the offer, in the letter of Mr. Smithers, to carry out this policy. I put it right up to the right hon. leader of the Government that now is the time to act. He can succeed if he will act now, and a more favourable opportunity will never come than that which exists to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The hon. gentleman thinks that consistency is a doubtful virtue.

Mr. MACLEAN: That has been proved many a time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: With the hon. gentleman's consent, I desire to ask a question.

Mr. MACLEAN: Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman is understood to be in the confidence of the Government. There is a vote of $18,000,000 in the Estimates for the purpose of making a loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific. The proposal and absolute statement of Mr. Smithers must have been withdrawn, or at least sufficiently withdrawn to enable this proposition to be made, which seems to be entirely different. I suppose that the hon. gentleman, in caucus, has been informed upon that and can enlighten the House.

Mr. MACLEAN: I am sorry I cannot enlighten the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). There may have been a release, but I know nothing about it. The commitment is there acknowledged by Mr. Smithers, and it is on the statute books of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why offer a loan of $18,000,000 if he will not accept it?

Mr. MACLEAN: I suppose he has said he would accept it. I do not recall having seen any man around this Parliament buildings who would not accept anything he could get. No, I should not say that for I have seen people to whom propositions have been made and they did not take them, and those who made them went away; that has happened not often, but it has happened. I do not think Mr. Smithers is going to be released, but I would not release him from any of his commitments. Now is the opportunity; it will never come again. I say again to the leader of the Government that he told the people of Canada that public ownership was the thing to apply to the Transcontinental proposition of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Now is the day and now the hour to carry out that plan. To-day the Grand Trunk is suppliant at our door; never will such an opportunity come again. We can take over the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, link them up with the Intercolonial, and make of these roads a great system, giving the people a better service, building up the Canadian West and giving better railway rates. Then you will be able to use railroads as Bismarck said they should be used; for the national purposes, for national defence, most of all for national upbuilding. What is the secret of German advancement in the world, notwithstanding their attack on the world's liberties? The case of Germany is the most marvellous instance in the history of the world of the development of a nation having many men but no great resources—no iron, no coal, and practically no trade. Bismarck said: "Nationalize the railways; use them to build up industries at home by giving them improved railway facilities; use them to give cheap rates to assist our ships in carrying raw products back to us and in carrying our exports to the markets of the world.

Mr. GRAHAM: But the federal authority of Germany does not own the railways.

Mr. MACLEAN: I did not say that it did, but the federal authority in Germany, working with the minor authorities have used the railway for national purposes, first, for the defence of the Empire, second, for the promotion of trade. The secret of the great growth of German trade was that the nation could use its railroads for the encouragement of trade.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: And to absorb part of the freight rate in bringing to the

seaboard towns that were far away from the seaboard.

Mr. MACLEAN: I had forgotten something; the hon. gentleman reminds me of an awful heresy which I propose unfolding to this committee. Do you know what you can do when you have a Transcontinental line? You can valorize the cost of transporting a bushel of wheat. In other words, a man who grew a bushel of wheat in Manitoba or Saskatchewan or Alberta would get the same price for it no matter on what siding of the railway it might be delivered. That may be another heretical doctrine to propound; I do not propose it just now. But the only way you can valorize the price of wheat is by owning the railways so that the freight charge on a carload of wheat going to the seaboard would be the same from Manitoba as it would be from Saskatchewan or Alberta. Probably that is the way you are going to get settlement all through the western country: by giving equal railway charges to all people. They have actually recognized that doctrine in Germany, Austria and Hungary in regard to the transportation of workingmen. Whether the distance be five, ten or twenty miles, the workingman can go to work in the morning upon practically the same ticket in each case. This is done under national ownership. You can do a great many things by public ownership of railways; certainly you can improve the West.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: You can, by equalising freight rates, obviate the demand for free wheat.

Mr. MACLEAN: I met a man the other day, known to many members of this House, who warned me as to some of my views. He said: "If we have not competition in freights in Canada, we have competition in service, and that means a great deal." There is something in that; the shipper gets better treatment where he is in a position to ask another competitive road to give him service. Some things can be said for private ownership, and there are evils inherent, perhaps, in public ownership, as there are evils inherent in private ownership. I am prepared to discount everything I have said in favour of public ownership, and to allow it to be discounted and ridiculed, but, standing here in my position as representing a portion of the people of this country, I say that the people I know and represent are in favour of public ownership of railways. I think the view of my own province, of many of the newspapers—indeed of all Canada—is in favour of public ownership. The feeling seems to prevail that the old system is coming to an end. If the war has taught us anything, it has taught us what I told a well-known Englishman when he was over here the other day—and I rather annoyed him because he asked me for the chapter and verse, and I could not quite give it to him. I said: "If there is anything the war has taught us, it is to realize the application to these times of the words of St. John in the Book of Revelation: 'I saw a new Heaven and a new earth.'" This war has put us in a new earth. The problems are new, the outlook is new, and the man in politics who is to succeed or to lead is the man who has the vision to see the new world and the solution of these new problems. You never can settle these problems—I care not whether in connection with trade or railways—by the old methods. There is a new approach to everything now, and there has to be a new approach to the railway question. While the people of the United States have not as a whole come to believe in public ownership, they are coming to it so fast that you will wake up some morning and see a man like Roosevelt at the head of affairs in the United States. Under the guise of a law protecting the public mails, or something like that, he will give a start to the system; it will be worked out and the people of the United States will welcome it. I make that prediction and I say that if we do not get busy in the matter of public ownership of railways the United States will be there before us. Seventy-five per cent of their roads have gone through liquidation at some time or other; they would all have been there but for the business that came to the United States as a result of the war. But the old conditions will come back again; the effects of unnecessary duplication will have to be dealt with. I say—and I want it to be engraven in the memories of you all—that now is the time to take over at least one railroad, and, by the leverage that the taking over of that railroad gives you, to deal with the others on your own terms and to the great advantage of Canada.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): I do not intend to detain the committee at any great length at this date in the session.

Mr. BURNHAM: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend from Peterborough says "Hear, hear" with his usual frankness. However, there are a few things that I think I ought to say to this committee. First, I must congratulate the hon. member for South York upon the splendid presentation of his case that he made this afternoon. I have listened to it, and I have enjoyed every moment of it. A great deal that he has said will be very profitable to me. Ever since I was a young lad I have dreamed of the coming of public ownership of great utilities in Canada. It was always in my mind; it is in my mind to-day as an ideal to be sought after, and, if possible, attained. But I find, as I grow older, that there are two things facing you; one is the ideal, and the other is the attaining of that ideal. There is the theory, and there is the practice, and when I consider the great problem facing the people of Canada to-day in regard to the nationalization of the railway systems, after many decades of private ownership, I am almost overwhelmed by the stupendous problem which faces those who are called upon to work out the details. To put it in an illustrative way, my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) would take a gun, put it to the head of the Grand Trunk and say: Come to Ottawa, talk this over, and liquidate or deal; one or the other. It is a spectacular way of putting it, and I appreciate it from my hon. friend's standpoint, but there are other considerations that must be kept in mind. In the first place, we must consider the indirect effects upon the country generally of a revolutionary movement of this kind, and, having in view the carrying out of the nationalization of the railroads, we must, as far as possible, minimize the disruption of trade, or the dislocation of the various interests that would be affected.

It is not my intention to go into a long argument, or to follow my hon. friend, because in my own mind I agree with him entirely. We simply differ on this point, that he is exceedingly hopeful of the simplicity of the process, while I am overwhelmed with the conviction that the process is a most intricate and difficult one. For instance, my hon. friend says he would summon the Canadian Pacific Railway, offer them 7 per cent for twenty years, and, he says, we could get the Canadian Pacific system to-morrow. It sounds good, and I think my hon. friend is sincere, but when I think of Baron Shaughnessy, of Mr. Bury and the army of experts and legal advisers, of the large amount of stocks and bonds, of the financial institutions affected, the hotels, steamships, terminals, elevators, and the other ramifications of that great system, the very thought of it is confusing to the mind. It would take a commission of the ablest experts at least a year, in my judgment, to investigate the matter, and that is exactly what the Government proposes to do. They say: give us $150,000 and we will secure the best experts we can get, put them on the job for a year or nine months, and then, at the next session of Parliament, we will present their report with ours giving the Government view. That is what they are proposing to do at the present time. So far as I am concerned, I think the Government's course is wise, safe, and business-like.

I wish to refer to some of the arguments presented by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the railway problem that is facing Canada to-day. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and others, have continually dinned into our ears in this House that the whole railway trouble in Canada lies west of the Rocky mountains. They say that if we could get rid of this incubus known as British Columbia, everything would be lovely and we would not have any problem on our hands to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: Would the hon. gentleman stop talking nonsense.

Mr. STEVENS: I thank my hon. friend for his interpellation, but I am not talking nonsense. My hon. friend stated on the floor of this House not more than a week ago, and has stated time after time, that the fault lay in the extension of those lines to the Pacific coast.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—

Mr. STEVENS: I have no time to look up Hansard.

Mr. OLIVER: I just wish to say that the hon. gentleman's statement is incorrect.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member puts it as if we had said that we should get rid of British Columbia. I never said a word about British Columbia. I stated distinctly that I thought the time was inopportune to build through to the Coast, but that eventually the road should be built. I took

exception to building being proceeded with at that time, but I said nothing about British Columbia, and I was speaking of the Canadian Northern.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friends cannot get away from the fact that this session, and in other sessions, when the railway situation has been under discussion in this House, they have continually referred to the British Columbia end as the chief difficulty in the situation. Of course, being entirely responsible for the Grand Trunk Pacific, they have not cast any reflections on that road. So far as the Canadian Northern in British Columbia is concerned, it passes through a very rich territory, and I purpose giving the House some idea of the possibilities of the Pacific coast province. So far as the territory from Edmonton to the coast is concerned, my hon. friend from Edmonton knows very well that one of the richest parts of the province of Alberta lies between the summit and Edmonton. He also knows that immediately west of the pass on the British Columbia side, we have some of the most magnificent farming lands to be found in Canada. The British Columbia Government at this very moment own in the Peace river district of British Columbia 6,000,000 acres of excellent farming land, 4,500,000 acres of which have been reserved exclusively for pre-emption purposes.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the hon. gentleman tell us what on earth that has to do with the Canadian Northern?

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend will only contain himself for a moment I will tell him. I am not saying that the Canadian Northern runs through that part. I am saying that there are west of the Rocky mountains tracts of land capable of development which will create traffic and trade not only for the railroads there now, but for other railroads not yet constructed, but which ought to be constructed. For instance, the extension of the Dunvegan line from Edmonton to Fort George would pass through that district.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend conveyed to the House the idea, if I gathered his remarks correctly, that he was going to tell us what area was being developed by the Canadian Northern in British Columbia.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not say anything of the kind. I said I would give some idea of the resources of British Columbia, which, in my estimation, justify the expenditures on railways which have been made in that province. Perhaps some of the money has been spent a little ahead of time, but the resources of the province will justify, not only what has been spent, but more expenditures.

Mr. OLIVER: Will the hon. gentleman say that any part of the money expended upon the Canadian Northern has any bearing upon the area of land he spoke of?

Mr. STEVENS: No, it passes through an area of land between the point where it leaves the Canadian Pacific railway north of Kamloops, or opposite the Canadian Pacific railway, and a point straight north at the North Thompson river. It passes through a district which is one of the most fertile in the province of British Columbia, or even in the Dominion of Canada, a district which was not touched by any railway, and which was inaccessible, so far as railway traffic was concerned, up to the time when the Canadian Northern was constructed. The district is also exceedingly rich in minerals. It may be that the construction of the Canadian Northern, paralleling the Canadian Pacific railway through the Fraser valley could be criticised, but, on the other hand, it must be remembered that the Fraser river and the Thompson river run from Kamloops to the coast. This river is a wide and turbulent stream, and the railway runs down one side. It is impossible to serve the other side of the river from the railway line, but the Canadian Northern takes the opposite side of the river, and where the Canadian Pacific railway crosses the Canadian Northern crosses to the other side. In this way both sides of the river have been served. It is a costly thing to double track the Canadian Pacific railway through what is known as the Fraser canyon. You virtually have in the construction of the Canadian Northern down the Fraser valley a double-track railway created out of the Canadian Pacific system. I say that merely to show that the construction of the Canadian Northern on the Pacific coast is not the incubus that many hon. gentlemen would lead us to believe. It is rather a striking statement but it is an actual fact that the grade from Edmonton to the coast on the Canadian Northern railway is a better grade than from Edmonton to Fort William on the same system, and it is an infinitely better grade than that which the Canadian Pacific have

through the Rockies. I remember 22 years ago when I went to British Columbia first, we had the Canadian Pacific line passing through the Rocky mountains, and we had the Field hill and other large hills which have been tunnelled and reduced to a very large extent. These grades were from 5 to 5½ per cent, almost impossible grades, and they had to use two, three, and sometimes four engines to haul a train over those grades. Every man who knows anything about railway operation knows that that is an impossible grade for carrying freight economically. These grades have been reduced by the expenditure of large sums of money by the Canadian Pacific but still they have grades of 2 to 2½ per cent. The Canadian Pacific is spending $100,000,000 in the improvement and extension of their line in British Columbia. A large portion of this has already been spent in tunnelling, reducing grades, double tracking and extensions, and the Canadian Pacific would not undertake extensions of that kind if they were not justified in doing so. These improvements will ultimately cost $100,000,000 and they have been undertaken because the construction of the Canadian Northern brought competition, and the Canadian Northern, having better grades, threatened to be a superior road to the Canadian Pacific. The statement has been made that as this is a sparsely settled country there is no call for these extensions. When the Canadian Pacific was built, and when the Hon. Edward Blake made the statement that the Canadian Pacific would not pay for the axle grease used upon the road, there were 170,000 people in all west of the great lakes. In 1903 or 1904, there were 175,000 people in the province of British Columbia. In 1914 this number had increased to 500,000. In the face of the construction of the Canadian Pacific when there were only 170,000 people in that vast territory, is it not reasonable to say that the construction of the Canadian Northern was not inadvisable, was not bad business and that it had every reasonable opportunity to make good.

I would like to place on Hansard and before the house some figures in connection with the resources and production of British Columbia in reply to the impression that has gone abroad in the East that British Columbia to-day is in a languishing condition. With reference to mineral production, I quote largely from the figures for 1913-14 because these are the last figures that I could obtain at the library, later ones not seemingly being available as yet. According to the figures for 1913-14, the mineral production for the whole of Canada from 1886 to 1913 was $1,500,000,000, and the mineral production for British Columbia alone was $395,000,000; so that during the 28 years from 1886 to 1913 British Columbia produced 26 per cent of all the minerals produced in Canada. Of this $395,000,000 worth produced in British Columbia, 54 per cent was produced between 1906 and 1913 or within the last seven years of the period quoted. In 1913 the mineral production was $30,150,000, and in 1912 it was $32,440,000. The dividends paid by the mining institutions of British Columbia in 1913 aggregated $2,400,000. It is necessary to quote these figures to show the actual conditions obtaining in my province.

Take the fisheries—and we hear a great deal about their fisheries from our hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces. All Canada is proud of the fishery business of the Maritime Provinces. The total production of the fisheries of Canada in the year 1913, was $33,390,000, and of that amount British Columbia produced $14,455,000, or about one half of the total production, and double the value that Nova Scotia produced.

In regard to agriculture, we have heard from a great many persons who have not visited British Columbia and know nothing about its beautiful valleys and their fertility, that it is an impossible country from an agricultural standpoint. In 1910 the agricultural production was $14,000,000, but in 1913 this had increased by $10,000,000, the total being $24,000,000. The increase has gone on steadily from year to year amounting to from $2,000,000 to $4,000,000 per year. In 1913 British Columbia spent $322,000 in the promotion of the agricultural industries. It added to that amount the splendid grant from this Government of $46,000, so that a total of about $370,000 was spent in aid to agriculture in 1913.

I wish to quote a few figures in regard to the lumbering industry, the basic industry of British Columbia. I would like the House to bear in mind that we have the following great industries in British Columbia. Lumbering is our greatest, mining probably next, and I have no doubt that in time it will take precedence over lumbering; agriculture and fruit-growing,

and fishing, in addition to which there is a great deal of manufacturing, transportation, shipping, etc. In the lumbering industry, in 1913, which was supposed to be a poor year, although it proved an excellent year as far as the cut was concerned, the cut reached the enormous amount of 1,467,000,000 feet B.M., and the people of British Columbia took from that industry a revenue of over $3,000,000.

You hear in eastern Canada from the traducers of my province that the Government and the people are steeped in corruption, to the lips, as one hon. gentleman said in this House, and that there is no such thing as a proper administration of the affairs of the province. I am going to show the House that we administer our affairs in British Columbia in accordance with what I consider to be up-to-date methods. The revenues which are produced or collected in British Columbia are from natural resources. If the House will bear with me I will give some figures in regard to the revenues which I think will be a revelation to some hon. gentlemen who have so vehemently and bitterly criticised the administration of the province. I hold no brief for the Administration, but I do hold a brief for the people of British Columbia. If there is anything that makes my blood boil it is to sit silently by while my province is being traduced and maligned by a few agitators, who, by the way, are seeking public office rather than the welfare of the country.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does my hon. friend call Sir Hibbert Tupper an agitator?

Mr. STEVENS: I am not referring to him. I say to my hon. friend what I said to the hon. member for Cape Breton the other day: that Sir Hibbert Tupper made the attack he did on the provincial Government because he felt the administration was not suitable to his ideas. He never offered a single criticism of the administration of the affairs of British Columbia by the Dominion Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Nobody is speaking of that at the moment.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend was undertaking to defend British Columbia.

Mr. STEVENS: I told my right hon. friend that I had no brief for the Government of British Columbia, but that I had a brief for the people of British Columbia. I do not intend to sit in silence in this House while my hon. friend from Pictou or anybody else casts aspersions on the province without offering facts by which the House could judge of the merits of the case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have been here during the entire session, and have been almost continuously in attendance, and I have not heard a single member of this House malign or cast any reflections on the people of the province of British Columbia, not one. To cast reflections on the administration of provincial affairs, are two entirely different things.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend can take whatever consolation he likes out of his own ideas; but I have sat here a little more continuously, I think, than he has, and I have heard these statements made.

Mr. PUGSLEY: By whom?

Mr. STEVENS: I quoted one a moment ago. I am not going to quibble about this. My hon. friend can have his own way if he wishes. I ask the House to judge of this administration—

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is better.

Mr. STEVENS: The revenue of British Columbia in 1913-14 was made up as follows: Land sales, $1,172,950; land revenue, $218,000; water leases, $62,000; real property tax (the tax on real estate, which some hon. gentlemen in this House are very strong on) $501,000; wild land tax, $660,000; or a total of $2,613,950. In mining we have a revenue of $556,000; timber royalty and leases, $3,000,000. This amount is from royalties, timber licenses and leases, but the greater part of it is from royalties which run from fifty cents to a dollar a thousand. Then sundry items of revenue are as follows: Personal property, $212,000; motor licenses, $90,000; income tax, $350,000; succession duties, $250,000; law stamps, $100,000; registry fees, $750,000; game licenses, $108,000; fire insurance, $46,000; fishing, $40,000. For 1913-14 there was a total revenue of $12,500,000 in the province of British Columbia, derived almost entirely from the natural resources of the country. I have here also a few items of expenditure.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the exact amount of guarantees that the province of British Columbia has assumed in connection with railways?

Mr. STEVENS: I have not the figures here, but they are given in the pamphlet my hon. friend has before him. I think it is in the neighbourhood of $47,000,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is only for the Canadian Northern; what for the other railways as well? If my hon. friend is going to give us the financial statement of the province, he should tell us what the debt is.

Mr. STEVENS: I will give an estimate of it in a moment or two. The revenue was expended on the following items: On education $1,141,000—a large amount for the province to spend on education, in addition to what had been spent by the cities and incorporated municipalities and towns. That sum of $1,141,000 was spent on a system of education which has absolutely nothing in the way of a sectarian school. Every school from the highest to the lowest is a public school. We spent 4 p.m. on roads and bridges $5,322,000 in 1914-15, and $9,600,000 in 1913-14, (in ten years the province has spent $20,000,000 on roads and trails) on hospitals and charities, $704,000; on the insane hospital, $496,000. I am giving these few items to show the manner in which the Government of British Columbia is looking after the interests of the people of that province.

My hon. friend asked me a moment ago about railway guarantees. I understand that the guarantee of the Canadian Northern railroad is in the neighbourhood of $40,000,000. While on this point let me say that the National Transcontinental cost this country $129,000 per mile. Am I right or not? Surely if the people of Canada can afford to pay $129,000 a mile for the construction of a transcontinental railway it is not bad business to guarantee a railway to the extent of $35,000 or $40,000 a mile, or to the extent of $40,000,000 for the whole province.

Mr. MACDONALD. What is the population of British Columbia?

Mr. STEVENS: A little over half a million. In 1901 the population was 175,000. With the population increasing at that ratio, there is an exceedingly bright future for British Columbia. Let me remind my hon. friend, who wishes to compare population with railroad construction, that the Canadian Pacific railway was constructed when there were only 170,000 people in the whole territory between the Great Lakes and the Pacific coast; and it is well that he bear that in mind when considering this question.

There is the question of the standard of construction, about which we hear a great deal. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), frequently impresses upon this House that the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific is of a very much higher standard than the construction of the Canadian Northern, and in that he finds some comfort for the late Government. We have heard a lot about its permanent and final construction. Does the hon. member for South Renfrew know that only last December the wooden bridge at the crossing of the Minnewashta creek, west of Winnipeg, was blown over? That high trestle was a quarter of a mile long, and of the type of permanent construction that we hear so much about. Hon. gentlemen who took advantage of the Canadian Northern trip to the Pacific coast last year will agree with me, I am sure, that the roadbed of that railway is of a very high standard. One locomotive successfully hauled a train of 16 Pullmans, a dining car and, I think, a recreation car over the Summit, a feat that has never been accomplished before, and which it is impossible for any other railway to accomplish. I am not saying this because I have any particular liking for the Canadian Northern railway, but to show that the money spent on the Canadian Northern railway in British Columbia has been spent to good advantage. What is the use of trying to give the impression that the province of British Columbia has guaranteed the bonds of some useless institution, and that, in consequence, a debt of $40,000,000 is hanging over them? As a matter of fact, for every dollar guaranteed the Canadian Northern railway by the provincial Government, there is real value, and a great deal more, in the road itself.

It may be an eye-opener to hon. members to know that in the last month of operation—and operation was begun only in the month of November or December—the earnings exceeded the operating expenses. I think that is a pretty good record; it is better than the five or six years of dead loss on the Transcontinental. It is a pretty good business investment when you can get a railroad to earn sufficient revenue to cover its operating expenses within four months after the commencement of operation, and that in face of the fact that the Panama canal has been blocked ever since last August, so that grain could not be shipped by that route.

I hesitate to weary the House with more illustrations, but I wish to say a word or two as to the city of Vancouver as a great seaport. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) mentioned some of the great seaports

of Canada. I hold that Providence has given us in Vancouver one of the greatest national seaports in the world.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: What does a protectionist country want with seaports?

Mr. STEVENS: I reply to my hon. friend exactly what I said to my hon. friend from South York. I have been a dreamer of the theoretical possibilities of free trade; but the theory of free trade and the practice of it are two entirely different things when you come into competition with other nations, as Canada is doing to-day. I do not want to enter into a discussion on free trade with my hon. friend, because I like him too well.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The practice in England has been changed since the war.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is getting on delicate ground. I do not want to remind him of the recent conference at Manchester, nor of the conference at Paris. I do not want to remind him of the fact that the space in the daily newspapers not devoted to war news, is full of what is to be the fiscal policy after the war.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: The ports are full as well as the newspapers.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend had better leave the matter alone. In regard to Vancouver, I find that in 1909-10 the exports from the ports of British Columbia, largely from Vancouver, were $25,000,000, the imports for consumption, $27,000,000, and the duty collected $5,750,000. In 1913-14, the exports increased to $33,000,000, the imports for consumption increased to $56,000,000, and the duty collected increased to $11,000,000. That is an indication of the growth of trade. I will also quote the Post Office and Inland Revenue figures, indicating the increase in trade in British Columbia—and I am making this argument for the purpose of justifying the investment in railways in British Columbia, and to inspire, if I can, in this House a little faith in the future of that province. In 1901 the post office at Vancouver had a revenue of $56,000; in 1911, when my hon. friends opposite went out of office the revenue was $350,000; in 1913, it was $500,000. The money orders in 1901 amounted to $240,000; in 1911, to $1,500,000; and in 1913, to $2,600,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: What is the figure for 1915?

Mr. STEVENS: I have not that. There was a decrease last year, but now the monthly reports show that things are rapidly coming back to their normal condition.

In regard to inland revenue, the figures are: for 1908, $438,000; for 1913, $728,000. For Customs the figures are: for 1906, $1,785,000; and for 1913-14, $11,366,000. I quote these figures simply for the purpose of demonstrating to the House the fact that, in your investment in British Columbia, as the representatives of the people of Canada you have good security. I could go on for hours illustrating the increase in the industrial facilities of British Columbia. Last year forty new industries located in and around Vancouver, with 4,000 employees and a pay-roll of $3,000,000 a year. I deprecate the suggestion thrown out from time to time that British Columbia has its windows boarded up. There is to-day no part of Canada where the outlook is more optimistic than in British Columbia; there is no place in Canada where the people are more willing to bear their part of the burdens, not only of the war, but of the building up of this country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend tell me what the surplus or deficit, as the case might be, was of British Columbia during the past year?

Mr. STEVENS: I have not the figures before me; but from the year 1908 to the year 1911 there was a surplus every year. In the year 1912-13 there was a surplus of $2,000,000: in the year 1913-14, if I am not mistaken, there was a deficit.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How much?

Mr. STEVENS: Quite a considerable deficit; it might have been two or three million dollars.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend remembers the surpluses, not the deficits.

Mr. STEVENS: Not at all. I am telling my hon. friend as frankly as I can the exact situation. My hon. friend is surely not going to quarrel over the fact that there was a deficit the year after the outbreak of the war.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member said the year 1913-14.

Mr. STEVENS: I meant the year 1914-15.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The deficit is said to be about $5,000,000. What I said was: With the magnificent revenue of $12,000,000, how

does it come about that there was a deficit of $5,000,000? That does not look like a good illustration of prosperity.

Mr. STEVENS: During the ten years prior to 1913-14, we spent in British Columbit $20,000,000 on roads and bridges and trade. Although that is really capital expenditure, every dollar was taken out of revenue, and the deficit of which my hon. friend speaks was due to a capital expenditure of over $13,000,000 on public works, roads, bridges and trails. Eight or nine hundred thousand dollars was spent on school buildings. We put up in the city of Prince Rupert the court house and other public buildings at a cost of nearly half a million dollars. Those expenditures are really capital expenditures, but they were all included in the so-called deficits. It is not really a deficit, so far as revenue is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the hon. member say that all the roads in British Columbia were built out of revenue?

Mr. STEVENS: I do.

Mr. KNOWLES: And not built out of money derived from the sale of lands and other resources.

Mr. STEVENS: I admit there would—

Mr. KNOWLES: That is all—

Mr. STEVENS: Wait a moment; my hon. friend is not going to confuse the issue. Out of $12,000,000 revenue for 1913-14, the returns from land sales was $1,170,000. The rest was practically revenue derived from the natural resources of the country. And, mark you, in that same year what I call the capital expenditure—and, I am justified in so calling it,—was about $13,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the hon. gentleman call expenditure on roads and trails capital expenditure?

Mr. STEVENS: To a certain extent it is. The expenditure on schools and court-houses is certainly capital expenditure. Take the court-house at Vancouver, one of the finest buildings in Canada and that was built out of revenue. Take the court-houses in all the British Columbia cities—splendid buildings that are good for a hundred years—the new one in Vernon cost a quarter of a million; and there are other new buildings in Victoria, Prince Rupert, New Westminster and many other places. I want hon. gentleman to be fair on this question, because these statements that are spread abroad are doing British Columbia harm, and they are doing Canada harm, for the credit both of British Columbia and of Canada, is injured by allowing these false ideas to go abroad regarding the expenditures of that province. I repeat, the capital expenditures of British Columbia have been made out of revenue up to about two years ago on the outbreak of the war. An addition has since been made to the debt of the province, but that is covered by $13,000,000 still owing on the sale of public lands. I want to say a word on that. I have heard it said, it has been stated in the Liberal newspapers, that the Government has squandered its public lands. One of my hon. friends in this House asked me to make a statement on that subject because this false impression was widespread in eastern Canada. Now, these critics can take either horn of the dilemma they like. Either they can say that the land on which that $13,000,000 is owing is excellent security for the amount, or, if it is never paid, then, the lands which they have valued at $5, $10, $15, or $20 an acre, come back to the ownership of the province and remain still an asset of the province. You cannot get away from that. And so I say that our province to-day is in excellent condition; not only has it survived this strain but it is going to come to the front again very rapidly.

Mr. KNOWLES: The hon. gentleman is familiar with the facts, and his opinion would be valuable. He does not need to answer if he does not wish, but I would ask him, with his permission, if he thinks that the administration of the affairs of British Columbia has been economical and wise.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not know that that has to do with the discussion other than in a general way. But I will answer it, and my answer is, yes. British Columbia has made mistakes, of course; it has done things that I did not agree with and which I would have criticised had I been a member of the legislature. On the whole, the figures that I have quoted show that the province has had a fair, decent administration; and, furthermore, there has never been one single statement brought before the people that has been demonstrated to reflect upon the personal honour and integrity of the present Prime Minister of British Columbia, Hon. W. J. Bowser. They have attacked, abused, and maligned him, but not one thing has

been laid at his door that has not been in the strictest sense honourable and honest.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How does the hon. gentleman account for the general condemnation of him in the two great cities of Victoria and Vancouver in the last election?

Mr. STEVENS: I am sure my hon. friend does not want me to discuss that; it is a long story and there is a great deal to be said about it. I can tell him that the people are to a large extent sorry; and let me tell him something further that will account for ninety per cent of it: To-day there is going on in the courts of Vancouver and before the Elections Committee an exposition of a most rascally and scandalous plot for plugging by bringing in over two hundred men from Seattle—and that was done by the political friends of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Brought in by the friends of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens).

Mr. STEVENS: No, these hon. gentlemen are mistaken. I am stating what is true; these men were brought in for the purpose of plugging in the interests—

Mr. TURRIFF: How does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. STEVENS: It is proven in the courts. That is the only corruption that I know of there. Now, I had not intended to bring up this matter, but my hon. friend has forced me to it. Let me conclude—I have tried it half a dozen times and I hope he really will let me conclude this time—by saying that we have excellent security for all the money that is being expended in British Columbia; and no one in this House or out of it need have the slightest doubt that British Columbia will take care of all its obligations. And, further than that, I am convinced that the railway which is so much maligned will prove in time one of the best-paying systems of Canada.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): I do not think any one who has ever visited British Columbia will question one of the statements made by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), and that is that the province of British Columbia is a great province, a rich province, a province of splendid resources. At the same time, I do not think he has given quite a fair statement of the position of that province. For instance, he gives the revenues of the province of British Clumbia up to 1913, and there he very conveniently stops—

Mr. STEVENS: For 1913-14.

Mr. TURRIFF: Well—and there he very conveniently stops and tries to make out that the depreciation of the revenue has been due to the war. Nothing can be further from the fact than that statement. I was in the province of British Columbia three years ago last fall, and half a dozen people in the city of Vancouver told me that during the year at least 20,000 people had left the city, and the same proportion held true of the city of Victoria. This could not have been on account of the war, because it was a year or two before the war broke out.

Mr. STEVENS: Last year they had the largest school population in Vancouver they ever had.

Mr. TURRIFF: It was not on account of the war, but on account of the depression which affected all Canada. It is no discredit to have a depression in British Columbia any more than in any other part of the country. But conditions have gone back very much, not only in British Columbia, but elsewhere, since then. Two or three months ago the local Government, to whom the hon. gentleman gives such a good character, estimated a revenue for the coming year of about five and a half million dollars and an expenditure of about ten and a half million dollars. Here was a government going into large expenditures which their revenue was only about half enough to meet. My hon. friend tried to make out that the Government were paying for public works out of revenue, though they were at the same time selling their public lands and timber in order to raise revenue. There is no doubt that a great deal of the land and timber sold will come back into the hands of the Government, for they were sold during boom times. Those sales were one great cause of the revenue in British Columbia, which turned out to be a bad thing in the end, because it led the Government—as I presume it would have led any government—into great extravagances, just as the bountiful revenue that we had in this Dominion some years ago led the people of Canada and the Government into extravagance, the results of which we have now to face. But conditions in British Columbia got very bad, and

I think this was largely owing to the way provincial affairs were administered.

However, that is not the subject we were discussing. My hon. friend tries to make this House believe that the money put into the Canadian Northern railway by the province of British Columbia during the last few years is money well invested. I do not think that one member of this House believes that the money put into the Canadian Northern railway by the provincial Government or by this Government in connection with the building of the line from the Rocky mountains to Vancouver is money well invested, because a great part of the line is simply a duplication of the Grand Trunk Pacific and of the Canadian Pacific railway. From the city of Edmonton the lines run parallel for a distance of almost 200 miles, if I remember rightly; in many cases you can throw a stone from one track to the other. When you get near Fort George the Grand Trunk Pacific verges to the northwest and the Canadian Northern proceeds in a southwestern direction, striking the Canadian Pacific at a point near Kamloops. My hon. friend has described how the two lines run down the Fraser river. No doubt my hon. friend is right in saying that the Canadian Northern, where it parallels the Canadian Pacific railway could be used in connection with the double-tracking of the Canadian Pacific railway; probably this method of double tracking would be as cheap as if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had undertaken to double track their road. In that respect the Canadian Northern line may some time be useful, but any development of traffic along that part of the road is out of the question.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is mistaken. There is a lot of traffic down the Fraser river; some of the biggest ranches in Canada are tributary to that road.

Mr. TURRIFF: All I can say is that I have been over the road several times and I have never seen any evidence of increased traffic. My hon. friend, however, knows better about that than I do. As to that part of the country from Kamloops to the point where the Canadian Northern joins the Grand Trunk Pacific, I am not prepared to say anything, because I have not been over it. There may be some good country there, but there was no justification for the province of British Columbia or for this Government in putting that road through at the time it was built. The province of British Columbia, in respect of some 600 or 700 miles of that road, guaranteed bonds to the extent of $35,000 a mile. Two or three years later they made another guarantee of $10,000 a mile in order to enable the Canadian Northern to pay the interest on the bonds, otherwise the province would have been called upon to pay that interest. The province of British Columbia has guaranteed bonds in respect of that line to the extent of more than $82,000,000, of which some $78,000,000 have been issued. The bulk of these guarantees are in respect of roads that for the next twenty years will not earn one cent of interest on the cost of construction. If they earn operating expenses they will do well. My hon. friend spoke about the Canadian Northern line through the mountains earning more than operating expenses a few months after it was opened. Well, in railroading as in many other things a good deal can be done in the way of bookkeeping, but no one need tell me that a road the main line of which was tied up for months during the past winter, on which practically not a wheel was moving, can be earning money to pay the interest on the cost of construction. I do not want to cast any aspersions on the Government for their aid to railways; I do not want to put any particular blame on my hon. friends opposite. I think we are all entitled to take our share of the blame, on this side as well as on the other side; I do not believe that anything can be gained by trying to place the blame for this condition of affairs particularly on one side. The fact is that this condition of affairs exists, that we have incurred these liabilities, that we have bonused these roads. We have aided in the building of two transcontinental roads; the question now is, what are we going to do in the matter? I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the hon. member for South York. I do not always agree with the hon. member for South York by any means, I have never been in favour of Government owned railways in Canada. But I will say this much: The hon. member for South York comes forward with a proposition; he offers something, but the Minister of Finance comes forward with nothing; he has nothing to offer the House. He makes no proposal except that we continue to shovel more money into this sink hole, the Canadian Northern railway. That is what I object to.

If the Minister of Finance in asking us to vote this money—$8,000,000 for the Grand

Trunk Pacific; $15,000,000, in reality, $18,000,000, for the Canadian Northern Railway Company—could point to some finality, to some object that he has in view, to some proposition by which this road could be handled, we should have something to work upon. But he does not give us anything of the kind; we are to continue voting millions of dollars for the continuation of these two roads in statu quo for another year, at the end of which time we shall be in a worse position to deal with them than we are now. I have heard it stated from both sides of the House during the last few days that the trouble in connection with these railways is due to the war. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that. Had it not been for the war, no doubt the railroads could have continued to borrow money in the Old Country, could have marketed all their securities and could have got a better price for them. They could have got more money and could have kept on building. But all they would have accomplished in the end would have been the piling up of greater liabilities. The day of reckoning would have come, although not as quickly, and it would have come with greater force and effect because of the increased liabilities. Look at what the railways have earned in connection with the war. Had it not been for the war the railroads in that respect would have been in a much worse condition, although they might still have gone on. As long as a bankrupt concern can get banking accommodation, it will continue business, but a day of settlement has to come and the longer that day is put off the worse things are in the end. The Finance Minister makes no proposition; to that extent I like what the member for South York has said. At all events he comes forward with a proposition that he believes can be worked out and that he believes would be a good thing for Canada. Well, I do not know whether we could nationalize the railways of Canada and run them successfully.

It seems to me that in view of the lessons that the people of Canada, and of other countries, are learning in connection with the war, we should be able to put these railroads, if we nationalize them, under the control of a commission, and make that commission absolutely free from political patronage. It seems to me that we should be able to do that. Of course, we could do it a great deal better if we had the whole system of Canada under Government control and ownership. As to the policy of getting control of these roads, I do not agree with my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) in one or two of the propositions which he submitted. I cannot for the life of me see why my hon. friend from South York should suggest that we pay to the owners of Canadian Northern common stock, which is not worth the paper it is written on, a sum of $6,000,000 in order that they may hand over the control of the road. It is a bankrupt concern to a far greater extent than the Grand Trunk Pacific. The proprietors have taken out of the construction of that road, not $6,000,000, but many times $6,000,000. What they have done with that money, whether they have put it into private enterprise, or whether they have lost it, is no concern of this House. But if they have taken millions of dollars of profits out of the construction of the road, out of the moneys given by the provinces and by this Government, why should we give them any more? They come now as suppliants; they cannot go on. They do not own the road, and the liabilities piled up against it are greater than the value of the road, so that I do not agree with my hon. friend that, if the Government takes it over, we should pay $6,000,000, or any other sum.

I asked the Minister of Finance when the question was last discussed what his policy would be as to taking over the controlling interest if we gave this $15,000,000, and I trust that he will give us a definite statement on that point. To my mind it is rather an important point. We are now proposing to give them $15,000,000 to keep them as a going concern for another year, not to permanently help them, because that sum would only tide them over for one year. I say to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that if we give this $15,000,000 it is the duty of the Government to take over at least the controlling interest in the common stock of the road, not that I consider it worth a five-dollar bill, but in order that the Government may have control of the road, so that, if conditions should change during the next three, four or five years, and we took the road over, the proprietors would not be able to say: "Hand over $35,000,000 or $50,000,000 or we will not give you the transfer." That is the position I take—if we do hand over this sum of $15,000,000, we should get the absolute control of the common stock of the road.

In reference to taking over the Grand

Trunk Pacific, I agree with my hon. friend from South York that we cannot take it over and release the Grand Trunk Railway from all liabilities as they suggest. That would be a most unfair proposition; it would be a case of heads I win, tails you lose. They came to this Government and secured assistance to build the Grand Trunk Pacific. They undertook certain obligations, guaranteeing roughly one-fourth of the cost of the road from Winnipeg to the Coast. Now they claim that the road is not a paying institution, and they ask to be relieved of the liabilities, and also to get back all the money they have put into the road. Whoever heard of such a proposition as that? I claim that it is the duty of the Minister of Finance or of the Government, when they come to deal with this question, to see that if the Grand Trunk refuses to take over the road, they are not allowed to get away from the liabilities which they have incurred. Why should they be relieved of one-fourth of the cost of the road any more than that the Government should be relieved of three-fourths of the cost? It was a Grand Trunk proposition. They wanted to build the road; they did build it, and now, because they do not think it is a profitable proposition for the old Grand Trunk, they propose to turn it over to the Government and ask to be relieved of their liabilities. That is an absolutely unfair proposition, so far as I can see. My hon. friend sitting beside me (Mr. Nesbitt) points out that while they would hand over the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific they would still retain control of all the feeders of that line. The Grand Trunk Pacific was never expected to be a complete road without its connection with the Grand Trunk in the eastern provinces. My hon. friend from South York has pointed out the value of the Grand Trunk system in the eastern provinces, connected as it is with practically every town, village and city in Quebec and Ontario, and with big manufacturing centres along its lines. That system would be a great feeder and adjunct to the Grand Trunk Pacific. You cannot deal with one separately from the other, because one is not complete without the other. If they are going to deal at all, the Government ought to deal with both roads.

There is one other point I wish to touch upon. We have 300,000 men in uniform, and we are all hoping that if it is necessary to have 500,000 men we will be able to get them and equip them. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we will have hundreds and thousands of men coming back from the war more or less maimed in body but still capable of doing good work. It seems to me that if we were to take over these roads there would be a field for those men. We could employ thousands of them in connection with the nationalized roads, and we would therefore be getting over one difficulty which we will have to face in the near future.

I would remind the Minister of Finance that I want to know what his proposition is in return for the aid which he proposes to give to the Canadian Northern, and as to taking over the control of the road. In addition to the 40 per cent of the common stock which we hold at present we ought to hold at least 15 per cent more. That would save a great deal of trouble in the future, and the company should have no objection to giving it. We should endeavour to have control of that road so that when the time comes to take it over we will be able to deal with it, and not be held up by its promoters as the country has been held up ever since they started to build railroads.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): I would offer just a few words in expression of my view of the railway situation. It appears to me that the situation which confronts Canada to-day, so far as railways are concerned, is of a most serious nature, especially with regard to its financial aspect. I am sure that our Minister of Finance must have had an anxious time over the prospect before him of having to furnish now some $23,000,000 to tide over the temporary requirements of two of the great trunk lines of this country.

The situation, as the hon. gentleman has just said, belongs to both parties, and I think he is very liberal in allowing this side as much responsibility as he takes for his own side. The Grand Trunk Pacific is entirely the child of the Government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. gentleman is not fair in charging that even the old Grand Trunk took that responsibility. The Grand Trunk never wanted to build the eastern section of the road. That was a political proposition forced upon them. They proposed to build from North Bay and only to the mountains, so that the two lean ends of the road are political propositions that our friends on the other side of the House must take responsibility for. That was fought out

in the elections of 1904; it was the principal issue at the polls and the construction of that road was opposed by the Conservative party at that time as being unbusinesslike and for the reason that the road was not likely to be taken over or operated under the agreement that was made with the Grand Trunk. The pessimistic outlook that the Conservatives took with regard to the proposition has been more than justified by the results, and to-day we find that we have that immense railroad, representing some hundreds of millions of investment, that the Grand Trunk is not now ready to assume responsibility for.

The Canadian Northern was not a child of this Government. The first great plunge that was made in regard to the Canadian Northern was made by the Liberal Government in granting a subsidy of $35,000,000 to build from Port Arthur East. That was when the country took the first plunge in regard to that road. Having $35,000,000 in it we were obliged to put more in to save what we had. My right hon. friend opposite shakes his head, but that is absolutely true. It is like a customer who gets into a bank. The bank controls the customer so long as his business is sound but as soon as his business becomes unsound the customer controls the bank and simply says to the bank: You carry me, for if I go under you lose your money. This is a difficult proposition to finance but the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has met the situation with good judgment. So that my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) is too generous when he says that the Conservatives are equally responsible with the Opposition in regard to these two great enterprises.

The financing of these roads has become very difficult by reason of the war. We all understand that, and it is not necessary for me to dwell upon it. The securities that were put up by this Government to tide them over a year ago could not be floated successfully on account of war conditions and to that extent the war is responsible for the position in which the Canadian Northern finds itself. The financial dealings of the Canadian Northern have been seriously interfered with on account of the war, and it was forced to sell the securities it did sell at a discount, while others could not be sold at all. This, coming on top of our war requirements, is certainly a very serious matter, and I think that the Minister of Finance has done well in proposing to finance them so that they may not go into a receiver's hands. In the meantime a commission of experts is to be appointed which will thoroughly examine the railway situation, come down with the facts and figures at an early date and lay before us a business proposition in regard to the taking over of these trunk lines or the making of some arrangement whereby they will not come to us year after year for assistance.

I have not had the opportunity to-day of hearing my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) speak on public ownership. I have heard him on many occasions on that question and I have a good deal of sympathy with his desire that the railways of Canada should be nationalized, taken over, and run by the Government or by a commission. But I want the members of this House and the country generally to look the matter in the face and not to take all the favourable anticipations in regard to public ownership without taking into consideration the financial responsibilities and obligations that the taking over of these roads will impose upon them. I desire to commend that remark particularly to the hon. member for South York. On many occasions I have heard him dwell upon the great advantages that would accrue to this country from the nationalizing of our railways. I do not say that he has exaggerated them. I daresay that he will feel satisfied that most of these points he has taken, and taken after a great deal of study, are correct. But, I see that he has lost sight lately of the financial responsibilities that will rest upon this Government, or upon any other government that takes hold of so large a proposition as the nationalizing of the railways of Canada. As nearly as I can estimate, it will cost between $2,000,000,000 and $2,500,000,000, or about four or five times as much as our share of the present war will cost, to take over the railways of Canada. That is rather a large sum but that is as near as I can figure it out. It will take more than half of that to take over the three great trunk lines which are already spanning this continent, the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific. These three propositions will probably cost $1,800,000,000 in round figures, or pretty close to that. I am speaking now of these lines with all their branches, all their terminals, all their rolling stock, all the other facilities that are required to equip and operate three immense transcontinental railways. That is a very large proposition for a country even with the resources of the Dominion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: How much have we in them now?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I have not entered into a close calculation as to that but I should think probably not more than 15 or 20 per cent of that amount. My hon. friend probably knows better than I do. It may be said that these railways should not be bought at their face value. That might be considered fair provided you could get the railways to see it that way, but it must be remembered that a great many people in the Old Country have put their money into these railway enterprises in good faith and they cannot reasonably be crowded out without giving them a comparatively fair and square deal. If we do anything else it will injure the credit of this country and we should not endeavour to drive a hard bargain with the bondholders and stockholders in foreign countries without giving them a reasonable chance to say whether or not they are prepared to accept it.

I did not hear what proposition my hon. friend from South York made in regard to the acquirement of these roads, and that is a very important matter. I want to commend my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) for the statesmanlike action that he is taking on this railway problem. There are three courses confronting the Government and the Minister of Finance at the present time. The first is to continue the present position, go on advancing money from year to year to one or both of these great trunk lines in order to aid them in their financial operations, taking their securities and deriving from them what they will yield which may not be very much. This year we take $23,000,000 in round figures. That is the first proposition and that is the one that is made for the immediate relief of the railway situation. The next proposition that I have heard put forward is to allow the trunk lines to go into a receiver's hands if they cannot stand on their own financial basis. That would be very serious for the railways, it would be very serious for the people of the country and it would be very serious for those who advanced money in foreign lands to build and equip these great enterprises. I for one consider that an unthinkable proposition, and I trust this country will never allow its credit to be dragged in the mud, as it undoubtedly would be if these roads were allowed to default and were placed in the receiver's hands. A third proposition is that we face the matter fairly and squarely—take the bull by the horns, so to speak,—and nationalize these great trunk lines, and perhaps all railway lines. I do not know what the view of the hon. member for South York is with regard to taking over all the roads; I did not hear that part of his speech. But these two transcontinental lines have to be dealt with almost immediately, as I understand the statement of the Prime Minister, and it is necessary to advance this amount of from $20,000,000 to $23,000,000 to tide the railways over the current year. A commission is to be appointed with full powers to examine into the whole railway situation, and submit to this House at the earliest possible date a report in concrete form, showing what the nationalization of these railways will mean, what amount of capital will be required, and what are its prospects of financial success. I am not one of those who believe that, with an investment as great as I have spoken of you will be able to reduce either freight rates or passenger charges in the immediate future. I may be wrong about that, but I am very much in doubt whether it is fair to go upon the public platform and endeavour to enlist the approbation of the people of Canada in this immense proposition, in the expectation that a two-cents per mile rate is going to prevail all over Canada, and that freight rates are going to be much lower than the rates now charged by private companies. I question very much if either freight or passenger rates will be materially reduced in the near future, in view of the necessity of taking care of overhead charges and the interest accruing on this vast investment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Is there not a prospect of the rates being reduced, if unnecessary duplication and unnecessary competition is cut out under public ownership?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is a fair and proper question and I was coming to that. I think it quite probable that a considerable amount may be saved by cutting out this multiplication of boards and directorates, and this unnecessary duplication of lines, which entail unnecessary overhead charges. But that will altogether depend upon the ability of the commission that is to be appointed to solve this problem. I believe with the hon. member for South York that

very material savings could be effected. I do not want him to go away with the idea that I am at all opposed to public ownership, for I am very largely impressed with the idea that it is the only good solution in sight. It is a difficult solution, but it is the only sound one. Until the report is submitted I am not prepared to commit myself absolutely to saying that all the railways in Canada should be nationalized. But nearly all the enlightened countries in the world to-day do own their railways. At the present time 230,000 miles of the railways of the world are public-owned. Great Britain, recently, in war time, took possession of parts of the railways in the British isles, and has been operating them, I believe, satisfactorily. And what has been done in these other countries can be done in Canada; there is no doubt about that. But it will require men with excellent judgment, and an honour that is above reproach; men with a keen sense of responsibility to the people of Canada, a sense that is rarely met with in individuals. They will have to be selected with the utmost care from the very best ability in railway enterprise that Canada or the United States can produce. But I trust that it may not be necessary to have all these experts come from either Great Britain or the United States.

5 p.m.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend has observed that some of the railways in Great Britain have been nationalized. Does he infer from the fact that it has been done successfully in Great Britain, which is not as large as some of our smaller provinces, that nationalization could therefore be advantageously adopted in Canada, with its immense area?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think it would be very much more difficult in Canada than in Great Britain. Great Britain is a very small country; the railways are very short, and they have an immense freight haulage all along the line. They get freight rates that we know nothing of in this country. We often hear complaints about high rates in Canada, but I have known farmers in the midland counties in England pay higher rates to have their produce hauled from the midland counties to London, a distance of 200 miles, than would be paid to take the same produce from the city of Montreal, unload it at Liverpool, and transport it over the English railways from there to London. Such is the railway situation in Great Britain. Their capitalization per mile is probably twice as much as it is in Canada. In Great Britain nationalization was a comparatively small proposition, as the hon. member for Pictou has pointed out, and it will be a much larger proposition for us. But let us remember that Australia is about as large a country as Canada, and every bit of railway in the Commonwealth has been state-owned, not federally-owned, for many years past, and the roads, I understand, have been operated successfully. Does any one mean to say that we cannot do in Canada what has been done in Australia successfully? And they are not following the most enlightened policy there. I travelled in Australia some six years ago. Every state there has a different gauge railway, and, therefore, when freight gets to the boundary of one state, every car has to be unloaded and the freight reloaded on cars of the other state railway. That is the policy of the Federal Government, which is supposed to control the railway situation there. The labour situation in Australia has been such that the Government has been unable to unify the gauges. Labour says: You would destroy our labour; at the present time we get work loading and unloading these cars, and we refuse to have the gauges of the different railways unified. The result is that there are five or six different gauges in Australia, yet even with that disadvantage I believe the roads are run successfully; so I cannot see why we should not make a success of it in Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: Is my hon. friend sure that the Australian Government is making a financial success of it?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I would not say that they are in all cases, but they have operated some of the roads with success, and the roads generally have been operated to the satisfaction of the people for a great many years. I cannot say that they are paying dividends; I do not think they are; but probably they do not intend to pay dividends. They try to make the road self-supporting, and I presume that all the railways in Australia have been self-supporting. Now this policy of transferring freight when it gets to the boundary of a state is a proposition that no enlightened country should put up with. I do not wish to cast any reflections on Australia, but I am making the point that the labour party in Australia will not allow the gauges to be unified because it would cut down labour.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does not that illustrate the contention that political influence enters into the operation of railways? It must be political influence that prevents them changing to one gauge—the influence of the labour vote, I presume. Is not that just an illustration of one of the great dangers of state ownership?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not think it can be the fault of the labour vote, because a labour Government is in power.

Mr. KNOWLES: All the more reason.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Australia is the land of the workingman, and the workingmen certainly manage to get into power there and to remain in power for a long time. If you please the labouring man, you please every one else so far as public ownership is concerned. For myself, I am willing to travel on a railroad, whether it is publicly owned or privately owned, so long as it is well run and safe, but I do not want to be ditched; I do not want to travel on a line that is not safe, nor in rolling stock that is not in proper condition. The people of Canada to-day have their eye on the railway situation, and it is going to be one of the great questions before the people when this or any other Government goes to the polls. The railway situation must be grappled with and settled with a strong hand. I congratulate the Prime Minister on being prepared to face the situation in such a splendid manner.

I was perhaps wrong in saying that the railways in Great Britain have been nationalized. I do not know that I am warranted in using that term in the sense that they have been bought outright by the British Government, but at present they are all being operated, and successfully operated, under the Government.

In regard to the appointment of a commission, as I have said, it will be necessary to select the biggest, brainest, and most capable men in the Dominion of Canada, or if they cannot be got here, in the neighbouring Republic or in Great Britain, to handle this immense railway proposition. The suggestion that has come from the Minister of Finance and from the right hon. leader of the Government, is, I think, one of the best auguries for the solution of this question. The first ray of light that I have been able to see in the railway situation in the last twenty or thirty years is the proposition that the question shall be thoroughly investigated by a commission which will look into the questions of how the financial and other responsibilities will be taken care of, what it will cost to continue the present system, or what it will cost to take over the railways and make of them a great national enterprise. In my opinion the last solution is the best, the soundest, and the safest, but I do not want the House to believe that the outlook will be rosy; that the freight charges or express charges or passenger charges will be very largely reduced in the near future.

Just one word more. I have spoken longer than I intended, but as I do not often speak in this House, I think that, as a business man who takes a deep interest in the transportation situation in this country, I have a right to say something on a proposition such as this.

I want to refer to the labour situation that will be created. The labour situation is one that must be reckoned with and taken into very serious consideration in nationalizing the railways of the Dominion, as that will mean the employment on all the railways of Canada of probably 200,000 men of the most skilled and intelligent mechanics and labourers that this country possesses. The last census, I think, shows that the number at present employed on the railroads is about 150,000, and I believe that in the very near future 200,000 will be employed. If those men are all under one commission and if anything should go wrong between the commission and them, you have the possibility of a general strike which would tie up every mile of railway in the Dominion of Canada. I do not know whether my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who is full of solutions, has a solution for that difficulty, but that is a serious matter that must be reckoned with. Those men will be all under one management and if they become dissatisfied with their rates of pay, or their hours of labour, or the method of treatment, we might have a national railway strike on our hands.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The United States of America are to-day confronted with the possibility of a general railway strike and negotiations with the men are going on. Every road is tied up with the others in that threatened strike; the men are organized; the railroads are organized, and the danger that threatens is a general tie-up. The Government, however, are dealing with the situation just as France has dealt with the strike that occurred there, and she got over it and she has national railways still.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend says it is quite possible that a strike might occur in the United States where the railways are under the management of a great many different companies. I quite agree that that is a possibility, but it is hardly as likely to occur as where men are under the management of one commission. I think that is a very serious question and one that will require very careful handling. There have been very few labour troubles on the Intercolonial Railway as I remember, but the Government have treated their employees liberally and the men are satisfied, as compared with the employees of other railroads. I do not know of any reason why things should not run smoothly, but I am asking the hon. member for South York to consider all the disadvantages as well as all the advantages, and to look at the proposition in a businesslike way and see whether it is likely to prove a financial and administrative success and whether it is likely to be of advantage to the people of this country. I for one am very hopeful that that will prove to be the case. The hon. member for South York has done a great deal towards advancing me, so to speak, on the road towards being in favour of the nationalization of railways.

The money proposed to be spent on this commission will be the best money voted in this House next to the money voted for the war, and next to the war, this is the biggest question on our hands from a financial point of view. I am sure the Minister of Finance will agree with me that the railway situation is as bad financially as the war situation, and that it looks as if some of the money proposed to be invested in the railways will be wasted just as some of the money spent on the war is being wasted. It must be admitted that we have built railways in advance of our time; that we have far more mileage than the business of the country warrants, and that the building of the eastern section of the Transcontinental was intended as a waste and is going to be a waste of money for years to come. It is a white elephant of the largest type; I think it is the largest of its kind and if Barnum were still living I would advise him to get it into his museum.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is my hon. friend not aware that the Acting Minister of Railways has announced that there has been a profit on the operation of that road by the Government?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Do you mean the road from Winnipeg to Moncton, or only from Winnipeg to Cochrane?

Mr. MACDONALD: I mean from Winnipeg east.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: How far east? It is only operated as far as Cochrane, as I understand it. And my hon. friend is taking no account of interest charges, but is speaking only of the operating expenses. What about the interest charges on that vast investment? The $13,000,000 that was going to pay all the interest certainly will not pay it; it will take nearly $30,000,000 to pay the interest. Then you have the Quebec bridge and all that Eastern section.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman deals in millions very easily and hands them out—

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am as careful with my figures as is the hon. gentleman. I certainly would not like to be guilty of as many wild statements as he.

Mr. MACDONALD: There was just one point—how does he work it out to $30,000,000 for annual interest charge?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is for six years.

Mr. MACDONALD: He said $30,000,000 a year.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not think I said that; I certainly did not intend to. There was a construction period of several years, and I said that the $13,000,000 which hon. gentlemen opposite said would pay the interest was not enough, and that it would be $30,000,000. I was putting this $30,000,000 in contrast with the $13,000,000, and I think Hansard will show that that was the effect of my statement. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) did not see that he was entering into a gigantic speculation which would end so disastrously. But we saw it, and it has come out exactly as we expected —only worse. The Quebec bridge alone is going to cost nearly as much as the whole Eastern section was to have cost. Now, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, who knows so much about running the eastern end of this railway, how he expects the line from the Quebec bridge to Moncton to pay when it parallels the Intercolonial, which does not pay? How are you going to make two roads pay when there is not traffic enough for one?

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman ought to get his facts right. The Grand

Trunk Pacific does not parallel the Intercolonial all the way.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It parallels it nearly all the way.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman should visit the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: How far does it parallel the Intercolonial; let the hon. gentleman state.

Mr. MACDONALD: I will send my hon. friend the figures.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman will not give the figures now, for he knows that what I say is about right.

Mr. MACDONALD: They run parallel for a short distance in the province of Quebec, but the Transcontinental runs the other side of the mountain and diverges, and from a point in the county of Dorchester it runs miles and miles away from the Intercolonial.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Does not it end in about the same spot; and does it not start from about the same point? In order to have one railway parallel another, you do not have to have both run on the same right of way.

Mr. MACDONALD: I say it serves a different section of the country altogether, and the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If I did not know anything more about business than some of the lawyers know about law, I should not have much to say in this House. Let me tell my hon. friend that this House is about sick of legal arguments, mere hair-splitting, and we want a little business common-sense. We do not want to hear it said that one railway does not parallel another because it does not run on the same road-bed. It depends altogether on the traffic. Railways running fifty miles apart may be said to parallel each other. In the country to which the hon. gentleman refers there is no traffic to be developed. He knows that you parallel a railway if you put another within even two hundred miles of it if thereby you divide traffic which was not enough for the first railway. If there is not freight for one, you certainly cannot have freight for two. The hon. gentleman is simply trying to draw a red herring across the track. He knows that that road could not have been built as a freight or passenger road; it was a political road, and the effect of its construction has been to bring about the expenditure of $40,000,000 more than was necessary to build it, as was shown by the report of the Transcontinental Commission. Knowing that, it does not become my hon. friend to talk as he does. He might make an impression among a lot of lawyers, but he cannot go into any enlightened business community and show them that this road was the outcome of the application of business principles. The interest runs night and day, whether the freight is carried or not, and now where the railway was we have two streaks of rust. How much trade has been done over that road up to the present? How much was likely to be done in that country in the near future? Can the hon. gentleman tell that?

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman spoke of a road "through a country like that." What does he mean?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I mean a country that affords no freight for the railway.

Mr. MACDONALD: How does the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Does the hon. gentleman think I have never been in the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not think you have.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Oh, yes, I have. The wise men came from the East, and sometimes they stayed West after coming. I had not intended to enter into a controversy with my hon. friend, but he is anxious for it. I simply rose to give the business view of a very difficult situation, not the legal view. My desire is that we should face squarely the financial obligations that are going to rest upon this country, no matter what is done, to waive aside all minor considerations and enter into a serious calculation as to what will be necessary to invest in these great enterprises and how it is going to pay when it is done. I say the Government are to be commended for the proposition they have brought in, to appropriate $150,000 to thoroughly investigate this situation in order to bring in a report upon which we can bank as absolutely correct. This is one of the best day's work that has been done in this House in a business way for years, and I shall hope for satisfactory results from it. I believe the Finance Minister will sleep better in his bed

when he sees the solution of this great railway question.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I desire to say just a word in regard to the eastern section of the Grand Trunk Pacific, or, as it is known, the National Transcontinental. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cockshutt) belongs to that class of little Canadians who would shut out the Maritime Provinces altogether from——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes—would shut out the Maritime Provinces from any participation in the transportation plans of Canada. It is quite common now to blame on the war the financial condition of this country. The Finance Minister takes the position with regard to the additional vote which he is asking for the railways, that had it not been for the war it would not have been necessary to ask for a vote. He justifies a second or third financial provision for the railways upon the ground of the war. Let us see how this applies in connection with the question as to the utility of the eastern section of the Transcontinental. My hon. friend talks about the policy of the Government of the day in contrast with that of the Government that was in power in 1904. My hon. friend knows that the verdict of the people of Canada in 1904, reiterated in 1908, and the well understood opinion of business men who were imbued with the hopefulness that existed throughout Canada during those years, was that the Transcontinental railway was a necessity and that it should be built. Were it not for the fact that the war has paralyzed immigration into Canada and has seriously interfered with the development of the country throughout that section in which the road has been built, we should have had an ample and complete vindication of the wisdom of constructing this railway—a vindication so complete that even my hon. friend would have been satisfied. My hon. friend is one of those, I am sure, who would desire a continuance of the policy of sending the trade of western and central Canada through our Atlantic ports. If the war were to cease within a year and a period of prosperity, involving extensive development and large increase of trade, should come to this country, does my hon. friend say that Canada should be satisfied for all time with the avenue of exit or entrance afforded by the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: What about the Canadian Pacific railway? Have they not a line to St. John?

Mr. MACDONALD: The Canadian Pacific railway has a line with its terminus at St. John, but that line does not run entirely through Canadian territory. The necessity of having a road entirely within our own territory is shown by the fact that no matter how pressing the necessity may be, you cannot transport through the foreign country through which the Canadian Pacific railway runs anything relating to supplies for the war. Is that not so?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No.

Mr. CURRIE: When did the United States place an embargo upon the shipment of munitions through the state of Maine?

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Railways has been stating publicly in this House, and, I have no doubt, privately to his friends, that the reason the business of the Maritime Provinces has been congested and absolutely paralysed is because the Intercolonial railway is the only railway that has been hauling war supplies to the East.

Mr. CURRIE: That is because most of the munitions were being shipped from Grand Trunk territory.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend will say that to have a railway running through foreign territory, if it has a terminus in Canada, is just as good for this country as if the whole railway were on our own soil.

Mr. CURRIE: The Canadian Pacific railway was just as much congested last winter as was the Intercolonial.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not at all.

Mr. CURRIE: I know better.

Mr. MACDONALD: I admit that my hon. friend is very well informed on a great many subjects with regard to which I should not venture to question his assertions, but I say to him that when he seeks to instruct me with regard to business conditions in the Maritime Provinces, I will not defer my judgment to his.

Mr. CURRIE: I want to tell the hon. gentleman that I do a great deal more business over the railways in the Maritime Provinces than he does. I have had thousands of dollars worth of freight going

over these railways, and I suppose my hon. friend never shipped a ton.

Mr. MACDONALD: All I can say with regard to that is that I have the statement of the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that there was no congestion or delay on their road, that they were prepared to take freight to St. John, but that they were unable to take freight to points east of St. John or to give freight to the Intercolonial for carriage to points east of St. John because of the congestion that existed on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman's statement is perfectly correct. The congestion was common to both roads and to all roads in the East. If the money that was expended on the Transcontinental to Moncton had been expended on double-tracking the Intercolonial, they could have carried four times the tonnage that they are carrying now on either road.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is unfortunate for my hon. friend and for his party that he has not been Minister of Railways during the last two years. He would have had a chance to put into operation some of his theories in regard to this matter, and I am sure we would have been delighted to watch him work them out. If my hon. friend's argument amounts to anything it is this: it is just as good for Canada to have its transportation lines run through a foreign country as it is to have them all on her own territory. I am sure my hon. friend is not prepared to stand by that assertion. The hon. member for Brantford, who indulged in some wild talk with regard to the Eastern section of the Transcontinental and with regard to the inutility of the line which runs through the western part of Canada, does not know anything about the subject that he is dealing with. When that line in New Brunswick is properly operated and proper connection is afforded at its western end; when the line is complete as a through line from Winnipeg to Moncton, the wisdom of the policy of 1903-4 will be vindicated.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If that is correct, why does not my hon. friend show the Grand Trunk Company, who agreed to take over the road, that that is the fate that will overtake them if they take over the enterprise? The Grand Trunk undertook to take it over; now they want to retire after spending $100,000,000 on it. Would they retire if it were as rosy a proposition as my hon. friend states it to be?

Mr. MACDONALD: If they retire it will be for the same reason that they retired from the western proposition: that the Grand Trunk is controlled by directors who live across the ocean; that they have lost the controlling influence of Mr. Hays, who directed the operations which culminated in the Grand Trunk Pacific proposition. The road is under the control of men who, on account of the war, want to run away from the whole thing. They asserted in their letter to the Premier in December last that although they believed they would be blamed by the directorate for doing so, they begged the Government—on account of the war, of the existing conditions, of their financial obligations being too great—to take the road over. That is the reason why they dealt with the western proposition in that way; that is the reason why they dealt with the eastern proposition in that way. The confidences which are expressed in this letter as to earning powers and successful operation apply as much to one section of the road as to the other. But my hon. friend speaks of a line which is not completed. He condemns the whole thing on a limited knowledge of the facts. Until connection is made between the Maritime Provinces and the western portion of the system no one will be in a position to tell what the result will be.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The trouble with the hon. member for Brantford and the hon. member for North Simcoe is that they have been reading the remarks of the Solicitor General in regard to the Transcontinental. They probably saw in the newspapers a short time ago the report of a speech which the Solicitor General made in Eastern Canada, in which he said that the Transcontinental simply consisted of two streaks of rust and a lot of decaying sleepers, or something of that kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mentioned the debt, too.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It was the two streaks of rust that impressed him most, as apparently it has impressed the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie). If these hon. gentlemen had the pleasure of being in the House when the Acting Minister of Railways presented his admirable statement with regard to the traffic upon the Trans-

continental they would have entertained a different opinion. The Acting Minister of Railways did not speak of it as two streaks of rust. He spoke of the splendid road-bed and of the very great and satisfactory traffic which was being carried over the Transcontinental. Unfinished at it is—being in the position of a house which has to be completed by the contractor, which is to have three stories and has only two stories completed, which is to have two bathrooms and has only one, and which this Government would call a completed house as they call this railway a completed railway, even although they themselves admit that it is not completed—even in its uncompleted condition the Transcontinental is to-day a great factor in connection with the transportation business of Canada. I was told just the other day that, if you go to any point on the Transcontinental in New Brunswick, every day, and almost every hour, you will see trains half a mile long, trains with 50 cars being hauled by one locomotive and transporting vast quantities of freight. The authorities of the Intercolonial Railway are using that road to far greater advantage than they would have been able to use the Intercolonial even if it had been double-tracked. Let these hon. gentlemen take comfort and hope from the statement of the Acting Minister of Railways, and realize, as they ought to realize, that the Transcontinental is one of the grandest and one of the most magnificent undertakings which have ever been carried out in any country. Let them take hope for its future, because they will have abundant reason for that hope. I trust that before making disparaging remarks again with regard to the Transcontinental the hon. members for Brantford and Simcoe will read the very interesting and instructive statement of the Acting Minister of Railways as to the business which it is doing, so far as eastern Canada is concerned.

Mr. CURRIE: I made no disparaging statement about the eastern section.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did my hon. friend not say in effect that instead of wasting money upon the Transcontinental it would have been infinitely better to devote that money to double-tracking the Intercolonial.

Mr. CURRIE: Sure it would. That is right, but I was not disparaging the road.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Even if it had been double-tracked, the Intercolonial has not the splendid grades which the Transcontinental has. On the Intercolonial between Quebec and Halifax there are grades of 1½ per cent in a number of places, while on the Transcontinental you have a grade of only ⅒ per cent. Go down east and you will find a locomotive on the Canadian Pacific railway or upon one of the lines of railway which it is operating, hauling eight or ten cars while you will find the same locomotive power hauling 50 cars on the Transcontinental. Cannot the hon. member see what wonderful difference it makes in the cheapness of transportation.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman is mistaking a local freight train for a through train.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am speaking about the difference in grades. On the Intercolonial, taking the whole district from Quebec to Halifax or St. John, a locomotive could not haul half the number of cars it could on the Transcontinental. The Transcontinental is a road of which we ought all to be proud. We ought not to speak of it as two streaks of rust, but as one of the greatest and grandest accomplishments in this country, or in any other country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a psychological study to sit on this side of the House and watch hon. gentlemen opposite when the Transcontinental railway or the Grand Trunk Pacific is under discussion. That any hon. member of this House, who had the remotest relationship with that undertaking of colossal folly, can stand before an intelligent people and pronounce it to be a grand and noble success really passes human comprehension. My hon. friend from St. John says that if we only listened to the statement of the Acting Minister of Railways we would take great comfort and encouragement, and would bestow our blessing on the late Government because they initiated the Transcontinental. The statement of the Minister of Railways shows this: That undertaking to operate the road as we would be forced to operate it—because those who fathered the road and forced it on the late Government would not operate it as a gift—the loss on operation alone is estimated $3,000,000 a year. That is what we are asked to take comfort out of in regard to this railway which has already cost the country $200,000,000, from Winnipeg eastward, and which will cost more than that. We find that with the probable necessity of loading our backs with

the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg westward, if we take it in the only way in which we now can, it would cost us $240,000,000 more. My hon. friend tells us that we have a fine road with fine grades and that a locomotive could haul more cars on the Transcontinental than on any other railway. Perhaps it could, if we had the freight to haul.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You will have the cars.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would it not be better to have the road first. What is the good of having a road twenty years before the freight comes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have never seen a case yet where you had the cars before you had the railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sometimes there is freight when there is no road. The hon. member for Edmonton gave us an instance, and there are other instances where freight is waiting to-day and there is no railroad. The finances of this country are crippled because hon. gentlemen opposite built railroads where there was no freight. Yes, about $240,000,000 from Winnipeg westward —that is what it would cost us now if we took over the road with the debt which is against it. The road over the prairie, they said would be an immediately paying part that would be strong enough to carry the eastern division through troublesome years and lean years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell this House that the Transcontinental is not an essential factor in connection with the transportation business of Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is just about as essential a factor as an air line. I would rather have the $200,000,000 that was spent upon it than this "essential factor." Hon. members opposite denounce the utility of the Canadian Northern and what it has done in return for what it has got. Last year that railroad carried nearly 40 per cent of the western grain, and the "essential factor," of which the hon. gentleman speaks, carried about 8 per cent of the western grain. This road, the "essential factor," has cost about $42,000 a mile, and, before we are through, it will have cost about $44,000 a mile. The other road cost $21,000 a mile and the $21,000 a mile road is carrying from 33 per cent to 40 per cent of the grain while the "essential factor" is carrying about a quarter of that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does the hon. gentleman think that the road from Winnipeg to Edmonton should not have been built?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It should not have been built in the way it was built, and neither should the road from Winnipeg eastwards. Four hundred and forty million dollars have been sunk in this road and the return in value to the Dominion is relatively infinitesimal. Yet, the hon. member for St. John stands up and says that this is a noble, a grand, a glorious work. What ties our hands in this war to-day financially?—the Transcontinental railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific. What loads the feet of this country and keeps us in our present——

Mr. MACDONALD: What about the Canadian Northern, which has been assisted to the extent of $75,000,000?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman was chiding me for mentioning the Canadian Northern a moment ago; now, he wants to get away from the Grand Trunk Pacific by bringing in the Canadian Northern. This, gentlemen opposite tell us, was a grand and glorious project. When we get this $240,000,000 road from Winnipeg westward, where are we? What was the record of the road last year under private management, and what can we expect under public management?

Mr. MACDONALD: It earned $6,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Returned $6,000,000?

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not say "returned." I say earned $6,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it earned $6,000,000 count next the operating cost and what did it lose? It lost $1,552,000 on the mountain section, lost on nearly all its branch lines. On the prairie section in six months it made about $600,000, leaving out fixed charges, and in stating the earnings it leaves out betterments, upkeep, even such items as throwing dust off the road that every railway charges against its cost of operation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what the Canadian Northern lost last year on the mountain section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Canadian Northern lost nothing on the mountain section because it did not open until November.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman might very well answer the question because they have been operating since the first of November.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman has come to the House with a certain proposal, or his Government has, and he ought to be able to tell us how much the Canadian Northern lost during the time they have been operating the mountain section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will tell the hon. gentleman something that will surprise him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: You might answer that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am going to answer the hon. gentleman and I am going to do it in one second, but I would like him to tell me what he thinks of this. The "monument," the "essential factor," the "grand," the "noble work," lost $1,552,000 on its mountain section on operation alone, to say nothing of fixed charges and in the operation expenses did not include the upkeep of the road and the ordinary charges that every other railway company includes in operating expenses. On the contrary, here is a road that has been running in that section for only a few months, not years. The Canadian Northern opened in November and the Canadian Northern, for the present month, I am informed, did not lose a dollar in operation and is making money on the operation of the mountain section. That is the difference between that road and the "essential factor."

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman takes one month in the spring of the year when there is a good deal of traffic, but he will not answer my question as to the loss on operation since the first of November.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not the figures for the first two or three months, and I have not the figures for this month, but who would expect any road to earn the cost of operation for the first two or three months, or even the first five months? But compare the Canadian Northern with the "essential factor," which not only did not pay, but is losing at the rate of $1,552,000 a year on the mountain section and losing on the branch lines on the prairies where of all places it ought to pay. It did not pay even the cost of operation or fixed charges notwithstanding the fact that it was carrying between 8 and 12 per cent of the grain of that western country.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do you think there was good management?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was certainly very poor management in the building of the road and in laying out the scheme. We are going to find out what the nature of the management has been. The hon. member for Pictou explained the situation by saying that Mr. Hays, the genius of the whole thing, died, and there was no man living to take his place.

Mr. MACDONALD: I did not say that at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood that, and it appealed to me as the best possible excuse.

Mr. MACDONALD: You did not understand anything of the kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what he did say?

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman quoted me partly correctly, as he usually does in discussing matters in this House, and then to suit his own purposes, he added that I said there was no man living who could take Mr. Hays' place. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman was complaining to us about the death of Mr. Hays. He did not say that there was no one to take his place, but if there has been some one to take his place, then what is the difference? He died, as the hon. gentleman states, and I only added the essential factor to make his complaint commonsense. What did we hear the other day? We heard the other day from the hon. member for St. John that the folly of the Canadian Northern was really fathered by this Administration, that the mountain section was away out of the Liberal mind altogether, and that they had no thought of such a thing as a third transcontinental railway through the mountains.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is not just what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman explain what he said, so that I will get it perfectly right?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I said the late Government did not give any financial assistance to the Canadian Northern through the mountains, that while we looked forward to its being carried through the mountains in later years, we had declined to give financial assistance, and it is this Government, in conjunction with the Government

of British Columbia, which is responsible for the building of the mountain section and placing upon the road enormous obligations which rest very heavily on the province of British Columbia, amounting to something over $40,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me how the late Government purposed that this new transcontinental railway from the Pacific coast to Montreal should get through British Columbia except by a separate line? What was their intention?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The time had not arrived when the Government could arrange that, but I will tell you what the late Government did. The late Government stipulated in the contract for the building of the Transcontinental that any other company should, with the approval of the Governor in Council, have running rights. I think that it would have been wise to have had an arrangement for running rights over the Grand Trunk Pacific more especially in view of the fact that even another road was built, and aided by the Government of British Columbia. I refer to the line from Vancouver to Prince George.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The time had not come for anything but a transcontinental railway from this side of the mountains to Montreal. The time had only come for the providing for a future transcontinental railway, and the route to the Pacific coast was to be by means of running rights over the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is the claim made on behalf of the late Government and that is the claim made by the hon. gentleman now. The route was to be by running rights. But legislation affirms that the time had come for a third transcontinental railway from the Pacific coast to Montreal, legislation passed in 1911. More than that, the Government of which the hon. member for St. John was a member, and during the time he was a member of it, not only by legislation pledged this country to the ratification of a third transcontinental railway right to the coast but they had the plans placed before them for the line and that line was approved under the hand of their Minister of Railways. How does the hon. gentleman square these facts, which I hold before me on the authority of the clerk of route maps of the Railway Department, with his now four years belated idea of giving the Canadian Northern railway running rights over the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Transcontinental.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me ask my hon. friend—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, just wait till he gets the facts. On the 22nd of October, 1906, a route map was submitted for approval covering a line from Edmonton to Dean Channel on the Pacific coast. This map was never approved. On the 10th of September, 1908, a route map was submitted, covering a line from Tête Jaune Caché to Vancouver. This map was approved on the 18th of January, 1909. Again on the 21st of May, 1910, a route map was submitted covering the line from Edmonton to a point near the Pembina river. This map was approved on the 22nd of June, 1910. I am ready to follow my hon. friend, with his route map approved by the department, and which, according to his own words in this House not a month ago, meant authority from the Government for the company to go ahead and build—

Mr. PUGSLEY: To go ahead and build without Government assistance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Without Government assistance? How does that accord with his scheme of running rights over the Transcontinental? By route maps approved on the 18th of January, 1909, on the 22nd of June, 1910, and on the 8th of November, 1910, the late Government authorized the Canadian Northern Railway to build through their line to the Pacific coast, right through the mountains of British Columbia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If they chose to do it at their own expense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did he authorize that to be done if his real scheme was only to give them running rights over the Grand Trunk Pacific through the mountains?

Mr. OLIVER: Should the Government have prevented them from building at their own expense?

Mr. MEIGHEN: At their own expense? The plan of the late Government, then, was this: to assist the Canadian Northern Railway over the prairies and through Ontario, and when it came to the mountains, where the cost of construction was twice as much, let the company build at their own expense.

Mr. OLIVER: At the proper time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the Minister of Railways and Canals in the late Government stated in this House only about a year ago that the proper time had come,

that they could not build too soon; and he said the same thing in the debate on the Canadian Northern Railway in 1911.

At six o'clock, the House resumed and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 102, for the relief of Martha Isabella Kenny.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 103, for the relief of William Thomas Craig.—Mr. Pardee.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income —Grand Trunk Pacific Company—loan not exceeding $8,000,000, repayable on demand with interest payable half-yearly at the rate of six per centum (6 per cent) per annum; to be used for expenditure made or to meet indebtedness incurred in paying interest upon securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to meet deficit in operation and for the purchase of rolling stock; said loan to be secured by mortgage upon the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company containing such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve. The disposition of the loan to be subject to the direction of the Governor in Council, $8,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER: When the committee rose at six o'clock the Solicitor General was speaking. Does he wish to continue his remarks?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are some remarks I wish to make, but I do not think it would be of any great advantage to make them at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to say a little in regard to the general proposition that is before the committee and then to speak in regard to the vote of $8,000,000 in aid of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which, I understand, is the particular item under discussion. I find my principal ground for criticism in the fact that has drawn so much commendation to the Government from the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), and, I think, from the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), namely, that the Government is now about to appoint a commission for the purpose of arriving at a policy to deal, either with the railroad situation created by the Grand Trunk Pacific and Canadian Northern railways, or perhaps with the whole railroad problem of the Dominion. Whether it is the one or the other, I want to say that I cannot join my friends in their commendation of the Government policy because I consider it not a policy, but a lack of policy. I do not favour Government by commission; I am for responsible Government in this country, and I take strong exception to the fact that this Government, since it has attained power, has adopted the principle of Government by commission to a degree that was never before dreamed of in this country nor, do I think, in any other self-governed country. There are circumstances and occasions when the appointment of a commission to deal with a special, or peculiar, or little understood question is desirable, but I submit that the question of how this country is to carry the responsibilities now resting upon it because of these two great transcontinental railroad enterprises, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific, is not a proper subject for the appointment of a commission. This subject is of such a gigantic character; it is of such immediate importance to this country, that it must be dealt with by the Government of this country as a matter of policy and administration. It would be, in my opinion, as reasonable for the Government to place in the hands of a commission the administration of its affairs in connection with the war as it is to place in the hands of a commission responsibility for the direction of the government of the country in regard to these two great railroad enterprises. If the Government is a Government for the purpose of directing in any measure the important affairs of this country, this is certainly the most important affair that at the present time can come under its consideration, aside from measures looking towards the prosecution of the war, and for the Government not to discharge those responsibilities but to side-step—I do not use the word offensively—its responsibilities by the appointment of a commission, is not a credit to the Government; it is not a credit to the country; it is not responsible Government. This Government have been in power since 1911, and the problems connected with the completion and maintenance of these two railroads met them when they entered office; those problems have been before them every day since they entered office, and they have been in office now for a matter of nearly five years. Who, in all the wide Dominion of Canada,

should know by this time what ought to be the policy in regard to these two railroads if not the members of the Government of Canada, assuming that they are discharging their duties and responsibilities?

When gentlemen who now form the Government sat in opposition, I was from time to time very much astonished to hear the present Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and his Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), then respectively leader of the Opposition, and his first lieutenant, argue, in good set terms, that the condition of the country was not a matter of Government responsibility. I have heard them argue that if the country was prosperous that prosperity was not properly due in any important degree to the policy of the Government, but was due to the industry of the people, the bounty of Providence, and to the opportunities afforded by the country. I did not take the argument seriously then, I assumed that it was merely a form of words used to cover up the evident fact that the policy and administration of the Government of that day had resulted in vast benefit to the country and its people, and that this was the only argument that our friends of the Opposition at that time, discharging their functions as critics as was their proper duty, could put forward to minimize the facts that were in the plain sight of everybody and of which everybody was receiving the benefit. But, if we are to take the facts as they are to-day—this policy of government by commission, and particularly the proposal that this great railroad question shall be dealt with, and presumably settled, by a commission—I can only conclude that our friends opposite were absolutely honest and believed what they said when, in opposition, they declared that the policy of the Government was not an important factor in securing the wealth of the country. That would be in line with their attitude to-day. They have declined to assume responsibility for the condition of these two great railway enterprises with which is interlocked to such a tremendous degree the welfare and progress of the country. I take the position that the Government of this or any other country, its policy and its administration, cannot fail to have an important effect upon the well-being of the country. And, if I may be permitted to take the time, I wish to draw the attention of the committee to certain facts as they appear to me, concerning the policy and administration of the Government, which have led up infallibly to the present conditions in regard to one enterprise—the Grand Trunk Pacific—which we have to deal with to-day, and which the Government proposes to deal with by appointing a royal commission.

The Government was well aware, when taking office, of the character, purpose, and magnitude of the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise, speaking of it as a transcontinental railway proposition. They knew its purpose; they knew approximately what its cost would be; and they must have realized how it was expected that the purpose would be achieved and how the difficulties that stood in the way of the achievement of that purpose were to be met. It would be absurd to suggest that such an enterprise as a transcontinental railroad could be completed without difficulty, or with absolute certainty as to what the result would be. These hon. gentlemen must have realized, if they realized anything, that, the enterprise having been entered upon and carried forward, as it had been carried forward with a certain definite purpose, that a responsibility in regard to it rested upon them, and that it was for them to make their decision either to carry that enterprise through to completion, with the intent of fulfilling the purpose for which it was instituted, or, in the alternative, deciding what other course they were going to pursue, and taking the responsibility of pursuing that course whatever it might be. But it appears to me that they did neither the one thing nor the other. In the discharge of the functions of government, even as they understood it, they were bound to fulfil the obligations entered into by their predecessors. And they were under equitable obligation to see carried out the contract for the construction of the Transcontinental. But, at any time, in the exercise of their sovereign authority, they could have altered the conditions to meet whatever line of policy they saw fit to pursue. They did not see fit to introduce any different line of policy in regard to this enterprise, they apparently decided to carry it forward, or to allow it to be carried forward, or to assist in carrying it forward, to completion. But the completion of a line of railway from Prince Rupert to Moncton was not a result, it was only a step in the fulfilment of a purpose, that purpose being to further the occupation and development of the country at large, without which, beyond any question, the vast investment of capital

in that tremendous enterprise must prove, measurably or entirely, unremunerative and the enterprise itself be discredited to that extent. When the Grand Trunk Pacific project was launched before the country, the country had not traffic to provide interest upon its proposed enormous capital cost. The project was launched with the expectation that by the time it was completed the country would have advanced in development, in occupation and in production, to the degree that the enterprise would find traffic and yield profitable results.

When hon. gentlemen opposite assumed the responsibilities of government, having this enterprise on their hands, they did not pursue a policy of looking to the further development of the country, to that increase of occupation and promotion of trade that would naturally provide the traffic that would make the road profitable, and to create which the road was built. It is true that they carried out the project so far as securing the laying of the rails was concerned. But that was not the project; it was only a step towards the achievement of the project, and while they took that step they refused to take any of the other steps that were necessary to secure the success of the enterprise.

From the day the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise was launched in this House, the party in Opposition at that time, headed by the present Prime Minister, in season and out of season, by day and by night, in winter and in summer, on the floor of Parliament, in the press, and on the hustings, used whatever arguments they were capable of and every influence at their hand to discredit that enterprise in the eyes of the people of Canada and in the eyes of the world at large. No opportunity was ever lost by the then Opposition to discredit the Grand Trunk Pacific transcontinental railway enterprise in the minds of the people of Canada and of the people of the world at large. When they attained power and when they decided to continue the material completion of the project, it would have been reasonable that they should have reversed their policy in regard to the enterprise. They did reverse their policy in regard to other matters, and I do not know that they are to be seriously criticised for having done so. Consistency is the virtue of small minds, I believe it has been said, and I am sure that on that ground our friends on the other side could not be accused of being small minded. But in this particular they maintained the virtue of consistency, and the same policy of destructive criticism that was the policy of His Majesty's loyal Opposition up to 1911 has been the policy of His Majesty's Government from September 21, 1911, until the present day, May 12, 1916, when the Solicitor General, not three hours ago, stood up in his place in Parliament and spoke of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—I forget his exact words, but the idea was that it was a mad enterprise. How the people of Canada or this Government could expect that that stupendous enterprise, which depended upon the maintenance of its credit in the money markets of the world and in every other way, could thrive under such conditions, is certainly a mystery to me. The world knows that the enterprise depended upon the support of the Government of Canada. It was an enterprise in large measure of the Government and of the people of Canada, and when those who were more recently charged with the responsibilities of Government of the country decried the enterprise in every possible shape, form and manner from the day they took office as in the years before they attained office, surely they must have realized that even if they did stand by the actual contracts that had been made, which required that the rails should be laid for a certain mileage, they were destroying the enterprise just as surely as if they had refused to lay those rails. It may be that they did not know what they were doing. It is not for me to say whether they knew or did not know, but in either case the responsibility rested upon them, and to-day we are facing the results.

In the matter of the construction of the railway, I have said that they carried out the contracts that they found when they came into office. They did in some measure, but only in some measure. The rails are laid from Prince Rupert to Moncton, but the contract required that there should be terminal facilities at Quebec, which was the great Atlantic port of this great Transcontinental railway. When the time came that the rails had been laid and it would have been possible to transact business over those rails through that great Atlantic port of Quebec, were terminal facilities available there? No. How did this Government expect that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company were to handle the business of half a continent through an ocean port that did not have any terminal

facilities for the accommodation of their traffic? This question arose two years ago and it was thrashed out in the House. The Minister of Railways and the Solicitor General argued that the Government had completed its contract with the company, that the company was now called upon to take over the road, that the road was completed. At the very same time that these gentlemen were standing in their places and asserting that the road was completed, the House was asked to vote the sum of $5,000,000 for expenditure on construction on the Transcontinental. The position is so absurd that it is only taking up time to dwell upon it. This Government was a party to laying 1,352 miles of rails from Winnipeg to Quebec. When the rails were laid and the $150,000,000 or $200,000,000 of expenditure made of which they complained so long and so loudly, they had not provided the means or facilities for handling traffic over these rails at the Atlantic port that the whole expenditure was made for the purpose of reaching and doing business at. A year has gone by since that time and we passed the other day an Estimate of $1,500,000 for construction on the Transcontinental. The Government made a bargain —wisely or unwisely, never mind—they made a bargain with the railroad company that when that road was completed the company would take it over and operate it on certain terms. The road has not been completed, and the company, in justice, as they set forth to their investors, are not able to accept an uncompleted road as a completed road. They are not able to take it over, and the condition is that more than two years after the last rail was laid, that road is not in a position to do business at the port of Quebec.

When the Grand Trunk proposal was placed before Parliament in 1903 by the then leader of the Government in the eloquent terms that he is so competent to use, he used the expression, in launching the enterprise, "Pray God that it be not too late." This expression has been the cause of vast merriment, and of a large measure of sarcasm from that day to this. But from year to year the railroad was pushed forward, and up to 1911 the production, upon which the success of the enterprise depended, was increased from year to year. Had that increase of production been continued up till the present time, there would have been, not only ample traffic for the railroad to enable the company operating it to earn interest on the cost, but such a pressure upon it that there would have been ample demand for the second Transcontinental railway. Unfortunately—and I will deal with that feature of the case a little later, if I may—production did not continue to increase under the benign policy and administration of our friends who occupy the treasury benches. It was not because the sun did not shine, or because the rain did not fall, or because the grass did not grow; it was because the policy and administration of the Government of the day prevented the producers of the West from securing that return for their labour to which they were entitled, and which they could have secured by the scratch of the pen of the Prime Minister of this country.

War broke out. That was a time when it was desirable that Canada should have ample communication from coast to coast, when it should have access to all ports, and means of transport for her produce under the most favourable terms, for her produce for export, as well as for her imports. It was a strange coincidence; in fact, it was a set of circumstances that synchronized with the needs of the Allies, then at their height, when Providence blessed our country with the most magnificent crop ever known in its history. We had in the Prairie West, without any very large increase of productive acreage, an enormous increase in natural production of export grain because Providence, was kind to us and gave us a return for our labours such as we had never expected and had never seen before. We had a crop of something like 350,000,000 bushels of wheat, oats to correspond, and barley to correspond, and the great need of the prairie farmer, of the prairie west, of all Canada, was that the grain should get to market and be turned into cash to be returned into the channels of trade throughout the Dominion in order that our people might receive the maximum benefit from it. We had the rails on the Transcontinental, built for the express purpose of coping with such a contingency, laid to Quebec, to the ocean port. Thank God, it was not too late, so far as getting the railroad constructed to tide water was concerned. Providence was not in fault in the matter. Providence had given a good crop. The people of Canada, to their credit, had supplied the money to build a railroad, but the Government of Canada, in control of the affairs of the people of Canada, did not see to the operation of that railroad.

so that the crop so produced could get to market and be returned in cash for the benefit of the people of Canada. Whose is the responsibility if to-day we have 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for the overseas market in this country at the present time. With a railroad built at a cost of $200,000,000, to give the shortest possible route under the best possible circumstances from the wheat fields to tide water. Over that road this year, when we had this tremendous crop, and two years after the last rail was laid, out of 350,000,000 bushels, we have hauled to the port of Quebec, it is claimed, but disputed, 3,000,000 bushels. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the fault of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway enterprise. It is not the fault of the Liberal Government that instituted it. It is not the fault of Providence, and it is not the fault of the country. It is not the fault of the war; it is the fault of the Government that did not realize its responsibilities and the possibilities of the enterprise, or at any rate, that did not use the proper means to realize on those possibilities. To-day our crop is still back in the country, we are without the money, the difficulties of getting across the ocean are increasing from day to day, and the responsibility is on the treasury benches.

We have heard to-day from the Solicitor General in terms that surely his colleague, the Minister of Finance must have regretted to hear him use, if he has considered how far his comments can reach in discrediting a great financial enterprise of this kind when we all appreciate that our enterprises need bolstering up instead of knocking down. We are asked to believe that this enterprise has not within it the elements of success, and we are told that its earnings during the past year have been limited to such a degree as to show that success is not possible. The Grand Trunk Pacific, as distinct from the Transcontinental railway, was intended to connect lake Superior with the prairies and then the Pacific coast. In order that the Grand Trunk Pacific in the prairies might be connected with lake Superior, a railway connection of 200 miles was built by the Grand Trunk Pacific connecting with the Transcontinental at a point about 250 miles out from Winnipeg. While the company would take advantage of direct connection between the wheat fields and the Atlantic port at Quebec, it would also have the advantage of direct connection between the wheat fields and the great lakes at Fort William.

For many years the Canadian Northern had that connection and did business over it with great success. Ever since the inception of the Canadian Pacific, that company has done business over that route with great success. It was an essential part of the project of the Grand Trunk Pacific that it should have an independent outlet on lake Superior and it spent the money of its shareholders, and raised money on the credit of the company, in order to build 200 miles to make that connection. A year ago the crop was light in the West and traffic was light. When the business was not there the most capable management could not earn money. Then this Government come in and they say to the railway company: If you do not take over this uncompleted line between Winnipeg and Quebec, do not take it over in its uncompleted condition, and do not take it over on the terms we dictate, we will cut you off at Winnipeg from access to lake Superior as well as from access to Quebec. And they did it. To-day the Grand Trunk Pacific, that should have had its outlet on lake Superior and should have had the benefit of that outlet, having spent an enormous amount of money in constructing terminals there, providing elevator accommodation and in other ways to enable it to carry on trade on that lake in the past year, when there was abundant traffic, when there was more than abundant traffic, has been denied the opportunity to share in that traffic to the extent of one dollar. The Government took over their traffic at Winnipeg and shut them out from the earnings of upwards of 450 miles of road. Then the Solicitor General asks why the Grand Trunk Pacific did not earn as much in proportion as the Canadian Northern. The Canadian Northern, or any other road, would not earn satisfactorily if it was broken off 450 miles before it reached the terminals to which it was endeavouring to carry its traffic. The Government broke the back of the Grand Trunk Pacific when it took away from it the connection that it had to lake Superior and where it had established its own terminals at its own cost. It did that at a time when the company was at a disadvantage owing to the light traffic and the small crop and did it under the plea that the company was not dealing honestly by the Government in not undertaking to operate the line to Quebec when the Government had not honestly completed the line and fitted it for operation.

The three great points in the eastern operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific en-

terprise were: access to the head of the lakes at Fort William, access to the ocean at Quebec and access to the great distributing and collecting system of the Grand Trunk Railway Company throughout the eastern provinces. Nobody would have been mad enough to undertake to push a great railway enterprise only from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast. Such a road would have been a local road, a colonization road, and certainly no such expenditure as was made on the Grand Trunk Pacific would have been warranted in such circumstances. Had it been the policy of the Government to organize, or encourage a company that would give colonization railway facilities throughout the Prairie West from Winnipeg to the Rocky mountains, then each mile of road would have been constructed for half or a quarter of what the Grand Trunk Pacific main line cost. But, that was not the enterprise. The proposition was that they should build the Transcontinental railway from Quebec to Prince Rupert with an even grade and of as high a standard of construction as could be secured and such as no other transcontinental railway had. It was only as a transcontinental enterprise that this vast expenditure was warranted, and when our hon. friends broke the back of the enterprise, took over the operation of the road from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Winnipeg to Thunder Bay, absolutely disconnected the Grand Trunk system in the eastern provinces from the Prairie Provinces in the West, there was nothing to it; they had destroyed the enterprise just as absolutely as if they had refused to lay the rails between Cochrane and Quebec.

Then they come to the House and say: "We need $8,000,000 as aid to this broken backed railway, this bankrupt concern. We do not know what to do with it, so we are going to appoint a commission to tell us what is the matter and see what we are to do with it." These are the facts of the case and no commission is necessary to tell what has happened to the Grand Trunk Pacific up to the present time. No commission is necessary to tell what must necessarily have happened to it under such direction and control. There was no possibility, it having been diverted from its original purpose and that purpose having been absolutely destroyed by the intervention of this Government, of its success as a commercial undertaking.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does my hon. friend suggest that the Government prevented the Grand Trunk Pacific from operating the National Transcontinental?

Mr. OLIVER: Surely.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: And took away the section from Fort William to Cochrane?

Mr. OLIVER: I am absolutely saying so.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does not my hon. friend know that the Grand Trunk agreed to that and was glad to?

Mr. OLIVER: I do.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: How, then, can he accuse the Government of breaking the back of the Grand Trunk Pacific by taking away that branch?

Mr. OLIVER: The company had to agree to it. They were at the mercy of the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Oh, no.

Mr. OLIVER: Certainly; they had to agree to whatever the Government insisted upon. And when the Government was hostile—deliberately, publicly, avowedly and aggressively hostile to the company—what was there to be done but to submit to any terms the Government saw fit to dictate? There was no other recourse. The Grand Trunk Pacific had to come to this Government to enable them to complete the line to the coast. My hon. friend has thrashed out that point time and again in the House, and explained how it was necessary. Well, the Grand Trunk Pacific cannot come to the Government and ask as a favour a certain concession, and then refuse the Government a concession it may see fit to insist upon. We do not need a commission to tell us that.

9 p.m.

I am sorry the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in the House, because I am going to refer again to a subject to which he takes strong objection—the question of free wheat. I have said that the production of the prairie west made a continuous increase from year to year up to 1911, in which year it reached its maximum for the time being. In 1911 there was a big crop, but harvesting conditions were unfavourable, and it became necessary and desirable from every point of view that as much as possible of that crop should be marketed south of the line. The Government had been newly returned to power on a policy opposed to the marketing of grain south of the line, and therefore they were absolutely consistent in their policy when they re-

fused to permit of that marketing south of the line. But the fact that they had refused to permit it cost the producers of western Canada figures that ran into tens of millions; and that refusal absolutely broke the back of production in the West. It was not that Providence had not given a good crop; it is true that Providence had given bad weather for harvesting, but the Government could have saved the situation in a large measure if they had seen fit to do so. But they would not do it because it was against their policy of trade restriction and of opposition to the movement of our grain south of the line. The year 1912 showed no increase in either acreage or crop; the year 1913 showed no increase in either acreage or crop. The year 1914 showed a substantial decrease in both acreage and crop; that, however, I will admit was in a large measure the result of climatic conditions. But before that we had had two years of stagnation, so far as production was concerned, absolutely as the result of the policy and administration of our friends opposite—years when we should have been increasing our production so that when these great transportation enterprises were completed there would be business for them to do at a profit both to them and the people depending upon them and to the country. The Government was opposed to grain being transported south of the line. It ought to go east, they said, and not south, and so they would not let it go south. And when the railroad is completed to the east, when the rails are laid and the trains running, we find, four months before the next harvest, surplus grain to the amount of 125,000,000 bushels still not having gone east, still not having gone south, still in the elevators of the West or in the farmer's hands. As their policy was to keep the grain from going south, on the plea that it ought to go east, they ought at least to have sent it east when they had the railroad to send it over, and when theirs was the responsibility of seeing that it found a market in that direction. They are now going to appoint a commission to tell us how to finance or manage or administer the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern Railway If they do not know now what is the cause of the present situation, no commission that they appoint will ever tell them, because the men they appoint will be like-minded with themselves, will hold the same point of view, and bring in a verdict accordingly. It is suggested that the solution of the problem is Government ownership. Well, if that is the proper solution it is just as good to-day as it will be a year from now. What I complain of is that the Government is demanding over $8,000,000 to tide over the situation for one year, without any suggestion as to what is to be the situation after that $8,000,000 has been spent.

Coming now to another aspect, there is one condition under which Government ownership is desirable and necessary, and that is where any public utility is in the hands of a monopoly. If we had only one railroad operating in Canada we would surely need Government ownership to introduce competition. But I maintain that the difficulties of working out the problem of Government ownership satisfactorily are such that it is better not to undertake it unless it becomes a necessity. Our experience in Government ownership of railroads in Canada has not been fortunate. We have had Government ownership of the Intercolonial for many years. We complain that the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific are not able to pay interest on their bonds; we call them lame ducks and broken-backed enterprises! They are injuring the credit of our country; they are a discredit to the men who conceived the enterprises and who carried them on, because at this time, they are not able to pay interest on their bonds! My information is that the Intercolonial railway has never yet paid a cent on its cost of construction; that it has never yet come anywhere near doing so; that from year to year and year after year the cost of operation has been met by appropriations out of the public treasury. While that may not be the condition to-day, there is no doubt that it was the condition for many years, and I say that until under Government ownership it has been demonstrated that we can earn some part of the interest upon the cost of construction of the Intercolonial, we are hardly the people to undertake lightly the project of managing such a vast network of railway systems as is involved in taking over the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, which, if we are not able to manage them better than those who are now in charge are doing, and far better than we ever managed the Intercolonial, instead of lightening our burdens, are going to increase them vastly. Government ownership is an ideal condition. I have said—and I say it again for the bene-

fit of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who did not hear it before —that it is only in the case of a private monopoly of any public utility that Government ownership becomes a necessity; but so long as private enterprise can be maintained in effective competition, my opinion, as the result of our experience, is that we are better off without Government ownership than with it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: What will you do with the roads on your hands now?

Mr. OLIVER: I have been trying to explain to the Government how they have fallen down in regard to that matter, and I would suggest better management in that case. The difficulty of Government ownership is briefly this. In order that any enterprise may succeed, it must have a directing head, and that head must have a direct interest in the success of the enterprise. When the whole people are the owners of an enterprise, that direct interest is lacking; there is a diffusion of interest that does not tend towards energetic and successful management. That is the weakness of Government ownership. I speak with knowledge, because we have in Edmonton municipal ownership, which is on the same principle, and we find that difficulty.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The contrary is the case in Toronto.

Mr. OLIVER: That may be so, but we find a great difficulty in working out municipal ownership successfully, for the reason that I have stated. It may be that, under the direction of my hon. friend's campaign of education, and under changed circumstances, we may arrive at a point where the public mind will be so seized of its responsibilities as to enable us to manage these matters better in the future than in the past. I hope that time may come; it has not arrived yet. My faith is based rather in effective business competition, where that can be secured; and, before I close, I want to point out that the essential features of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway project and of the Canadian Northern Railway project, so far as the former Liberal Government was responsible for either or both of them, was that they represented effective railroad competition throughout the Dominion of Canada. It was for the purpose of securing effective railroad competition that these enterprises were severally instituted or aided by that Government. Given that effective competition of these great utilities in the hands of men whose interests are in their absolute efficiency and success, and given a measure of Government control such as we have through the Railway Commission, and I think we have arrived at as near the ideal as we can expect to get in the present condition of the public mind. I know it is usual to say: Government ownership is the solution of all difficulties. I do not, however, hold that to be the case. The railway problem is not solved by the Government assuming ownership; it is only at the beginning. I would have been better pleased if the Government had come down with a definite policy with regard to these railroads that would look to their being financed successfully during the present period of difficult finance, so that we might expect them to emerge successfully when that condition passed away. I regret that the Government has not adopted that policy because I believe it to be sound policy and the best policy. I am sorry that the Government has come down with a policy, every line and every word of which is absolutely to further discredit these two railways as business enterprises and render what formerly was difficult, now a practical impossibility, that is, to finance them further on their own account. I know that these are hard times; I know that there are financial difficulties for the Government and everybody else; I know that we have sunk an enormous amount of money in these enterprises; I know that so far as earning their own interest to-day is concerned, they are failures; but we must take into consideration the fact that these are not the only enterprises that have failed to earn profits at the present time, and that this depression occurred—and remember that it was not due to the war condition, but to the condition before the war—at the time these roads were just completed, that is, at the most critical time in their career, because during construction all charges are carried out of capital,—but when they are completed they must be carried by the traffic, and the traffic must be sufficient to enable that to be done. Just at this particular time evil days have come and both enterprises are behind. My suggestion is that it would have been wisdom on the part of the Government to come down with a definite policy to carry forward these enterprises with a view to their becoming permanent and substantial competitive transcontinental railway enterprises for the benefit of the Dominion of Canada. That

is a somewhat radical, a somewhat serious suggestion; but we are facing a serious situation, and I have confidence enough in the country and in its future to believe that if these enterprises are properly handled, they will, in due time, work out successfully. I am, however, just as sure that, handled as they have been, hampered as they have been, by the policy of the Government of the day, they cannot possibly work out to a success under a policy of Government ownership unless we have a different kind of administration from anything we have had yet in regard to railroads or any other public utilities at the hands of this Government. Just a word in regard to the progress of affairs in Canada and the possibilities of the future. When the Canadian Pacific railway was first built across the continent the population was sparse; conditions were unfavourable; traffic was light, and I remember that during many years the passenger business of the Canadian Pacific was carried on by one train a day each way across the continent, and that the passengers on that train were remarkable rather for their absence than for their numbers.

I remember that, years after the Canadian Pacific railway was built, it entered the minds of the great men who were managing the enterprise to build a connection between St. Paul and the main line of the system at Moosejaw—what is called the Soo line. It looked like a splendid railroad proposition, and they expected that it would bring traffic. I have seen that train come into Moosejaw time and again—it came in every day—with engine, tender, baggage-car, second class car, tourist car, first class car, and Pullman, and with one solitary passenger on all that train. To-day everybody knows that the Canadian Pacific railway is probably the most successful railway enterprise in the world. The traffic of their main line is so great that they have double-tracked a large part of that line, not only on the prairie, but also in Northern Ontario as well. Their Soo line is a magnificently paying proposition. Every part of the enterprise, as they have undertaken it, has turned out splendidly. But it did not turn out that way for many years after the inception of the enterprise. Circumstances were such that it could be carried on very much more economically than a railroad enterprise can be carried on to-day. Now, throughout the Northwest, on those wide, lone prairies, where we might expect possibly to have a train once or twice a week—and I remember that during eight or ten years all we had at Edmonton were two trains a week, and accommodation trains at that; so-called because they did not accommodate very much—to-day, between Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina, Saskatoon, and Edmonton, and between Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina, Moosejaw, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, and Spokane, Washington, you have railroad services that are not excelled on this continent. This is absolutely the result of competition, competition made effective by the introduction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern railway enterprises into that country. It may seem to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), living where railroads come in from every direction, where they are almost climbing over one another, that we should not have railway competition, and that he can regulate railroads to run this way or that as he sees fit. But, looking at the circumstances as I see them in our country, and bearing in mind the conditions that we had under a monopoly as compared with those to-day, I say that present conditions are good enough for me. I do not want to revert to a condition of railroad monopoly, and I am not so sure that I want to see a condition of only government ownership, either.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Having listened to the discussion of the merits and demerits of public ownership, I still think that the arguments in favour of that system are sound and that it is the proper railroad condition for this country. I tried to make it clear this afternoon that the opportunity to bring about public ownership in this country is here, in this crisis created by the war or by something else, when we find two railroads asking Government assistance. The small attendance during this debate may be accounted for to some extent by the length of yesterday's debate lasting into this morning. But the thing that strikes me in this debate is that the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Northern Railway, are very much afraid that we are very near the open door of public ownership in this country, and they would like to see the country get past the present situation. That situation presents itself to Parliament, and it is upon Parliament I urge that that situation should be used for the purpose of trying out the system of public ownership. I would like to see public ownership

tried with at least one of these railroads in the East which has connecting lines in the West. We have the Grand Trunk Pacific on our hands, or we have to finance it; and we have the Transcontinental certainly on our hands, and are running it. We have also the Intercolonial, and are buying other lines in the East. So, I say take over one line that is profitable in the East and is linked with these lines in the West, and let us see what we can do in competition with the other roads. My suggestion was to give a sum of money—I mentioned a certain sum as a feeler—to get possession of the road. The only road that I see in immediate sight is the Canadian Northern, which, I believe, would sell its interest for a very small consideration. The suggestion I made is entirely my own. These negotiations afford us opportunity to take over a good system that affords connection with our cities in the East. And with that one road, whichever it may be that we take, we should link the great transcontinental system that will give competition with the other lines. The operation of such a road would be more effective in moderating rates in the West than anything else I know of. It would do more for the public of the West than the Railway Commission with all its powers of regulation can do. It may be that we shall be forced to take them all by our still further experience or on the recommendation of the commission that we are going to appoint. I am not going to object to that commission, and, of course, its report may be in favour of public ownership. But I am not going to be guided by that.

I tell this Parliament again that this is the opportunity of trying public ownership, where you have a transcontinental line connecting the cities of the West with those of the East. I think the people of Canada will be rather disappointed when they know that this opportunity of getting a transcontinental system has been allowed to slip by. I should have thought that the member for Edmonton would have been prepared to accept that course at least as one measure of relief. He may blame this Government for the fate that has come to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Transcontinental and all its alliances. That may be, but it has proved a failure and the failure having taken place and the Grand Trunk being responsible in a legal sense for what has happened, the greatest opportunity that has ever presented itself to a nation has arisen, and to take advantage of this opportunity would give us a railroad and a chance to improve conditions in this country. The conditions could not be worse than they are to-day; they could be much better. I absolutely dispute the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that to get good railroading you have to have the competition of privately owned lines. The whole experience of America is against that dogma being true or justified by the facts. Seventy-five per cent of the roads in the United States have gone into liquidation; road after road has been wrecked by railroad exploiters, and the system has proved to be the greatest failure in the way of railroading that has been known in the history of the world.

Mr. OLIVER: When the hon. member speaks of failure, does he mean financial failure, or failure as regards service rendered to the public?

Mr. MACLEAN: Both. Service has not been given the public in the United States for the money invested that that money properly invested under judicious state administration would have given the public.

Mr. OLIVER: For the two cents a mile that a man pays to ride in a train in the United States, does he not get better service than is given anywhere else in the world?

Mr. MACLEAN: I do not know that he does. In some ways they give a splendid freight service, but in view of the money invested and of the opportunities they have had in the United States, it has been an inferior service. I would remind my hon. friend that before many years he will see public ownership of railways coming in the United States. I have myself put on record and I intend to keep it before the people of this country that the opportunity came here to-day for public ownership of at least one transcontinental system. Again I say that this administration and the Conservative party are on record as saying that public ownership of the Grand Trunk Pacific would have been better for this country than the privately owned system which was imposed upon the country by the Liberal party. The two parties were in issue on that question; now the opportunity has come and it may never come again. Things that may happen in connection with the coming election may deprive them of the opportunity that they have here to-day. But as a party they are on record as saying that the Grand Trunk Pacific should

be publicly owned and administered and that this system is preferable to the system which is shown to have failed. That system has failed; the documents making the confession are on record and now, I say, is the time to adopt the new and better system. If the argument of the member for Edmonton is good—the same may be said of the remarks of other hon. gentlemen who have spoken here to-day—we ought to give away the Intercolonial railway; we ought to get rid of it, bag and baggage, as a thing that the state should not have. I have heard these arguments time after time.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the hon. member suggest that I said anything about giving away the Intercolonial?

Mr. MACLEAN: No, but the hon. gentleman would like to see it run in a different way. His hopes lie in private administration.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes; that is, judged by the results of the operation of the Intercolonial.

Mr. MACLEAN: Well, as to private administration of railroads in competition we have had that and we are sick of it. We have put millions of money into that system and what have we got for it? Nothing. We financed them right to the hilt, and they are here again asking us to continue financing them. Moreover, they want us to help them over this period when public ownership is likely to be accomplished. All we are asked to do is to help them over this time of trial and give them another opportunity to attempt to succeed in their enterprises. The matter rests with this Parliament, and I am convinced that when the people hear of these facts it will be the general opinion that the opportunity came to Parliament in this year to acquire at least one Transcontinental road and we did not take advantage of it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have had a very interesting discussion, but we were here late last night and until rather early this morning. I would suggest that the Grand Trunk Pacific item be allowed to pass, and to-morrow we will take up the Canadian Northern railway item. Some other items have not yet been passed and we might make some progress with them.

Miscellaneous printing, $100,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is this for the printing of public documents?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Miscellaneous printing.

Mr. REID: This is an item that is put in every year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand from the Assistant's King's Printer, whom I met the other day, that only a few members receive copies of the evidence taken before the Royal Commission. It seems to me that the evidence should be distributed to all members of the House. I do not complain myself, because I receive copies of the evidence.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would suggest that my hon. friend raise the question tomorrow, when the Prime Minister is here. I have no information as to the matter.

Legislation—House of Commons, $10,687.50.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to refer to a matter which is not specifically mentioned in this item, but which relates to the House of Commons. I would first of all thank the Government for making provision for the payment of the indemnity of the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland). Last year the gentleman who manages the affairs at home of that hon. gentleman, his brother-in-law, suggested to me that the indemnity be deposited at the bank where the hon. member for Beauce generally deposited his money. I wrote to the accountant of the House of Commons, and he was willing to do so, but he explained that he had to get the permission of the Government, through the Minister of Finance or the Auditor General, I think. The reason for the request was that the hon. member (Mr. Beland) might get the benefit of the accruing interest during his detention in Germany. I would ask the Minister of Finance to see that arrangements are made to transfer the indemnity from the treasury to the bank.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Was it done last year?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was done last year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend might send me the name of the bank.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will see that that is done.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I need not say with what great pleasure we will do anything on behalf of the hon. member for Beauce, for whom we all have so much admiration, and whose absence we all so much regret.

Mr. MACDONALD: What provision is made with regard to the payment of the

indemnity to members who are on active service, at home or abroad?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Provision has been made in the Supplementary Estimates for the cases of members on active service.

Mr. NESBITT: You will find it in the Estimate.

Customs, $4.215.000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was the Minister of Customs asked with regard to the matter of the admission free of duty of large quantities of goods at Morrisburg?

Mr. REID: We discussed that the other night at the instance of the hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not think that it would unnecessarily delay the Estimates if this item were allowed to stand. The minister has been putting his Estimates through pretty rapidly. Is that upon the theory that prorogation is expected to take place shortly?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is due to an arrangement which we made before my hon. friend came in.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is a large item and I think the minister might let it stand over.

Mr. REID: We are going to leave some items upon which you can discuss anything.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understand that when the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) agreed to the arrangement he was not aware that there was an item amounting to over $4,000,000.

Mr. REID: It is exactly the same as last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How many items will still be left?

Mr. REID: Quite a number.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then this might go through.

Civil Government—Department of Public Printing and Stationery—to appoint Frederick Cook Assistant King's Printer and Controller of Stationery, at $4,000 per annum, from July 1st, 1915, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that our friend the ex-Mayor of Ottawa?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is the gentleman.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely he is not willing to take $4,000 in these times.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will remember the high cost of living.

Mr. PARDEE: Is that a new office?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think it is. It has been in existence since July last.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the minister had better let this stand. It is new and we had better have some information about it.

Item stands.

Mines and Geological Survey—Mines Branch—publication of reports, translation of reports into French, purchase books, stationery, chemical laboratories supplies, apparatus, instruments, office contingencies, additional assistance—further amount required, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In view of it being ten o'clock, and as most of us were up until five o'clock this morning, probably the minister would leave the rest of the items. There are not very many.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Before the hon. member came in, I put, not quite as nicely as he has, the same idea, that is that we were up late last night, or early this morning, and I thought it was desirable that we should pass these items and then rise. There are only four more items in the Supplementaries for 1915-16 and I suggest that we pass these and let the Supplementaries for 1916-17, containing about twelve items in all, remain until to-morrow.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is a pretty big amount.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, let it stand.

Item stands.

Miscellaneous—to recoup vote "unforeseen expenses" for advances made to defray the expenses for the Economic and Development Commission, $8,500.

Mr. OLIVER: Is that commission the eightieth or eighty-second?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have forgotten; it may possibly be the eighty-first.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who is the chairman?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Senator Lougheed.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. PUGSLEY: What business will there be for to-morrow?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Supply, the Canadian Northern loan, and any other items.

The Grand Trunk Pacific item was passed but the Canadian Northern loan will be taken up.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like to give the minister notice of an amendment which I had intended to move, but which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) will move for me, to the item providing for the $15,000,000 loan to the Canadian Northern. I propose that as a condition of the loan the Canadian Northern shall give to His Majesty an option which may be exercised at any time within five years for the transfer of all the property of the Canadian Northern railway and the connected systems at a price which may be fixed by the Governor General in Council. That is the effect of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) to bring down some information as to the two roads to be absorbed by the Transcontinental, the Quebec and Saguenay and the Lotbinière and Megantic, the amount which the Government will have to pay for the roads, the cost of building them, their actual equipment, what remains to be built of both, the gross and net receipts of both and, generally speaking, such information as we should have to enable us to intelligently discuss this question? Would my hon. friend let me have that on Monday?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On to-morrow?

Mr. REID: I will get the information.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understand the second reading of the Bill will take place on Monday.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before we adjourn, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that, as Chairman of the Citizens' Committee for the collection of funds, I have received a telegram stating that the 163rd French Canadian Battalion, started three months ago, is now fully enlisted, the number being 1,100 or more. I was pleased to receive a telegram from Major Asselin stating that he had received orders to leave by the middle of next week.

Motion agreed to, and, House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Saturday, May 13, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

PUBLIC PRINTING.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN COST.

Mr. JOHN A. CURRIE (North Simcoe) moved:

That the recommendation contained in the second report of the Joint Committee on Printing, presented to the House on May 11, be concurred in.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: If I am in order in speaking at this stage, I wish to enter, on behalf of the Debates Committee, a very strong protest against concurrence in this report.

Mr. CURRIE: There are two reports. The report against which the hon. gentleman wishes to speak is the third report, concurrence in which I shall move in a moment. The report to which this motion refers is only a formal one. When I speak on the other I will make an explanation.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CURRIE moved:

That the recommendation contained in the third report of the Joint Committee on Printing, presented to the House on May 11, be concurred in.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Would my hon. friend have any objection to having that motion stand until Monday?

Mr. CURRIE: I shall not be here on Monday. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of both Houses on Printing has had under consideration means by which a reduction may be made in the cost of the printing of Parliament. It will be as well for me to read this third report of the committee dealing with this question, which is incorporated in the Votes and Proceedings, so that it may appear on Hansard. The report of the committee of which I am the mouthpiece is as follows:

The committee has had before it for consideration the question of the prevention of waste in public printing and distribution.

The committee has made careful investigation and inquiry, and after referring the matter to a sub-committee for further investigation, beg leave to report as follows:

The committee desire, in the first place, to call attention to the great increase in the cost of parliamentary and departmental printing in recent years. For instance, the expenditure in 1895 was $330,627. In 1915 this had increased to $1,807,390.

Within the past few days the committee has had before it the King's Printer and other offi-

cials of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. After hearing the testimony of these gentlemen, the committee is of the opinion that great economies can be effected by the adoption of certain changes, both in the manner of printing and distributing. A complete review of the situation from the King's Printer's standpoint is contained in a memorandum which he prepared in March last year, copy of which is attached hereto, and which it is recommended be printed with this report.

Dealing first with the distribution lists, because upon these the extent of the printing to be done depends, the committee recommend:

That all distribution be made from the office of the King's Printer, as provided by the Act constituting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery (chapter 80, R.S.C.).

That all departmental mailing lists be sent to the Distribution Branch of the Government Printing Bureau, and that these lists be revised annually by the Distribution Office. This should be done by sending out reply cards to all individuals on the lists—for any class of Government publication. In the event of no response within a specified time, the name or names to be dropped.

The same practice to be pursued with regard to bound volumes of the sessional papers, over 640 sets of which are now sent out to different institutions. It is estimated that fully half of this quantity is thrown away, and that if the lists be reduced by fifty per cent there will be a saving of at least 9,600 bound volumes.

Distribution lists and the printing of the Debates of both Houses in every case to be referred to the Printing Committee.

Recommendations made to either House by any committee for the printing of evidence taken before it to be referred to the Printing Committee for action.

Reports of special commissions to be referred to the Printing Committee to determine whether they shall be printed, and if so, in what quantities.

The committee is of the opinion that the practice of charging the general public for departmental blue-books and special publications should be strictly adhered to. The indiscriminate distribution of maps, annual blue-books and special monthly reports has led to many abuses in the past. Instances have been cited by many departments where scores of applications have been received from schools in different parts of the country for publications which could not, in the slightest degree, interest the school children applying for them. These books have been asked for probably on the mere mention by some newspaper that they would be sent free. Some deputy ministers are of the opinion that the motive underlying the requests for these reports is the hope that the report will contain pictures.

In order to expedite the mailing of Governmental publications, it is earnestly recommended that a branch post office be established in connection with the Distribution Branch of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, and mail be sent therefrom direct to the railway stations.

With regard to the parliamentary printing which is done under the supervision of the King's Printer, the committee is pleased to learn that during the past two or three years changes have been made in the typographical arrangements of several blue-books, whereby considerable economy has been effected. On these books it is estimated that an annual saving of $15,000 has been made. The King's Printer, however, has no editorial authority, and can only bring about these changes through the good-will of the officials of the several departments.

Attention is called by the committee to the enormous increase in the number of illustrations in annual and special reports. Many of those illustrations are of no value. It is suggested that only such plates be incorporated in parliamentary blue-books as are necessary to a proper understanding of the text.

There is great room for economy in the printing of annual departmental reports, by eliminating entirely technical treaties, complimentary references, lists of staffs of officials, formal introductions and formal signatures, duplication of statistical information, etc. In the latter connection one has only to examine the statistical reports of the Departments of Customs and Trade and Commerce to see the proof of this statement. The committee recommended that where at all possible duplications should be avoided.

The committee recommends that the scope of the monthly Agricultural Gazette be extended, by incorporating with it Seasonable Hints and small bulletins now issued by the Department of Agriculture in leaflet form in order to give them permanent value, and that the Gazette be distributed free to all Canadian farmers who apply for it. This could be accomplished without much additional cost by dropping the Bulletin of Foreign Agricultural Intelligence, much of the information contained in which is of little practical value to the Canadian farmer. The best features of the bulletin could be incorporated in the Agricultural Gazette, which should be published in cheaper form. The Bulletin of Agricultural Intelligence has been in existence for over five years and costs annually about $2,400.

The committee would call attention to the large quantities of maps, which are prepared by some sixteen branches of the public service, and which in a large measure are circulated free. The report of the Royal Commission appointed in 1914 to "inquire into the state of the records of the public departments" called attention to this great division of labour, and suggested "that the whole of the map-making for the Dominion Government might be carried on more effectively and economically under the direction of a central authority." We would recommend that this work be supervised by the Department of Public Printing, with absolute authority to prevent useless duplication or overlapping.

The committee would further recommend that all "copy" for the printer be typewritten. Instances innumerable have been noted of the great waste of public funds through bad caligraphy and consequent corrections of proof. Last year at the Government Bureau the cost of author's corrections was $48,376. This was a decrease of $5,666 over the previous year, but the committee is satisfied that this charge can be largely reduced by the exercise of greater care in the preparation of "copy."

As already pointed out, the King's Printer and the bureau staff have no authority to make any changes in the text of any parliamentary or departmental document. Recognizing that thousands of pages of reports of no value are printed annually, the committee is of the opinion that to revise copy to avoid redundancy

and over-lapping, a board of editors of parliamentary and departmental publications should be established by the Government to work in conjunction with the King's Printer. To this board all reports and publications should be referred, and authority should be vested in such a board to decide what should or what should not be printed. The committee is of opinion that such a board, properly constituted, with wide editorial powers, could save the country thousands of dollars annually.

Dealing first with the matter of distribution, which is the primary source of waste, the report says:

That all distribution be made from the office of the King's Printer, as provided by the Act constituting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery (Chapter 80, R.S.C.).

That all departmental mailing lists be sent to the Distribution Branch of the Government Printing Bureau, and that these lists be revised annually by the Distribution Office. This should be done by sending out reply cards to all individuals on the lists—for any class of Government publication. In the event of no response within a specified time, the name or names to be dropped.

The procedure as laid down by this Act is that each department shall have a mailing list which shall be sent to the King's Printer, and, as the various reports are printed, they shall be distributed according to that mailing list from the King's Printer's office. But the procedure, in fact, is that each department or committee has a large number of copies of documents printed for itself; in fact, nearly the whole issue is sent to it. Then at the department is established a mailing branch, which, half the time, is not employed, and these books and papers are distributed by this branch. The idea of your Committee on Printing is, that each department should send its list to the King's Printer, and that in the Printing Bureau there should be one general distribution office, as provided for by the Act. This method of distribution would avoid duplication of distribution staff to a very large extent. It often happens that the same name will be on the list of different departments, causing duplication in the issue of some of the documents. This duplication and waste is shown in the report in the following paragraph:

The committee desire, in the first place, to call attention to the great increase in the cost of parliamentary and departmental printing in recent years. For instance, the expenditure in 1895 was $330,627. In 1915 this had increased to $1,807,390.

Each department charges its printing against the vote over which this committee is supposed to exercise some supervision. The amount that each department therefore spends does not appear as an item in the estimates of each department. One source of waste is the lack of supervision of the various departmental lists. For instance, a man's name is put on the list for a certain publication—let us say for the Votes and Proceedings of this House, which make a large shelf of books. These books are sent to that man's address year after year. We find on inquiring that there are names on the list of men who have been dead for five or ten years, or who have moved away, and the books are still going to their address at great cost and waste to the public. It is proposed that a reply card should be sent out to each name on the list once a year. If the person still wishes to receive the public documents he sends back the card with intimation of his wish. In that way a check can be kept on the documents sent out. It may be that a certain document is required for only one year; but once a name is on the list we continue firing books at that mark, and the bulk of the books so wasted is so great that the printing bills of this country have been increased by about a million and a half dollars a year. It is necessary that this abuse should be stopped. If the person to whom the supply card is sent neglects to intimate his wish for a continuance of his name on the list, we are only wasting time in sending him these books. The department, in this way, will have some basis to calculate the number of books to be published. It is now mere guess-work, and thousands of tons of books are published every year merely to be destroyed—to be thrown aside as junk. It is not necessary for me to urge upon Parliament the duty of considering means of saving money. We are carrying on an advertising campaign in favour of Production and Thrift. If we take our own advice in regard to this matter of printing we can save from half a million to three-quarters of a million dollars a year.

The same practice to be pursued with regard to bound volumes of the sessional papers, over 640 sets of which are now sent out to different institutions. It is estimated that fully half of this quantity is thrown away, and that if the lists be reduced by fifty per cent there will be a saving of at least 9,600 bound volumes.

These bound volumes of sessional papers we are sending out still to mechanics' institutes in Ontario, organizations many of them that have ceased to exist, having been replaced by public libraries. The printing department should know whether the institutions and individuals to whom

they are sending these papers are alive or not, and whether they desire to receive these documents.

The next paragraph refers to the Debates of this House, and this is the point regarding which my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) says he wishes to protest.

Distribution lists and the printing of the Debates of both Houses in every case to be referred to the Printing Committee.

The Printing Committee has no desire to interfere with the form of the debates or anything in that connection. But the Debates Committee have been sending out copies of the debates to a great many people. The Debates can be purchased by any person who wants them for so much per annum, but the Debates Committee have been in the habit of putting a number of people on the free list from all over the country.

If a member asks it, Hansard is sent to half-a-dozen men in his riding. These Hansards that go out every day are published at great expense. Once they start going to a man they never stop, whether the persons to whom they are sent be alive or dead. If any one wants a public document of this House, and does not want to pay for it, the procedure is to go to the Printing Committee. Our suggestion is that the regulations in this respect be carried out by the Debates Committee, and that they should not be overridden by any committee of the House. It is not our desire to interfere in any way with the rights of the Debates Committee; but, if the Debates Committee want an increase in the number of official reports published to the extent of ten, twenty, or fifty per day, they should ask the Printing Committee for that privilege, because the Printing Committee has to pay for them out of the miscellaneous appropriation and is blamed for the great increase in the cost of printing. (Reading):

The committee is of the opinion that the practice of charging the general public for departmental blue-books and special publications should be strictly adhered to. The indiscriminate distribution of maps, annual blue-books and special monthly reports has led to many abuses in the past. Instances have been cited by many departments where scores of applications have been received from schools in different parts of the country for publications which could not, in the slightest degree, interest the school children applying for them. These books have been asked for probably on the mere mention by some newspaper that they would be sent free. Some deputy ministers are of the opinion that the motive underlying the requests for these reports is the hope that the report will contain pictures.

[Mr. Currie.]

Blue-books can be purchased by the ordinary voter at nominal prices. If a member wants blue-books or a series of parliamentary books sent annually to a friend, he can make the request through the clerk of the Printing Committee. In that respect the Printing Committee has been very generous; there is no desire on the part of the committee to disregard the wishes of members. If a member informs the clerk of the Printing Committee that he desires certain maps, books or things of that kind to be sent to certain persons, the committee is quite willing to comply with his wishes, because we are the servants of the members of this House. But we do not want the outside public to make demands that books and valuable publications of this kind be furnished to them free of charge, because a price is set upon them according to the law of the land.

The next recommendation is:

In order to expedite the mailing of Governmental publications, it is earnestly recommended that a branch post office be established in connection with the Distribution Branch of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, and mail be sent therefrom direct to the railway station.

Under the procedure at present, these books are taken from the Printing Bureau to the various departments; they are prepared for forwarding, franked and sent to the post office. The establishing of a branch post office at the Printing Bureau would effect a reduction of the general postal work and of a great deal of the haulage which is necessary under the present procedure. It would involve much less cost to the department to send a letter to the Printing Bureau asking that certain publications be sent out than it does to have a wagon or truck go to the Bureau, bring the publications to the department and have them sent back again with a truck to the post office. The idea is to have the distribution and mailing work all done at the Printing Bureau, where the proper facilities could be afforded.

The next paragraph of the report says:

With regard to the parliamentary printing which is done under the supervision of the King's Printer, the committee is pleased to learn that during the past two or three years changes have been made in the typographical arrangements of several blue-books, whereby considerable economy has been effected. On these books it is estimated that an annual saving of $15,000 has been made. The King's Printer, however, has no editorial authority, and can only bring about these changes through the good-will of the officials of the several departments.

For the last year or so the King's Printer and the officials of his department and other departments have been earnestly attempting to effect a reduction in the size of the blue-books. The idea is to reduce the size of some of the tabulated statements by putting them in smaller type or condensation. By this method some publications have been reduced in size from three volumes to one volume. In cases where a tabulated statement is printed on two pages, with one heading in French and one in English, the heading is put on one statement in both languages, thus effecting a saving of space. The idea of this clause is to inform hon. gentlemen that work is now being carried on along the lines recommended by the committee, and that, with their approval, the committee desires your approval and intends to continue it. (Reading):

Attention is called by the committee to the enormous increase in the number of illustrations in annual and special reports. Many of these illustrations are of no value. It is suggested that only such plates be incorporated in parliamentary blue-books as are necessary to a proper understanding of the text.

I quite approve of illustrations in departmental books which relate to the text, but in many cases illustrations are inserted in connection with geological work and so on —Indians carrying canoes, and that sort of thing—which involve a good deal of expense. It is the view of the committee that economy could be effected by a change in that regard. (Reading):

There is great room for economy in the printing of annual departmental reports, by eliminating entirely technical treaties, complimentary references, lists of staffs of officials, formal introductions and formal signatures, duplication of statistical information, etc. In the latter connection one has only to examine the statistical reports of the Departments of Customs and Trade of Commerce to see the proof of this statement. The committee recommended that where at all possible duplications should be avoided.

In many of these publications there are technical references which can be understood by no one who is not a technical student or a professor at a university. In the second place, many complimentary references are made to officials of departments. Sometimes half a page or a page which costs the country $2,000 or $3,000, is taken up with a statement that so and so has joined a certain branch and is now in charge of certain work. There should be some editorial supervision of these trivial matters. It is to be noted that the statistics of the Department of Trade and Commerce and those of the Department of Customs are almost identical, figure for figure, and are published in large books. We think that better results would be obtained by issuing one book instead of two, which would contain far more information than is contained in the two at the present time. The United States has a publication of that kind, the Statistical Abstract, in which you can get everything you want. We do not deprecate the publication of these reports; they are very necessary, but the question is whether we can avoid duplication. The committee has cut out the Monthly Abstract, which was issued by the Department of Customs. For my part, I think that some simplified form of that abstract should be issued monthly; but by some collaboration or editorial supervision much more valuable information could be given and the interests of the service more adequately preserved.

We do not wish to interfere with the work of any department, but we are anxious to do everything possible to increase the usefulness of the publications and, with the co-operation of the departments, to reduce their cost. (Reading):

The committee recommends that the scope of the monthly Agricultural Gazette be extended, by incorporating with it Seasonable Hints and small bulletins now issued by the Department of Agriculture in leaflet form in order to give them permanent value, and that the Gazette be distributed free to all Canadian farmers who apply for it. This could be accomplished without much additional cost, by dropping the Bulletin of Foreign Agricultural Intelligence, much of the information contained in which is of little practical value to the Canadian farmer. The best features of the bulletin could be incorporated in the Agricultural Gazette, which should be published in cheaper form. The Bulletin of Agricultural Intelligence has been in existence for over five years and costs annually about $9,400.

The Bulletin is sent out to practically all farmers, and contains 50 or 60 pages. The Agricultural Gazette, a most excellent publication also, has a very large circulation; but not nearly as large as that of the Bulletin. The paper used in the Gazette is of the highest and most expensive quality; it is first-class book paper, costing possibly three times as much as the paper on which Hansard is printed. Paper of that class is increasing in cost, and probably next year it will cost twice as much as it does this year. The suggestion here made is that the Gazette and the Bulletin be incorporated in one monthly volume, on cheaper paper, and that it be sent to all the farmers on the free list, so that we will have a most valuable publication issued monthly free in such

a form that farmers will keep it for reference, and not destroy it as they do many of the Bulletins,, etc., now sent to them. Many valuable treatises are now thrown away by the farmers, which would be preserved if they were issued in some such form as is suggested. That is only a suggestion, but that one change would save possibly $15,000 to $25,000 a year.

Another paragraph of the report reads:

> The committee would call attention to the large quantities of maps, which are prepared by some sixteen branches of the public service, and which in a large measure are circulated free. The report of the Royal Commission appointed in 1914 to "inquire into the state of the records of the public departments" called attention to this great division of labour, and suggested "that the whole of the map-making for the Dominion Government might be carried on more effectively and economically under the direction of a central authority." We would recommend that this work be supervised by the Department of Public Printing, with absolute authority to prevent useless duplication or overlapping.

It will be observed that there are sixteen branches of the public service in Ottawa each having a staff of men preparing maps, and these maps are, in many cases, of such a nature that the information given on two or three of them could be given on one map, which would be a great saving. We suggest that that work should be mobilized under the control of the Department of Public Printing. We do not want to interfere with the issue of these maps, but we feel that it should not be left to some officials in one department to say that a map shall be published simply because he wants to give out certain information. That should be submitted to an editorial department having power to decide whether any map should be published. The report continues:

> The committee would further recommend that all "copy" for the printer be type-written. Instances innumerable have been noted of the great waste of public funds through bad caligraphy and consequent corrections of proof. Last year at the Government Bureau the cost of "author's" corrections was $48,376.

"Author's corrections" are changes made after the copy is set up in type. These corrections are attributable to carelessness in the preparation of the copy. The copy is thrown at the printers without being edited. It is set up in type and those who sent it to the Bureau then tear the proof to pieces, so that in many cases the proof has to be revised three or four times. The report says:

> This was a decrease of $5,666 over the previous year, but the committee is satisfied that this charge can be largely reduced by the exercise of greater care in the preparation of "copy."

The report goes on:

> As already pointed out, the King's Printer and the Bureau staff have no authority to make any changes in the text of any parliamentary or departmental document. Recognizing that thousands of pages of reports of no value are printed annually, the committee is of the opinion that to revise copy and to avoid redundancy and overlapping, a board of editors of Parliamentary and Departmental publications should be established by the Government to work in conjunction with the King's Printer. To this board all reports and publications should be referred, and authority should be vested in such a board to decide what should or what should not be printed. The committee is of opinion that such a board properly constituted, with wide editorial powers, could save the country thousands of dollars annually.

That board would not cost the country one cent additional. It would consist of an officer from each of the leading departments that print reports, and, working in the public interest, it would do everything possible to reduce the duplication of volumes and cost of public printing and would see that the copy sent to the Bureau was edited and put in proper shape for the printers. I think that every department having a large amount of printing to be done would be willing to delegate an able member of its staff to serve on such a board. This board would meet at the Printing Bureau once or twice a week for a few hours to pass editorially on all publications.

The committee have appended to their report the memorandum of the King's Printer, from which it will be observed that this question of reducing the great cost of Government printing has been the subject of inquiry in the United States as well as in Canada. The matter has been before our committee again and again during the time I have been a member of it, and it has been debated in the Senate. I feel satisfied that, if Parliament should see its way clear to accept these recommendations, the committee would be able to report at the next session a saving of fully half a million dollars. The adoption of this report would not interfere with the present functions of any department or person. The idea is simply to co-ordinate the work of the different departments and of the King's Printer, in order that the best results may accrue.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As we have not had an opportunity of perusing this report, I would ask that it be allowed to stand until Tuesday.

Motion withdrawn.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

JOHN LYONS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is John Lyons an employee of the Exchequer Court, in the Department of Justice?
2. If not, was he dismissed?
3. If dismissed, what was the reason for the dismissal?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. John Lyons is not an employee of the Exchequer Court. He was temporarily engaged at $2 per day by the Registrar of the Supreme Court to assist the messengers when additional assistance was required during the sessions, his engagement being from day to day as his services were desired by the Registrar.

2. His services have been dispensed with.

3. Because the Registrar considered it desirable in the administration of his office, and this man had already received employment beyond the period of six months allowed by the Civil Service Act for temporary employees.

MARTIN'S RIVER MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

Who is the postmaster at Martin's River, Lunenburg county, N.S., and when was the appointment made?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mrs. Stella Langille is postmistress at Martin's River, N.S. She was appointed on 15th April, 1912.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service between Martin's Point post office and Martin's River railway station, Lunenburg county, N.S.?
2. (a) Were tenders asked for the said service? If so, (b) what were the names of persons who tendered, and the amount of their respective tenders?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. James Shupe.

2. (a) Yes. (b) Burton Langille, $270 per annum; John B. Mosher, $290 per annum; Charles Sartee, $340 per annum; James Shupe, $350 per annum; G. F. Shupe, $350 per annum. The contract was awarded to Burton Langille, the lowest tenderer, but he was unable to provide the necessary security. James Shupe having offered to perform the service at the rate of Langille's tender, the contract was given to him.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Who is the postmaster at Martin's Point, Lunenburg county, N.S.?
2. Did James Baggatt, the late postmaster, resign or was he dismissed?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. William Dorey.
2. He resigned.

L'ASSOMPTION MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Who is the contractor for carrying the mails in the parish of L'Assomption, for rural distribution?
2. What were the names of all the tenderers, the amount and date of each tender, and on what date was the contract awarded?
3. What is the amount of the present contract?
4. Were any negotiations carried on after the tenders were opened? If so, with whom?
5. Were any recommendations received by the Government? If so, from whom?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The rural mail route in the parish of l'Assomption has not yet been established. The department is now considering the tenders in connection therewith.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—CLOTHING CONTRACT.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Who has the contract for supplying the clothing to the gentlemen cadets of the Royal Military College at Kingston?
2. Is it the intention of the Militia Department to ask for new tenders on this work?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN:

1. At present no one; Messrs. Crawford and Walsh's contract expired on the 30th April last.

2. Under consideration.

PURCHASE OR HORSES BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. MORRIS:

1. How many horses have been purchased by the Department of Agriculture within the last year?
2. Where were they purchased, from whom, and at what price per horse?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Seventy-six since the 1st of April, 1915, up to the 30th of April, 1916.

2. The following horses were purchased by the Live Stock Branch:

	Stallions.
Bowden, Alta., Black Jas.	1
Hayfield, Man., Black, Wm...	1
St. Ferdinand, P.Q., Carey, Ed.	1
Magrath, Alta., Card, Geo. C.	1
Moosejaw, Sask., Cooper, I. W...	1
Spring Coulee, Alta., Elredge Bros. ..	1
Vegreville, Alta., Forbes, W.B.	1
Cochrane, Alta., Goddard, G. E.	4
Tregarva, Sask., Grant, Wm.	2
Swift Current, Sask., Guest, E.	3
Port Guichon, B.C., Guichon Estate..	1
Condie, Sask., Hogge, Thos.	1
High River, Alta., Hendrie, Mrs. Mary	1
Pekisko, Alta., Lane, Geo. & Co.	5
Hudson, Heights, P.Q., Macaulay, T. B.	1

	Stallions.
Melba, Alta., McElroy, Geo. M.	1
Drinkwater, Sask., McWilliams, S. H.	1
Raymond, Alta., Meeks, Wm. & Sons.	2
Truro, N.S., N. S. Agricultural College.	1
Coaticook, P.Q., Poulin, Robt.	2
Magrath, Alta., Ririe, J. B.	1
Alameda, Sask., Scott, R. H.	1
Cloverdale, B.C., Shannon Bros.	1
Edmonton, Alta., Sporle, Walter, Jr.	1
Allan's Corners, P.Q., Steel, A. G.	1
Wawanesa, Man., Stevenson, David	2
Saskatoon, Sask., Sutherland, W. C.	2
Kingsville, Ont., Wigle, L.P.	1
Tregarva, Sask., Wylie, Mrs. Mary	1
	43

Average price per stallion, approximately, $535.50.

The following horses were purchased by the Experimental Farms Branch:

Morden, Man.	Alleyn, R	3 teams.
Manitou, Man.	Falls, Richard	1 horse.
"	Carswell, Thomas	1 team.
Fredericton, N.B.	Jewett, H. C.	1 team.
"	Hutt, J. T. G.	1 bay mare.
Keremeos, B.C.	Gibson, F. B.	1 bay mare.
Hawkesbury, Ont.	Rutherford, S. H.	1 bay mare.
"	Hanna, Samuel	1 bay gelding.
Point Fortune, P.Q.	Kirby, D. B	1 gray mare.
Hawkesbury, Ont.	Higginson, W. A.	1 bay gelding.
Point Fortune, P.Q.	Kirby, J. M.	1 black gelding.
Hawkesbury, Ont	Fraser, David	1 bay gelding.
Dalkeith, Ont	McCallum, M. J	1 black gelding.
Ottawa, Ont.	Brennan, P. J.	2 teams.
Kingsville, Ont.	Scratch, E. C	1 horse.
Vankleek Hill, Ont	Lefaivre, R.	1 bay gelding.
Brysonville, P.Q	Greig, D. J.	1 pedigreed mare and foal, and 1 pedigreed mare in foal.
Montreal, P.Q.	Climie, Geo.	1 team.
Truro, N.S.	Archibald, F.	1 team.
		33 horses.

GRAIN CONGESTION IN THE WEST.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CRUISE: I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) to a matter that I consider of great importance. I have just received the following letter from my constituency:

Just a word to let you know how we are fixed in regard to wheat markets. A poor settler came to my place this evening after driving 17 miles to market only to find no room in the elevators to take his wheat in. He came five miles back with his load to my place. He was unable to purchase a few necessaries of life to take home to his family.

I would respectfully ask the minister to look into the matter and see if anything can be done.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like to read a letter which bears upon the same subject as that which my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Cruise) has referred to. The following letter, dated May 8, has been addressed to me from Craigmyle, Alberta:

Dear Sir,—I live at Craigmyle on the Goose Lake branch of the Canadian Northern railway. I note that in the debates in the House of April 25 in reply to your query the acting Minister of Railways is reported to have said: "The Railway Commission operating under this Bill were able to relieve the situation in the Goose Lake district by having the grain hauled out and carried through."

Without wishing to mix in a political controversy, I want to say that on November 2 last, when I got my grain threshed, I ordered a car and have not got it yet, although I have made every possible effort even to making a complaint to the Grain Commissioners through the Board of Directors of our Provincial U.F.A.

I suppose that is the United Farmers' Association.

My number on the car order book was 160. When the railway station and car order book were destroyed by fire some ten days ago, I was still 22 numbers off getting my turn then.

Now, I am told that no cars are being allotted, awaiting instructions from commissioners.

The three elevators and a flat warehouse are full and have been for a very long time. There are also bins of grain all over town, so that I think there is easily 200,000 bushels there awaiting movement with quite a lot out on the farms. So that, so far as Craigmyle is concerned, the situation is far from being "relieved," or "grain hauled out."

I wish something could be done and I wish you would put it up to the acting minister that he certainly must be misinformed. I would not want to infer he was trying to mislead.

It is a new district, we have been to big expense, and we need the proceeds of this tied-up grain to pay our bills.

Yours, etc.,

(Sgd.) S. Stevenson.

The matter seems to me so important that I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Trade and Commerce will take it up. This man gave his order for a car last November. It certainly seems an extraordinary condition of affairs that for six months he has not been able to get a car to take his grain to market.

Mr. REID: I will take this matter up with the Railway Commissioners on Monday.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will send a copy of the letter to both ministers.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, while this matter may not be within the range of my responsibilities, I may say that I have been taking up the matter of the grain congestion on that line during the last ten days with the Chairman of the Railway Commission, and I was assured yesterday that 130 cars per day had moved out of that district until the congestion was relieved. The difficulty has been that the grain on that line goes out towards Saskatoon instead of in the other direction. I may also say that the United Farmers' Association of Alberta have presented the matter to me, and I have been taking it up with the Board of Railway Commissioners. I have their assurance that the matter has now been adjusted, and all the cars necessary have been put upon the line since that letter was written.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MINES.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to draw the attention of the Government to a book that has been published by the Department of Mines. I will send it over to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), and he will find that it well illustrates what the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) said a few moments ago in regard to the over-production of printing. When the Department of Mines Estimates were going through, we found a good deal of fault with some of the items, and the opinion was expressed that a good deal of the money was wasted. This book is not merely indecent but filthy, and it ought immediately to be burned.

RESIGNATION OF MR. LAVALLEE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you have received the resignation of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lavallee)?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellechasse has sent me his resignation. It was received to-day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In due form?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is in due form.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Signed by himself?

Mr. SPEAKER: I know it is signed by the hon. member for Bellechasse, because I know his signature. I did not take notice as to whether it was in proper form, because it only came to me at half-past one. I will look the matter up and bring it before the House to-night.

SPIRIT RIVER FOREST RESERVE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior if he is able to give a reply with regard to the two matters I brought to the attention of the House last Saturday during his absence. One relates to the proposed Spirit River Forest Reserve. The question was:

Is it intended to include land in townships 79-81 ranges 7-11 in the Forest Reserve?

This proposed forest reserve was the subject of a protest from the Spirit River Board of Trade. That is one question.

Mr. ROCHE: I looked up Hansard, saw the question, and got a departmental answer to the same, which I sent to the hon. member privately. I do not recollect its exact terms, but I understand it was to the effect that the proposed Forest Reserve would be satisfactory to the Spirit River Board of Trade, as it would not include the particular lands they had protested against being included.

Mr. OLIVER: I am afraid that their protest applied to very much more than the lands which the map the minister has been good enough to send over to me indicates as being withdrawn. However, I wished to have the minister's statement on record. The other matter I referred to was the homestead rights of soldiers who had entered for homesteads after enlisting. I drew attention to the fact that the announcement made public by the Militia Department gave a different interpretation from that given by the minister in the House, and I asked that this might be rectified in order that there might be one official decision upon

the matter. As this comes within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, I would respectfully ask the minister to make a statement.

Mr. ROCHE: The orders sent out by the Interior Department were to the effect that, while absent on service all volunteers who had taken up homesteads prior to enlisting would have their entries protected and the time counted as residence. Those who have taken up homesteads since enlisting are having their entries protected from cancellation, but the period they are absent on service is not allowed to count as residence. A letter to this effect was sent from the Interior Department to the Militia Department, but the Militia Department misinterpreted it, with the result that erroneous information was published in their Militia orders. When our attention was called to this we immediately asked the Militia authorities to correct the mistake, and we also sent to our agents in the West information to the effect above mentioned.

Mr. OLIVER: I have seen in various newspapers the Militia Department announcement that is now stated to be in error, but I have not seen any announcement correcting that error. I think it would be advisable for the minister to suggest to the Militia Department that the correction be made as public as the original announcement.

Mr. ROCHE: That has already been done.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS SMALL CLAIMS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the Order for consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 91, to amend the Government Railways Small Claims Act:

Mr. REID: I beg to move:

That this House doth disagree to the amendments made by the Senate to said Bill, and for the following reason: that parties having legal claims against the Crown in connection with the Prince Edward Island Railway now have their remedy in the courts, and it is not in the public interests that the said Bill be made retroactive.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. REID moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

SALE OF SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White for Committee of Supply:

[Mr. Oliver.]

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Last Monday I brought to the notice of the Prime Minister that I had a certain motion to make with regard to small arms ammunition, and he informed me that the Minister of Finance had an important motion to move on that day; so, of course, I had to defer mine. I have had no opportunity since of bringing it up until to-day, and as to-day is Saturday, not one of the prohibited days, I should like to go on with my motion now, if I am in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is that on Thursdays and Fridays the Speaker leaves the Chair without motion being put; so I think the hon. member is in order.

Mr. McKENZIE: This question has been receiving some attention from the House for quite a while. After several questions in regard to it had been put by the hon. member for Pictou and the hon. member for Carleton, a return was at last brought down to this House on the 6th of April, giving certain information as to small arms ammunition. The number of the return is 276. I think it is desirable that this matter should be brought to the attention of the House and that proper investigation be made. First of all I wish to quote what might be regarded as the principle laid down by the Prime Minister on the 15th of April, 1915, in respect to inquiries of this kind. Dealing with the question of irregularities in connection with public expenditures, he said (Hansard 1915, page 2612):

So far as these matters, or any other such matters, are concerned, what we propose to do in every instance is this—to investigate every suspicious case, and to exact restitution and punishment so far as the laws of this country will permit. And let me say now, for the benefit of Parliament, and particularly for the information of persons throughout this country who may be concerned in selling supplies or materials to the Government that if any man in Canada, be he Conservative or Liberal, proposes to commit any fraud or imposition upon the Government and people of this country, or to be concerned in any attempt for that purpose, especially in connection with the war vote, he should remember that there are courts of justice in this country, and that the doors of the penitentiary are yawning for every man who commits such an offence.

Keeping fully within that statement laid down by the Prime Minister, I propose to prove to you, Sir, and to this House, that there are at least good grounds for suspicion that this was an irregular transaction that should be properly investigated. This transaction is precisely set forth in

a letter from the Auditor General to Sir Thomas White, dated 3rd of April, 1916. I think the subject that I am discussing will be better understood if I read that letter to the House:

Ottawa, April 3, 1916.

Sir,—I beg to call your attention to a sale of ammunition made by the Department of Militia and Defence. Some time prior to the 31st of December last this department sold through Col. J. Wesley Allison, without the authority of the Governor in Council, over 3,000,000 rounds of ammunition at $20 per thousand. The department has been buying ammunition since the declaration of the war at $33 per thousand and has also been manufacturing ammunition at the Dominion Arsenal at a cost of $34.60 per thousand. Consequently there has been a loss to the Government on this transaction of over $45,000. It is alleged that this ammunition has been sold to Vickers Limited for testing purposes. I can hardly credit this statement owing to the magnitude of the sale; but if it were so, why was it sold at such a low rate and why was it necessary to obtain the services of Col. Allison? I have reason to believe that the ammunition was resold at an advance of about 25 per cent and that its destination was not Vickers Limited. I may be mistaken in this, but Col. Allison's connection with the transaction does not tend to allay suspicion.

I wrote to the Department of Militia and Defence asking to be furnished with an Order in Council and also the particulars of the sale, but have had no reply. I have therefore to request that you will obtain the approval of the Governor in Council for the sale and that you will also let me know why the rate was fixed at $20 per thousand.

I am, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) J. Fraser,
Auditor General.

To that letter the Minister of Finance replied on the following day:

Ottawa, April 4, 1916.

John Fraser, Esq., I.S.O.,
Auditor General,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 3rd instant referring to a sale of ammunition made by the Department of Militia and Defence. I am not aware of the facts connected with the transaction, but shall at once bring your communication to the attention of the Prime Minister.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) W. T. White.

On the same day the Minister of Finance wrote this letter to the Prime Minister:

Ottawa, April 4, 1916.

Dear Sir Robert:

For your information I enclose herewith copy of a communication which I have received from the Auditor General respecting a sale of ammunition by the Department of Militia and Defence, together with a copy of my reply thereto. No doubt you will ascertain the facts from the Militia Department and bring the matter to the attention of the Council later.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) W. T. White.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden, P.C.,
Ottawa.

That is a part of this history of the case so far as its discovery by the Auditor General is concerned, the steps that he took in regard to it and how the matter was brought to the notice of the Prime Minister. No doubt, according to the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, the matter has been before the Council, but there is no record in this return as to whether it was before the Council or not, and if it were before the Council, there is no report in this return as to what was done. I am not sure that there should be in this return anything that would transpire before the Council; I presume that it would have to be dealt with in some other way, because I understand that what is done in the Council does not ordinarily find its way back to the department concerned.

This large amount of ammunition was sold, as I take it, in an irregular way. On the first of May of this year the Prime Minister told us, as reported on page 3377 of Hansard, that as far as possible everything that was being done in connection with war matters was done by Order in Council.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I said that all purchases were made.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the word "purchases" was used: but I think the language of the Prime Minister was sufficiently broad to give us to understand that an Order in Council was passed whenever that would be necessary in connection with any war transaction. This is such an extraordinary matter that I presume the Prime Minister would not have it in mind when he was making that address, and the sale of ammunition, when we are buying ammunition everywhere, would not regularly be in his mind and he would make no statement that would cover this case exactly. I think, however, the broad meaning of the statement made by the Prime Minister on the first of May was that, when money or money's worth was passing out of the hands of the Government, or when any money or money's worth was coming into the hands of the Government in connection with the war, proper recommendation was made and proper sanction was given to the

3 p.m.

transaction by the formality of an Order in Council.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What was the page from which the hon. member quoted?

Mr. McKENZIE: Page 3377. The whole of the Prime Minister's speech is not, of course, on that page, but I think what I especially referred to will be found there. The point that I particularly make is that, at all events, ever since the war broke out—and this transaction took place since the war broke out—nothing should have been done in connection with the sale of any arms or ammunition or anything else that would be specially required in connection with the war except with the full knowledge of the Governor in Council and with the full knowledge of the Government, and even if in any department the practice did exist that war material could be disposed of or done away with in a less formal manner, such regulations, when the war broke out, should be suspended and the greatest possible care exercised in the disposing of any property of that nature.

When I go a little further into the documents that have been brought down, it will be seen that there is only one precedent previous to the last year or so for the sale of ammunition in the Dominion of Canada, and that sale was carried out and sanctioned by an Order in Council, and up to this date, so far as the history of the department is concerned, there is no precedent for the sale of ammunition or anything appertaining to the defence of this country without an Order in Council. I submit therefore that this sale, taking place as it did, without an Order in Council, is irregular, improper, and that even at this late date, an Order in Council should be made ratifying it, if it can be ratified, and if not, that the proper steps should be taken to chastise and properly deal with the parties responsible for disposing of our property in this way.

It will appear further from the papers which I purpose reading that nobody seemed to know where this ammunition went. It is a most extraordinary thing that ammunition would be sold by the Department of Militia and Defence in this country, without any knowledge of where it was going or to whom the department was selling. I submit that it would be a most extraordinary thing if this department should permit the selling of guns by other people outside the department, much more if they should do it themselves. And if they were permitting the sale of ammunition, it is just as bad. We have been hearing that we are in danger of invasion by overzealous Germans of the United States; that plots and intrigues are entered into between parties on the other side of the line and people in Germany to do damage to this country, and that they were going to invade Canada. There will be evidence given that this material went to the United States without any knowledge as to its destination and without any proper convoy to make sure where it was going. I submit, therefore, that it was quite possible, even probable, that the ammunition sold by ourselves was going into the hands of these rebels, if there be such, who planned to invade Canada, and who would shoot us down with our own ammunition. It was a very grave and serious matter that ammunition of this kind, or of any kind, should be passed out, possibly to our enemies, or even allowed to go beyond the control of our officials, without any definite knowledge of its destination or by whom it was to be handled. This will seem particularly reprehensible when I point out to you that in this return appears an official statement that no such ammunition should be sold at all. I refer to one document dated 13th November, 1914, a letter addressed to the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, as follows:

> Under existing circumstances, low stock of ammunition, do you not think it would be wiser to hold this ammunition until such time as the stock in depots is brought up to normal condition?
>
> See folio 122 hereof.
>
> (Sgd.) D. A. Macdonald,
> Major-General.

Then there is a communication to the Quartermaster General, signed by the deputy minister:

> We should not dispose of one single round.

That is the decision reached by the deputy minister upon this subject.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What was the date?

Mr. McKENZIE: It was the 13th October, 1914, when the war was well under way. I have looked through this file very carefully, a very bulky file, and with a great deal in it that does not bear upon this subject, but I can find no official reversal of that decision of the deputy minister. There is nothing to show that any proper authority was given for the sale of ammunition, and it was therefore, so far as I can find out, sold in contravention of this decision and report made by the deputy

minister, who, no doubt, is responsible in connection with this matter, and who thought, I suppose, that he was taking such steps as were necessary to hold in stock whatever ammunition we had.

I shall be obliged to give to the House, so that there may be no mistake, an exact report of what appears on the file, and I shall do so as briefly as possible. On page 16 of this file I find this letter. It is marked "confidential." Let me say, Sir, that there should be no confidential letters passing between private individuals and the Department of Militia during time of war, unless that private individual be sufficiently important to give him license to do business of this kind. Of course, this letter is signed by J. Wesley Allison, and he may come within that designation:

September 8, 1915.

General D. A. Macdonald,
Quartermaster-General,
Ottawa, Ont.

My dear General,—Referring to my arrangements with you some time ago for the purchase of 236,000 .303 Mark VI cartridges for Sir Trevor Dawson, I have just received a cable requesting me to have those shipped to C. A. Searles, Vickers House, Broadway, Westminster, London, at the earliest possible moment.

I have cabled asking authority to pay you from their account here for the above cartridges. Therefore kindly send me your bill and I will see that it is paid.

Faithfully yours,

J. Wesley Allison.

There is a note on this letter:

Spoke to Col. Helmer, who says Mark VI ringed.

J. F. M. (S.H.)

10-9-15.

Give I.O. 4821.

I take the "S. H." to be the initials of the Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes). Then follows, on the 23rd of September, another memorandum:

With reference to Col. Wesley Allison's letter dated September 8, requesting that 236,000 cartridges, S.A. Mark VI, be shipped to Vickers House, London, Eng., will you please note that shipment left Montreal yesterday on ss. Corinthian.

The cash debit voucher to recover value of this ammunition will be passed to you as soon as received.

Should not Colonel Allison's letter go on H.Q. file.

(Sgd.) J. M. M.

Ottawa, 23-9-15.

On the 24th of September there is another letter sent by an official of the department to Colonel Allison:

Dear Colonel Allison:

General Macdonald, Q.M.G., has transferred your letter of the 8th instant to me, with the information that the shipmen of 236,000 cartridges S. A. Mark VI left Montreal yesterday on ss. Corinthian. This ammunition was consigned to C. A. Searles, Vickers House, Broadway, Westminster, London.

Your letter to General Macdonald was marked "Confidential" and as we do not like to have this letter on our file as showing the authority for shipping the ammunition, would you please drop me a line that the word "Confidential" may be overlooked and oblige.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) Lt.-Col. Military Secretary.

On the 28th of September there is a letter addressed to Lieutenant Colonel Charles F. Winter, Military Secretary, as follows:

Dear Colonel Winter:

In answer to your esteemed favour of the 24th instant, would say that you may overlook the word "Confidential" in my letter of the 8th instant, to General Macdonald, Q.M.G., in reference to the 236,000 cartridges, S.A., Mark VI, shipped to Vickers House, London.

Faithfully yours,

J. Wesley Allison.

There is this further letter, marked "confidential":

Confidential.

Hotel Manhatten, Madison Ave.,
New York, Oct. 6, 1915.

General D. A. Macdonald,
Quartermaster-General,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear General Macdonald:

I have just received instructions from London requesting me to order from you an additional 750,310 .303 Mark VI cartridges to be shipped to the same address as referred to in my letter of September 8. They have asked if you would permit them to deposit the amount of the purchase price to the credit of the Canadian Militia Department in London, at the Bank of Montreal there.

Thanking you for a reply, and with kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

J. Wesley Allison.

Minister says issue.

(Sgd.) D. A. Macdonald.

8th October, 1915.

This is marked on the letter: "Minister says issue. (Sgd) D. A. Macdonald, 8th October, 1915."

There is another letter dated Morrisburg, Ontario, October 8, 1915, as follows:

General D. A. Macdonald,
Quartermaster-General,
Ottawa, Ont.

Telegram fourteenth received. Ship seven hundred fifty thousand three hundred ten stop three hundred and three mark six to same adedrss as others, Vickers House. Mail account to me here.

J. Wesley Allison.

Then there is the following communication dated October 14, 1915, and addressed to Col. J. Wesley Allison, Manhattan Hotel, New York city:

Ammunition twenty dollars per thousand boxes extra average one dollar forty-seven cents each.

(Sgd.) General Macdonald.

I suppose that means that the boxes average $1.47 each. Then follows some way bills and other statements which are of no particular value to the House. On November 23, 1915, the following letter was addressed to Col. J. Wesley Allison, Morrisburg, Ont.:

With reference to my letter of the 1st instant, numbered as above, please find copies in duplicate of vouchers No. B. 105 and B. 176 for Mark VI ammunition shipped to Vickers, London.

Will you kindly instruct your principals to place the amount of $20,926.94 to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada in the Bank of Montreal in London.

(Sgd.) J. F. M.,
Lt.-Col., P.O.O.

Then, there is a letter from headquarters:

C. 1718, A.P.M.G. Copies of the attached C.D. V, Vs, Nos. B. 105 and B. 176, totalling $20,926.94, have been passed to Col. J. Wesley Allison, Morrisburg, the Canadian representative of Vickers, Ltd., of London, Eng., with request that he instruct his principals to place the amount to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada in the Bank of Montreal in London.

Copy letter attached.

(Sgd.) J. F. Macdonald,
Lt.-Col., P.O.O.

Ottawa, 23rd Nov., 1915.

A note at the foot says: "Noted, Lt. for A. and P.M.G.'

There is another letter dated November 11, 1915, as follows:

An application for an additional million rounds of Mark VI ammunition has been received from Col. Allison on behalf of the Vickers Co. Ammunition to this amount is available at Quebec. It is part of this which is under suspicion. Should this issue be made at same price as the last two issues, please?

J. F. Macdonald,
Lt.-Col., P.O.O.

This is marked "O.K., signed S.H." I take these initials to be those of the minister. This note appears underneath:

Spoke Q.M.G. that Col. Allison wanted two millions. Told to increase to that amount.

(Sgd.) J. F. M.

It will be stated, perhaps, that all this ammunition was defective. It will be noted, however, that nothing was said about defective ammunition until the writing of this letter of November 11, 1915. Previous to that at least two shipments of considerable quantities of ammunition were made, and if that ammunition was defective I think it is fair reasoning to say that some observation to that effect would have been made before that date.

The following communication, which I take to be a telegram, was sent on December 18, 1915, to General D. A. Macdonald, Quartermaster-General, Militia Department, Ottawa:

Can you ship our friends London two million more .303 Mark VI? General Hughes here and approves, but requested me to write you.

(Sgd.) J. Wesley Allison.

The Minister of Militia and Defence was evidently in New York at this time with his friend Allison, and had consented to this issue, but wanted to have it done through the officers of the department. There is another telegram sent from Morrisburg on December 20, 1915:

General D. A. Macdonald,
Q.M.G., Militia Department,
Ottawa.

Please wire answer Morrisburg my telegram regarding two million more.

Evidently Mr. Allison had come home to Morrisburg after sending the telegram and before receiving a reply, and he asks for a reply to his telegram of the day before. On the 20th of the same month, two days after the minister had evidently consented to the sale, we find a somewhat ordinary question asked by him. He asks: "to whom is this to be sold, and where is it going?" I think it will strike the ordinary business man as peculiar that two days after the minister had consented to the sale he should make inquiry is to who was buying and to whom the articles were to be sent. I will read the departmental report:

Col. Allison has applied for 2,000,000 rounds of S.A. ammunition, Mark VI, for his principals, the Vickers Maxim Co. of London. There is available in ordnance charge this amount of ammunition. It is part of that under suspicion. The amount of this ammunition already shipped to this company is 2,986,000. Shall issue be made and at the price formerly charged, $20 per thousand?

(Sgd.) J. M. Macdonald,
Colonel, P.O.O.

Minister says "O.K."

(Sgd.) D. A. Mac.,

Dec. 20, 1915.

Over the minister's "O.K." is this statement:

Ascertain where and by whom this is to be used if sold by O. C..

I assume that O. C. means Order in Council.

I wish to bring to the notice of the Prime Minister and of the House this extraordinary inquiry on the part of the minister two days after having consented to the sale of this two millions. He asks: "Ascertain where and by whom this is to be used if sold by Order in Council." Evidently the sale was made before there was any Order in Council. Still further down on the same page is this note:

Please note minister's instructions. If this ammunition is to be sold it must be done by Order in Council and the minister's inquiry should be fully answered.

Eugène Fiset,
Deputy Minister.

There is here a draft of an Order in Council dated January 5, 1916. It remains, of course, for those who are familiar with the inner circles and whose responsibility it is to know whether this Order in Council was passed or not, to tell the House and the country whether it ever received the proper sanction. This is not exactly a draft; it is perhaps a recommendation, or it appears to have passed the stage of a recommendation. I will read it:

January 5, 1916.

To His Royal Highness the Governor General in Council.

The undersigned has the honour to submit for the consideration and approval of Your Royal Highness in Council an application from Vickers, Limited, for the purchase of 4,985,900 rounds of S. A. ammunition, mark VI. This is part of the stock of mark VI ammunition which, "under suspicion," was not allowed to be used with rifles in Canada. The price of the ammunition to be $20 per thousand rounds. This ammunition, while rejected for rifle use, is, however, reported to be suitable for the testing of Vickers machine guns now being manufactured in very large numbers in England.

The matter is respectfully submitted.

Sam Hughes,
Major General,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

There is no record beyond that as to what became of this Order in Council, whether it was passed or not; but, so far as this House is concerned, from any information that any member can get, I have a right to believe that all the information is on this file, and there is nothing here to show that this Order was ever passed. There is also a letter from the Auditor General which I have read to the House wherein he asked the proper department to give him a copy of this Order in Council. That request of the Auditor General was never complied with. I think, Sir, it is a fair deduction that the Order in Council was never passed; otherwise the minister or his officials would have been only too pleased to hand it over to the Auditor General when required. A request was also made to the Minister of Finance, who, with the Auditor General and other officials, is the guardian of the treasury and is supposed to see that everything is done decently, regularly and in order, to make a demand for this Order in Council, and I do not think it would have been infra dig for him to pass it over to the Auditor General if he could get it. He did not get it, and he did not send it, and I have every reason to think that the hon. Minister of Finance would have gladly have filled up the gap and have rectified this irregularity if he had been in a position to do so. He did not get the Order in Council, and I am credibly informed that the Order in Council, if made, has never reached the proper officer in the Auditor General's Department. The Minister of Finance passed the whole thing over to the Prime Minister himself, and I have every reason to believe that his business instinct would lead him to make inquiry for the Order in Council and to see that it was furnished if it could be found. It has not been forthcoming so far. All that we know is that this ammunition was sold, and that there was evidently some irregularity, because the minister himself comes forward and says that he should have had an Order in Council for the selling of it, and that he did not get it. Why he did not get it is a matter of inquiry, and it is quite possible that it was determined by the proper authorities that such an Order in Council could not be made, and that the goods should never have been sold.

That, Sir, is, in a general way, the case. Besides, the file shows that the cost of production of these goods to this country was $34.60 per thousand rounds. They were then sold at $20 per thousand rounds, so that there was a loss to the country on every thousand rounds of the difference between $20 and $34.60. It has been reported, and I think if it is properly inquired into it can be shown, that these goods were not sold to Vickers-Maxim at all, but were sold to the Admiralty. Now, it strikes the ordinary individual, and I think the members of this House, as somewhat unique, that although we have a Department of Militia and Defence to which we are giving millions of dollars annually for the proper discharge of duties of this kind, we have not the machinery

by which we can sell these few rounds of ammunition direct to the British Admiralty without the intervention of Colonel Allison. We have often heard the prayer and offered it ourselves, confessing that the brittle thread of our existence is in the hands of the great power above. But it seems to me that the brittle thread of the existence of the Government—and the Lord knows it is brittle enough—is in the hands of Allison, and that they cannot do anything, they cannot move a finger, they are unable to do the smallest little thing, without the providence of this man being invoked. It has been hinted, and I see in the newspapers to-day that this matter has already been referred to the court established by the Government nearly a year ago, that is the court presided over by Sir Charles Davidson, who is assisted by eminent counsel, Mr. Thompson. I do not think it should be left to that commission, because I think there should be a vigorous inquiry into this matter. Whatever may be the nature of the inquiry in that court to which I have referred, it is moving very slowly indeed, and I do not think the Prime Minister will think it too much for me to say that, in my judgment at all events, this court should have been heard from in some shape or another before now. It is nearly a year since matters were submitted to them, and I think it would be only fair to expect that a report should have reached us in the earlier stages of this session, so that the people of this country, and Parliament, would know what this court was doing. So far we have not heard a word from them of their proceedings. The relief we may hope to receive from that court reminds me of the old story of the Indian whose wife had been very sick for many months. The priest came to see him and to console him, and said to him: Never mind, Noel, the Lord will relieve you. Oh, yes, says the Indian, the Lord is no doubt very good, but he is very slow some times. I must say that, so far as this court is concerned it may be very good, but, like the Indian's Lord, it is very slow sometimes, and I would expect, if this matter is to be sent to a court at all, that it would be sent to a court from which we might have some hope of a decision some time before the present generations pass away.

These, Sir, are the facts upon which I base this motion. I move:

That it appears from official papers laid on the table of this House, that the Minister of Militia, since the beginning of war, illegally and without any power or authority, sold a quantity of small ammunition exceeding 3,000,000 rounds to J. Wesley Allison, who represented himself as acting for Vickers, Maxim, Ltd., at a price of $20 per thousand rounds. That the quantity first intended to be sold was 5,000,000 rounds, and that over 3,000,000 rounds was actually delivered.

Be it and it is now resolved, that the depleting of the stock of ammunition held by the Government exclusively for the purposes of the war, and the disposal of the same to any one but the Imperial authorities, was a serious danger to the country and an offence which was further aggravated by the circumstance that there is strong reason for believing that the said ammunition was subsequently sold to the British authorities at an advanced price.

That the commission issued on the 3rd April to Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff to investigate certain contracts of the Shell Committee be also empowered to investigate the sale of small ammunition to the said J. Wesley Allison, as well as the disposition which he made of it and that for the purposes of the said investigation, the said powers and authority now vested in the said commission be continued and extended as far as may be necessary.

In the light of the facts which I have presented to you, Mr. Speaker, I make this motion.

Right Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has brought on this matter to-day without extending to the Government a courtesy that in my experience has seldom been withheld. It is the practice when a motion of want of confidence is to be made, that the hon. gentleman who proposes to make it will send at some reasonable time in advance a copy of the motion which he proposes to move. I did not know that this matter was coming up to-day, nor have I had from my hon. friend the courtesy of receiving a copy of the resolution he has moved, the terms of which I did not know at all until he read the motion to the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not want to be regarded as discourteous. I wrote the Prime Minister a letter in which I made reference specifically to this as being a matter that had been referred to in a letter from the hon. Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) to himself, bearing date the 4th April. I saw the Prime Minister since and discussed this matter with him, and he did not complain that that was not sufficient notice. I did not think it was necessary to bother him with a copy of the motion when he already had the full substance of it. I did not know, even if I gave him another notice, that I could be sure of going on to-day, but if the min-

ister has not sufficient notice he need not go on with it now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We will go on with it now, but it would have been better if my hon. friend had sent, some hours in advance, the usual notice containing an intimation of the terms of the motion, in order that the Government might have known what they had to meet in the proposal which was to be submitted to the House. The conversation which took place between my hon. friend and myself was simply this, that I explained to him that the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) desired to go forward with certain proposals as to which there had been an arrangement between himself and hon. gentlemen on the other side. I informed him at that time that an inquiry into this matter had already been authorized and that the inquiry would take place before Sir Charles Davidson. My hon. friend, in reply did not say that he was going on with the motion but he said that he desired to say something on the subject. The words impressed themselves upon my mind; I remember them precisely. I did not know until my hon. friend rose this afternoon that he really did propose to make this motion seeing that an inquiry had already been ordered.

However, I am glad to know that if he finds Sir Charles Davidson slow in reporting about matters into which he has made inquiry, he does not find him slow in proceeding with an inquiry once he has been authorized to do so. It was necessary to pass an additional Order in Council because when the Minister of Justice, with whom I had spoken on the subject about ten days ago, desired Sir Charles Davidson to proceed with this inquiry, he was told by Sir Charles Davidson that the terms of the Order in Council passed nearly a year ago, were not wide enough to embrace this matter. Therefore, the Minister of Justice brought a report to council on Monday last which was approved by His Royal Highness on Tuesday, and as soon as the Order in Council had been communicated to Sir Charles Davidson, he made arrangements to subpœna the witnesses and to proceed with the inquiry, with the result that the investigation commenced before my hon. friend made his motion. I understand that the matter was under investigation by Sir Charles Davidson this morning. Therefore, it would appear that the motion of my hon. friend is designed either to find fault with the commissioner who is making the investigation and to suggest another tribunal, or it is designed as a condemnation of the Government and of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes).

Mr. MACDONALD: Where is the inquiry being carried on?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He is holding it in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is a pretty large place.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not know the precise place. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence informs me that it is in this very building.

Mr. MACDONALD: Is it a private or a public inquiry?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is a public inquiry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It is a public inquiry unknown to the public.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: In what way is it unknown to the public?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Because the Prime Minister says he does not know where it is sitting and he is part of the public.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does my right hon. friend expect me to take note of the particular place at which any commission holds its sittings?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, but I would have supposed that my right hon. friend would have known.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Well, I found out very quickly from the Minister of Militia and Defence. It seems to me that my right hon. friend is hypercritical when he suggests that a minister of the Crown must know all these details about the proceedings of a commission that is carrying on its work. The commission is sitting for the purpose of holding a public investigation. I understand that the representatives of the press were present this morning; they knew about it, there is nothing secret about it and if it is desired, Sir Charles Davidson will no doubt send to my right hon. friend, or to any of his followers whom he may designate, notice of the time and the place at which the commission will sit for the purpose of this, or any other investigation. I am glad that my hon. friend the member for North Cape Breton (Mr.

McKenzie) has arrived at the conclusion that the Royal Commission composed of Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff is an efficient commission. Great objection was taken to the appointment of that commission for the purpose of investigating the matters they now have in hand, but my hon. friend from North Cape Breton is evidently satisfied with the commission so far, for he suggests that a further inquiry be referred to them.

As to the inquiry now before the Royal Commission, I might point out that it relates to an expenditure by the Government of the United Kingdom, whereas the inquiry with which Sir Charles Davidson is charged relates to matters with which the Government of Canada is concerned. For that reason, therefore, it was more proper to refer this matter to Sir Charles Davidson than to a commission which was appointed for the purpose of investigating expenditures made, not by this Government, but by the Government of the United Kingdom. There was this further reason for referring this matter to Sir Charles Davidson. Certain persons who are not usually in Ottawa, and who might be able to give necessary evidence in this inquiry, are in Ottawa at the present time. It could hardly be expected that Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff would interrupt the proceedings they are now carrying on, for the purpose of taking up this inquiry. On the other hand, Sir Charles Davidson was in a position to take it up at once, and secure the evidence of witnesses who are now available in the city of Ottawa. It was therefore more convenient, and more in the public interest, as we thought, to refer this matter to Sir Charles Davidson rather than to Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff. The Government have absolute confidence both in the one commission and in the other; we have absolutely no choice between them. The only thing the Government would desire from either commission would be an impartial and thorough inquiry, and it would secure that inquiry whether the matter was referred to Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff or to Sir Charles Davidson.

Coming to the points which my hon. friend has made, he has alluded to the Auditor General's letter, and to the fact that no Order in Council seems to have been passed. This subject first came to my attention in the first or second week of February last, when some further information which had been asked for was received from the Department of Militia and Defence. In consequence of the report then received still further information was asked for, and this did not come to hand until the first week of March, and did not come to my attention and was not read by me until after the Minister of Militia and Defence had left for England. I therefore did not read the information which has been brought down and laid on the table of the House, and which is contained in a memorandum from the Quartermaster General, until after the Minister of Militia and Defence had left for England. The question was discussed in the public press, and it was alluded to by my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition on the occasion when the Minister of Militia and Defence made a statement to the House with regard to the allegations of the hon. member for Richmond. It seemed to me then that as discussion had taken place and criticism had been made in the public press, and as my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition had made certain statements—I will not say insinuations—with regard to the matter, the subject was deserving of inquiry. We were aware then that witnesses whose testimony might be important and even necessary, would probably be very soon available in Ottawa, and for that reason no further proceedings were taken upon the report to Council, and the matter stood until the inquiry, as to which I spoke to the Minister of Justice about ten days ago, could be made. That inquiry is now proceeding. Therefore, so far as this matter calls for an inquiry, I have only to say that an inquiry is already in progress before a gentleman of the highest integrity, ability and experience, and in whose capacity to make an impartial and thorough inquiry I am sure the country will have absolute confidence, and in whom the Government has the like confidence.

My hon. friend not only makes a demand for an inquiry, but proceeds to censure the Minister of Militia and Defence, and incidentally the Government, for the course which has been adopted. Let us look for a moment at the circumstances to which the hon. gentleman has called attention. In the first place he says that no one seemed to know to whom the ammunition was sold, or where it was going. The hon. gentleman is not well advised in making that statement, because the documents upon their face show that the ammunition was

sold to Vickers, Limited, and the shipping documents which have been brought down and laid upon the Table show that the ammunition was shipped in care of Vickers, Limited, London, England; therefore, so far as the person to whom it was sold and the place to which it was shipped are concerned, there is no warrant for the statement which my hon. friend has made.

He then goes on to suggest that the price at which this ammunition was sold was altogether too low. He suggests, rather than states, that it was perfectly good ammunition suitable for use by the troops at the front, and that ammunition of that type is now costing $34 or thereabouts per 1,000 rounds. He says in effect that the Minister of Militia and Defence sold for $20 per 1,000 rounds ammunition which had to be purchased at the price of $34 per 1,000 rounds. Either my hon. friend has not examined the papers or he was not desirous of making a fair and reasonable statement to the House. I shall take occasion to quote from the documents to show precisely what the facts are. As a matter of fact, only four months before this war broke out this same ammunition was offered for $12 per 1,000 rounds to the Ross Rifle Company, for testing purposes, and was refused by them. Further, the price for the same ammunition fixed by the responsible officers of the Department of Militia and Defence before this war broke out was $10 per 1,000 rounds, which is one-half of the first cost, as I am informed. This is the very same ammunition for which this country is to-day receiving $20 per 1,000 rounds.

It is worth while perhaps for me to refer to the report of the Quartermaster-General with regard to this matter. The regulations for the Army Ordnance Service, part 2, paragraphs 552-3, define the steps to be taken in regard to ammunition which has been declared unserviceable, and reads as follows:

> Small arm ammunition, having been sentenced "Unserviceable" by the Inspecting Ordnance Officer or other proper authority, and the sentence having been approved, will be dealt with as follows: the bullets will be extracted, the cartridges will then be fired off and loose cordite will be burned. Where it is for any reason impossible to destroy ammunition in the above manner, it will be drowned in deep water.

A few years ago the Minister of Militia caused a very careful investigation to be made with regard to the ammunition in stock in this country. The report of the British experts who made that investigation has been brought down and laid upon the table of the House. It is proper that I should read a portion of that report:

> As to small arms ammunition, we do not recommend the continuance of ringing on new ammunition. We regard the ringing as a satisfactory method of checking the blow-backs to which Dominion Arsenal ·303 cartridges have in the past been peculiarly liable. Cases recently manufactured—with cap chamber better formed and freer from scores, etc.—do not require ringing, and we do not consider that in ·303 cases of future manufacture, any necessity should arise for this treatment, which should be regarded only as a means of overcoming defective manufacture.

The report is a very long one and indicates that ammunition manufactured during certain years, more particularly when my hon. friends opposite were responsible for the management of the Dominion Arsenal, was not of a quality which would justify its use in active service. The report continues:

> Some 40,000 to 50,000 cartridges have been rejected on examination after ringing.

I do not precisely understand the operation of ringing, and it will be explained by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Sam Hughes). It was a device for making defective ammunition serviceable by overcoming certain defects which had occurred in its manufacture. The report continues:

> We would suggest that these be visually examined for elimination of scored cases, etc., and used for machine gun practice only.

Further on the report proceeds:

> Ammunition subsequent to February, 1908, to be ringed, visually examined for ringing and for external scores, and for elimination of the old e.g. (07) cases, and subject to firing proof before reissue. For each lot of 200,000 rounds, 1,000 rounds should be taken for proof; if a burst occurs, a second proof of 1,000 should be taken of the lot in question and also of the lot immediately preceding and the one immediately following. We do not think that ammunition manufactured in and prior to February, 1908, is likely to be rendered serviceable even after ringing on account of the uncertain annealing and its liability to bursts, and we are of opinion that the ammunition should be broken up and the cases might be used for blank and a certain saving thereby effected.

I want my hon. friend and the House generally to understand that of the 3,000,000 rounds which have been sold 2,000,000 are of the character which I have described. Those 2,000,000 rounds were ordered by the Barlow report—the report of British officers brought to this country for the purpose of making a thorough examination of our ammunition—not to be ringed, not

to be used for any purpose, but to be broken up, and it was recommended that the cases should be used for blanks and a certain saving thereby effected. Therefore, so far as these 2,000,000 rounds were concerned, they were absolutely condemned by the Barlow report, and the 4 p.m. Minister of Militia and Defence, when the matter came before him, wrote the word "destroy," because it was obvious that that ammunition was not fit to be used in active service, nor even for practice.

Now, a précis of what took place will be found in the report of the quartermaster general, which has been brought down to the House, and which, after setting forth the regulations of the Army Ordnance Service, goes on to say:

The Barlow report condemned as unserviceable all '303 ammunition manufactured prior to February, 1908, and recommended same to be destroyed.

I have just read a quotation from that report. Then the following memoranda are noted:

Memo. from Director of Artillery proposing selling all Mark VI ammunition of five years of age and older at half price, dated 24th October, 1911.

Submission along this line to Militia Council by Master General of Ordnance, approved by Militia Council, dated 15th November, 1911.

Notification by Director of Artillery to Principal Ordnance Officer of decision of Council to sell and asking for insertion in Militia Order, dated 18th November, 1911.

A militia order to that effect was made thereupon in the same month.

Telegram, 4th of May, 1914, from manager, Ross Rifle Company asking what quantity of ammunition department would sell.

That was followed by a recommendation of the Master General of Ordnance to sell it, and there was thereupon a reply from the deputy minister to the Ross Rifle Co., offering to sell 10,000,000 rounds at $12 per thousand rounds. That offer was dated the 18th of May, 1914.

The next document to which the Quartermaster General calls attention is a memorandum dated the 29th July, 1914, from the Quartermaster General to the Master General of Ordnance, suggesting that this ammunition be destroyed by drowning. The destruction of ammunition by drowning simply mean that it is thrown into deep water where no harm can result from it. The suggestion was that this ammunition should be disposed of in that way rather than by the method proposed in the Barlow report. It will be remembered that the commission made a recommendation as to taking out and utilizing the cordite, and thereby effecting some saving. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence says that the proposal to break up the ammunition and save the cordite was in virtue of a departmental regulation and not a suggestion of the Barlow Commission.

The next document, which is dated July 30, 1914, just before the war broke out, is a reply from the Ross Rifle Company refusing the offer of sale at price quoted.

There are some of these documents which I think it might be of interest for me to read to the House. I am afraid they are not arranged here in chronological order, but I will read them just as they are, and hon. gentlemen, I think, will sufficiently understand the situation.

The first document that I have here is dated January 8, 1914, and is a report from General Morrison, who is now at the front:

According to the findings of the Barlow report on the Dominion Arsenal and its output all '303 ammunition made prior to February, 1908, is condemned as unserviceable, and it is recommended that this ammunition should be destroyed.

During the past summer some of this ammunition was used by the Royal Canadian Regiment at Halifax with very bad results, though no serious accidents happened.

I would suggest that orders be issued that no more of the ammunition made prior to February, 1908, should be issued to or used by troops, pending the decision of the minister as to what disposition is to be made of it.

Regarding all Mark VI ammunition made subsequent to January 31st, 1908, the report recommends that it should all be tested before being passed as serviceable. No action has yet been taken by the Honourable the minister, in council regarding this recommendation, possibly because until the arrival of Captain Gordon Ogilvie from Woolwich to take over the appointment of inspector of small arm ammunition there was no officer available to carry out the tests. Further action on this will be reported on at an early date.

Hon. gentlemen should bear in mind that all this ammunition which has been sold is what is known as Mark VI, which is only intended for Mark II Ross rifle. The authorized Ross rifle at the present time is the Mark III Ross rifle. Therefore, not one single round of this ammunition, even if it had not been condemned, could have been used in active service at the front because our troops are armed, not with the Mark II Ross rifle, but with the Mark III Ross rifle. I consulted with the Master General of Ordnance himself, and he told me that not one single round of any ammunition of Mark VI should be issued for service at the front, as it would be unsuitable; and the ammunition which must be

issued for troops at the front is Mark VII ammunition. The only ammunition sold was Mark VI, and it included two million rounds which had been condemned as absolutely unserviceable. The next document I wish to read is dated 24th October, 1911. It is signed by Major General Elliott, a British Officer of long experience, who entered the Canadian service some years ago and whose work has been thoroughly satisfactory, indicating that his capacity and experience are all that could be desired:

With reference to your return of .303-inch ball ammunition; it is suggested as ammunition over 5 years old is liable to deteriorate that all S.A.A. of dates up to and including 1906 beginning with the oldest should be sold at half price. This will make more certain of a turnover which is absolutely necessary, and will it is thought be appreciated by all ranks interested in rifle shooting and also by Rifle Associations and Cadet Corps.

It is at any rate better to make use of old though serviceable ammunition rather than to keep it so long that it becomes useless and has to be destroyed. An instance of this as you know has lately occurred.

Hon. members will bear in mind that this was nearly four years ago, and his suggestion was that they should begin to dispose of the ammunition of 1905 manufacture which, at the present time, would correspond, roughly speaking, with that manufactured in 1909. A memorandum upon that was made by Major-General Hallick, prinicpal Ordnance Officer, in the following words:

It is necessary before giving instructions, to ascertain from S.O.O.'s the date of manufacture of all ammunition on charge which in the consolidated return is shown as "prior to 1903". This is in hand.

It is assumed you will obtain council's authority for the proposed reduction in price for sales?

Then I come to a report of the Master General of the Ordnance which was confirmed by the Militia Council. The date of the submission of this report was 10th November, 1911. The report is in the following words:

The Master-General of the Ordnance makes the following submission for approval of the Minister in Militia Council.

Small Arm ammunition over five years old should be sold at half price.

This will obviate the possibility of this ammunition having to be destroyed owing to age and consequent deterioration, will ensure a proper turn over which is not the case at present, and will probably be appreciated by Rifle Associations and Cadet Corps.

That was presented to the Militia Council, and on 15th November, 1911, it was approved by the Militia Council, as will appear from this minute:

The Master-General of the Ordnance:

Your submission in this case was considered at the meeting of the Militia Council held this day, and approved.

E. F. Jarvis, Secretary,
The Militia Council.

Other departmental minutes and memoranda with regard to the subject were made, and finally the following report was made by the Quartermaster-General and was embodied, as I understand it, in Militia Orders:

Price of ·303" ball cartridges of old manufacture.

In future, issues on payment by the Canadian Ordnance Corps of ·303" ball cartridges of over 5 years manufacture will be made at half price, viz., $10 (ten dollars) per thousand rounds.

H.Q. 62-2-31.)

(Sgd.) D. A. Macdonald.
(Sgd.) H. K. B.,
A. A. G. (1.)

15-12-11.

These are the initials of General Benson, then Master General of Ordnance. Then comes a letter from General Benson, (at that time Colonel) Master General of the Ordnance, in the following terms:

Q.M.G. :

Re telegram from Mr. Craig, Ross Company, recommended that ten million rounds be sold composed of 1908-1909 manufacture leaving sufficient at Quebec to be ringed for use during 1914.

2. The cost of delivery at point to be named by Mr. Craig to be borne by purchasers.

3. Could you give me the approximate date on which this order could be delivered at Quebec?

4. Ammunition of dates prior to 1908 has been condemned and must be destroyed or broken up.

The telegram from Mr. Craig to which General Benson alluded was dated 4th May, 1914, and was in the following terms:

Quebec, Que., May 4, 1913.

Colonel Sam Hughes,
Minister of Militia,
Ottawa, Ont.

Referring to General Macdonald's letter twenty-fifth February, what largest quantity can you sell me up to forty millions at price mentioned?

Thomas Craig.

The response to that telegram was a letter from the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, dated 18th May, 1914, which is as follows:

Ottawa, May 18, 1914.

The Manager,
Ross Rifle Company,
Quebec.

Sir,—With reference to your telegram to the hon. the minister, dated the 4th instant, I have

the honour to inform you that ten million rounds of ·303" ball ammunition of 1908 and 1909 manufacture are available for sale to your company at $12 (twelve dollars) per thousand rounds, plus 75 cents (seventy-five cents) per box for such packages as contain it, delivery to be taken by your representatives at Toronto, Montreal and Halifax in about equal proportions.

The price offered is conditional on your accepting the whole ten millions, as any smaller lot would be charged for at an increased price per thousand rounds.

Please inform me if you accept this offer in order that instructions may be sent to the Ordnance Officers concerned.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) Eug. Fiset,
Colonel,
Deputy Minister.

On the margin is noted the following by the minister:

If this is proper price, O.K. Sam. Hughes.

The Ross Rifle Company, as appears by the correspondence, refused to purchase at the price of $12 and the proposed sale was not carried out. I may observe also that the ammunition which it was proposed to sell to the Ross Rifle Company was 1908 and 1909 ammunition, whereas the two million rounds to which I have alluded was three years older, having been manufactured in 1905 and 1906.

The result, therefore, is that the Department has sold at $20 per thousand rounds ammunition declared absolutely unserviceable by the Barlow report and ordered to be destroyed; ammunition which was three years older than the ammunition which was offered to the Ross Rifle Company in May 1914 at $12 per thousand rounds. I think that if these facts are borne in mind by the hon. gentlemen, they will dispose of any question as to adequacy of price.

The report which I was about to read is a report from Col. J. F. Macdonald for the Quartermaster-General. It is dated July 29, 1914, and is as follows:

Destruction of ammunition of date of manufacture prior to February 1908. With reference to folios 110 to 114, the S.O.O.—

S.O.O. means the Senior Ordnance Officer.

With reference to folios 110 to 114, the S.O.O. —5th division, was instructed to hand over to the superintendent of the Dominion Arsenal the stock of ammunition referred to on folio 41. He now reports that the superintendent has neither time, facilities nor accommodation for taking over this ammunition, but that he, the superintendent, stated that it may be possible to take it over about the 1st of October for salvage, provided, in the meantime, he sees that it will lead to economy.

It therefore seems doubtful whether the Dominion Arsenal will be able to take over the ammunition, and as the storage accommodation taken up by it is very urgently required for serviceable ammunition, and the boxes in which it is packed are required for packing ammunition now being manufactured, would it not be preferable to have all this condemned ammunition destroyed by drowning or otherwise?

Please see my minute, folio 114, in this connection, to which you do not seem to have replied.

J. F. Macdonald,
Lt.-Colonel,
for Major General,
Quartermaster-General.

There is a minute made upon that report by Gen. Hughes, personally, on the 6th day of October, 1914—I am not sure whether that is the correct date or not—which is just one word: "Destroy" of which the director of artillery made a note.

I might read, although it does not come in order of date, the letter of the Ross Rifle Company refusing the offer to sell at $12.00. It is under date of July 30, 1914, and is as follows:

Col. Eugene Fiset,
Deputy Minister,
Department of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Your letter of July 6th H.Q. "C" 1402 was duly received but acknowledgment was delayed owing to the writer's absence.

In view of the fact that we received a quotation from Ottawa, under date of February 26, of $10 per 1,000 for 500,000 rounds of .303 ammunition, it will be impossible for us to avail ourselves of your quotation of May 18th, viz. $12.75 per 1,000, which is $2.75 per 1,000 in excess of the former offer.

We beg to remain, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
Ross Rifle Company.
Thomas Craig,
Secretary.

It is perfectly true, as the hon. member for North Victoria and Cape Breton has said, that there was a note, concurred in, I think, by the chief of the General Staff and the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, that none of this defective ammunition should be sold. I have that under my hand, and I should like to refer to its exact terms. It was on the 13th of October, 1914; I might as well read it:

Under the existing circumstances, low stock of ammunition, do you not think it would be wiser to hold this ammunition until such time as the stock in depots is brought up to normal condition?

See folio 122 hereof.

D. A. Macdonald,
Major-General,
Quartermaster-General.

The following note appears under that: "We should not dispose of one single round. (Signed) E. F., D. M. 15th October, 1914." "E. F." means the Deputy

Minister of Militia and Defence. A further memorandum by Colonel Gwatkin, now General Gwatkin, was as follows:

With reference to folio 122, the situation has changed since the word "Destroy" was written; and the order, unless repeated, should not be carried out.

Then further on: "Noted. Necessary action taken." All these memoranda are based on the report of the Quartermaster General, which declared that it would be wiser to hold this ammunition until such time as the stock in depots had been brought up to normal condition. Let us see what the condition was at the time the war broke out—because a statement with regard to that is brought down and included in the return. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence desires to know whether this should be made public. I say no. I made this public in the face of the advice of the Chief of the General Staff, the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence and the Master General of Ordnance. I felt that I was compelled to do so by reason of the insinuations and virtual charges made in this House, more particularly by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Notwithstanding the advice of these officials, I was determined that this information should be brought down and the facts made known, although the publication of those facts may be a detriment to the public interest. If hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are determined to spend their time in seeking to pry into matters of this character with regard to which they are not fully informed, and to make charges and insinuations with regard to them, it is necessary, in order that public opinion in this country should be quieted, that we should make matters public that otherwise would not be made public. Therefore I felt it my duty to bring this information down and to place the actual conditions before the people.

On the first day of August there was in stock of Mark VI ammunition 36,418,160 rounds and of Mark VII ammunition 3,534,571 rounds, a total of 39,952,731 rounds. Hon. gentlemen will observe that we had on the first day of August, 1914, a very large supply of ammunition suitable for the Mark II Ross rifle, and a very small amount of ammunition suitable for the Mark III Ross rifle, which is the rifle used on active service, as it has superseded Mark II. We sent forward, to be used, as we understood, for practice purposes, a very considerable amount of Mark VI ammunition when the first Canadian contingent went forward. So that on the 31st December, 1914, the supply stood in this way:

	Rounds.
Mark VI..	14,936,304
Mark VII..	4,161,556
A total of..	19,097,860

As compared with 39,952,731 rounds on the 1st day of August. In other words, we had decreased by about twenty-one and a half million rounds the supply of Mark VI, and we had increased by about 600,000 rounds the supply of Mark VII. The decrease was due to shipment of large quantities to Great Britain. On the 31st day of March, 1916, the supply stands as follows:

	Rounds.
Mark VI..	9,449,772
Mark VII..	12,569,080
Or a total of..	22,018,852

We have decreased by about five million rounds the Mark VI ammunition, which is not suitable for use in active service at the front with the Mark III Ross rifle, the standard rifle of the Canadian forces; and we have increased by nearly eight and a half million rounds the supply of the Mark VII ammunition, which is the ammunition designed for use with the rifle with which our troops are armed for active service. So then I venture to think that, taking things as they were in the autumn of 1914 and as they are to-day, the condition alluded to by the quartermaster general has been brought about, as the supply of ammunition has been brought up to very much more than normal for the Mark III Ross rifle.

Under the circumstances, the course which was taken by the Minister of Militia and Defence was this: We have still in stock in Canada 10,000,000 rounds of Mark VI ammunition. I have conferred with authority as high as any recognized in this country respecting the supply of that type of ammunition which should be kept on hand; and the amount named to me was 5,000,000 rounds. This, as I have said, is suited for the old type of Ross rifle, and is not so suitable for the new type. Instead of 5,000,000 rounds of this kind of ammunition, we have to-day nearly 10,000,000 rounds; and in addition to that we have twelve and a half million rounds of Mark VII ammunition, which is suitable for use with the improved

Ross rifle for active service. Under the circumstances, hon. gentlemen on the other side, on the strength of newspaper rumours, have seen fit to make charges or insinuations in this matter, and we have thought it desirable that all the documents should be brought down, even though, in the ordinary course, they would not be brought down as they give certain information with which we would prefer that the enemy should not be made acquainted.

And we have done more than that; we have passed an Order in Council directing that there shall be a full inquiry into all the circumstances of this case, and that inquiry is now proceeding. Under the circumstances, considering that an inquiry has already been directed and is now proceeding, my hon. friend's motion is inopportune for two reasons: In the first place, the inquiry which he asks for is now being carried on and, in the second place, it is a most unusual course that any gentleman in this House while a matter is under inquiry by a responsible tribunal, should see fit, without waiting for the report of that commission, to propose a motion condemning the Government and especially condemning one of its members. It would have been in better taste, and the time of the House would not have been wasted, if my hon. friend had awaited the conclusion of that inquiry and reserved the motion he now proposes until we had before us the information which will be afforded by that inquiry when made. I need hardly add that, under the circumstances, we cannot accept the motion of my hon. friend, because an effective inquiry is now being proceeded with. When that inquiry has been made and the report upon it is in the possession of hon. gentlemen of this House, it will be quite time enough for any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to come forward with a vote of censure.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) opened his remarks by complaining that he had not received the usual courtesy which is extended from one side to the other whenever a subject is to be taken up which is not already on the Orders of the Day. The little discussion which took place between him and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) showed that there was no cause for complaint on his part. It has been shown that my right hon. friend did receive ample notification, because last Monday—this is Saturday—and last Monday the member for Cape Breton informed my right hon. friend by letter that on that very day, last Monday, he would ask for an inquiry into this matter, specifying that he would ask that this matter be referred to the commission composed of Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff. Surely, after the many occasions on which, during the present session, this matter has already been brought to the attention of the House, my right hon. friend should have known what was meant; and so it seems to me that his complaint was not well founded.

I call my right hon. friend's attention to this, that time and again during the present session he has stated that if any member had charges to make against anybody, against the Government or any of its members, the moment an hon. member would take the responsibility of making the charges, most ample investigation would be offered and given. If, Sir, there is a case which requires investigation, and the most ample investigation at that, it is the very matter which we now have in hand. Records which have already been brought down show that, some time during last year, the Minister of Militia took upon himself to dispose of a certain quantity of small ammunition. He had no warrant, he had no authority for doing so, the thing was absolutely illegal. What he sold was not the property of Gen. Sir Sam Hughes; it was the property of the Government, and the Government alone could dispose of it. What was his authority, what reason was given? My right hon. friend has given no reason at all for the conduct of his colleague in the matter. Whether the minister acted upon his own motion, without even consulting his colleagues verbally, does not appear. The first thing we know of this is that a communication was sent by the Auditor General to the Minister of Finance on the 3rd of April, 1916, calling the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact, some time prior to the 31st of December last, this department sold through Colonel J. Wesley Allison, without the authority of the Governor in Council, over 3,000,000 rounds of ammunition at $20 per thousand rounds, and he concluded in this way:

> I have therefore to request that you will obtain the approval of the Governor in Council for the sale, and that you will also let me know why the rate was fixed at $20 per thousand rounds.

It is very strange that amongst the papers brought down, the authority of the Governor General in Council for the sale of

that ammunition is not given. The only thing I find in the record is a recommendation of the Minister of Militia, dated 5th of January, 1916, to His Royal Highness the Governor General in Council, which is in the following words:

January 5, 1916.

To His Royal Highness the
Governor General in Council,

The undersigned has the honour to submit for the consideration and approval of Your Royal Highness in Council an application from Vickers Limited for the purchase of 4,985,900 rounds of S. A. ammunition, mark VI. This is part of the stock of mark VI ammunition, which, under suspicion, was not allowed to be used with rifles in Canada. The price of the ammunition to be $20 per thousand rounds. This ammunition, while rejected for rifle use.

Mark the words—

—for rifle use is, however, reported to be suitable for testing of Vickers machine guns which are manufactured in very large numbers in England.

The matter is respectfully submitted.

Sam Hughes,
Major General,
Minister of Militia and Defence.

That is the recommendation to council dated 5th January last. The report in answer to the motion passed by the House was brought in about three weeks ago. No Order in Council is found in the papers and as far as we know to this day there is no Order in Council. A few days ago my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) asked why this Order in Council had not been brought down. If I remember the answer of the right hon. the Prime Minister correctly, it was then stated that the Order in Council had not been passed because the matter had been brought to the attention of the Council in the absence of the Minister of Militia. Mystery piles upon mystery in this matter. The recommendation was made and sent to Council apparently on the 5th January. January passed away, February passed away, March passed away. For three months the Minister of Militia was here attending to his duties; he sailed for England in the last days of March or the first days of April, I do not know which; he was away for some three weeks, he has been back now for three weeks and to this day the Government has not legalized such an illegal matter as the sale of the property of the Government by the Minister of Militia. What age are we living in? Is this Parliamentary Government, or is it not Parliamentary Government? Do I understand that the members of the Government will allow one of their colleagues to dispose of the property of the country illegally and without a tittle of authority? That is the position in which we are at the present time.

My right hon. friend says that there are certain matters which ought not to be brought to the attention of the country because they affect the war. He gave us the information as to the amount of ammunition which was held by the country at one time, and the amount which is held to-day, and he says he did this in defiance of the advice of his officers to allay the suspicions of the Opposition. When and where have we asked for any information as to the amount of the stock of ammunition which is held by the Government? We have never inquired into that, we do not want to know. That is the business of the Government and in regard to that it ought to be trusted. But, we do want to know under what circumstances a part of the stock which should have been held for the country was disposed of to that philanthropist, Mr. J. W. Allison. The answer given by the Prime Minister to-day is not only insufficient but—and I do not want to characterize it too strongly—it is in absolute defiance of the law of Parliament. We should know where we stand to-day. Do the Government approve of their colleagues disposing of the property of the Government as he has done or do they not? What is the reason that to-day we have not the sanction of the Government for this matter? We should know whether or not the Government approve of the action of their colleague and if they do approve of it then they should legalize it because the thing is illegal. If they do not approve of it they should tell us why they do not approve of it and they should act accordingly. The whole defence which is set up by the Prime Minister to-day with regard to this sale is simply this, that there was a certain stock of ammunition which was deficient and which had been condemned by the authorities. But, I do not understand that the ammunition which was condemned by the authorities is the ammunition which was disposed of under this recommendation of the Minister of Militia to Council, is the ammunition which he has sold to that philanthropist and patriot, Mr. J. W. Allison, because he does not say in that recommendation to his colleagues that he wants to dispose of all the ammunition which was found defective. No, he says it is " suspicious." He speaks of such part of the stock of Mark VI ammunition as was under sus-

picion and he says that it was not allowed to be used with rifles in Canada; that it is suspicious and should not be used in the field. Yet, it has some virtue in it because he goes on to say that:

> The price of the ammunition to be $20 per thousand rounds. This ammunition, while rejected for rifle use—

Mark the words—

> —is however reported to be useful for the testing of Vickers machine guns now being manufactured in very large numbers in England.

If this ammunition was useful to Vickers for the testing of their machine guns, why was it sold to Vickers and not to the Imperial authorities? The Imperial authorities wanted this ammunition just as much as Vickers-Maxim wanted it and the charge which we make against the Government in this matter is that this stock was disposed of to a private individual, and that this Government had no right to authorize the disposal of this ammunition to anybody but the Imperial authorities. If they had power to do so, an Order in Council stating that the Government had that power ought to have been passed. There is on record in this return which has been brought down, the rule laid down by the Quartermaster General, General Macdonald, approved by the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, that no ammunition should be disposed of to anybody. In the face of this it was disposed of. Leaving aside altogether the fact that it was disposed of to such a person as Mr. John Wesley Allison, do hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, in times of war, believe that we should dispose of the stock of ammunition that we have, deficient or not deficient, useful or not useful, to anybody but the Imperial authorities if we do not require to use it ourselves? I submit that in this time of war, it is nothing short of a crime against the country that we should deplete our stock of ammunition by selling it to anybody. But who is that body? It is Mr. J. W. Allison who represents himself to be acting as a philanthropist while acting for the Vickers-Maxim Company.

It is said that the ammunition was sold to the Vickers-Maxim Company for testing purposes. I call the minister's attention to the letter of the Auditor General in which he says that he had reason to believe that the ammunition was disposed of finally through somebody to the Imperial authorities; that is to say that the ammunition, instead of being sold directly by the Government here to the Imperial authorities, was sold to private individuals, or through the agency of Mr. J. Wesley Allison. The Auditor General in his letter, makes use of this language:

> The department has been buying ammunition since the declaration of war at $33 per thousand rounds and has also been manufacturing ammunition at the Dominion Arsenal at a cost of $34.60 per thousand rounds; consequently, there has been a loss to the Government in this transaction of over $45,000.

It is alleged that this ammunition has been sold to Vickers, Limited, for testing purposes. I can hardly credit that statement, owing to the magnitude of the sale; but if it were sold, why was it sold at such a low rate, and why was it necessary to obtain the services of Colonel Allison? Mark this: the Auditor General can hardly believe that this ammunition was sold to Vickers, Limited, for testing purposes. Well, for my part, I am rather disposed to agree, until better informed, with the suspicion of the Auditor General. Vickers, Ltd., were intending to buy 5,000,000 rounds of ammunition at $20 per 1,000 rounds. Some 3,000,000 rounds had been delivered, for which they would have to pay $60,000, and there is evidence on record that some $20,000 was paid. Now, $60,000 seems to be a very large sum to pay for ammunition simply for testing purposes. That struck the Auditor General, and it would strike anybody else in the same way. The Auditor General goes on:

> I have reason to believe that the ammunition was resold at an advance of about 25 per cent, and that its destination was not Vickers, Limited. I may be mistaken in this, but Colonel Allison's connection with the transaction does not tend to allay suspicion. I wrote the Department of Militia and Defence, asking to be furnished with an Order in Council, etc, etc.

I repeat what the Auditor General says here, that there is reason to believe that the ammunition was sold at an advance of about 25 per cent. He does not say to whom, but I think I am warranted in saying that there is strong reason for believing that the ammunition was sold to the Imperial authorities, and I say this upon the statement made by the Minister of Militia and Defence himself. On page 7 of this file is found the following statement by the Minister of Militia and Defence:

> Re the sale of defective ammunition. The Canadian Treasury has received $20 for every thousand rounds thereof. There are no records available to show what became of it, further than that it was regularly ordered and shipped to Vickers, one of the most reputable firms in the world. The assurance was given that not

one cent was paid in commission by the firm to any one, and no profit was made on it. It is understood—

These words are very vague.

—It is understood that to cover the cost of transport, handling, exchange, insurance, etc., a sum was added by one of Vickers' officers to the price, but on learning that these expenses were borne by the British Government they were immediately removed.

These expenses were borne by the British Government. What is the meaning of that? If the ammunition was consumed by Vickers themselves, there was no necessity for adding to the price. If they were selling it to somebody else, then of course it was necessary to add to the price the cost of transport, handling, exchange, insurance, etc. Mark the closing words of this paragraph, and I leave it to the sense of any man to say whether they do not furnish irrefutable evidence that the purchaser from Vickers, Limited, was the Imperial authorities. Why were the expenses to be borne by the British Government unless the ammunition was sold to the British Government? And this is from the report of the Minister of Militia and Defence himself. The Minister of Militia and Defence also states:

The Canadian Treasury has received $20 for every thousand rounds thereof. There are no records available to show what became of it.

And he ends the paragraph thus:

On learning that these expenses were borne by the British Government they were immediately removed.

It seems to me that he knows more than he pretends to know; that he knows this ammunition, after it was sold by him to Vickers, Limited, was sold by them—or at all events through the agency of Colonel Allison—to the Imperial authorities. That is something which I say is absolutely inexcusable. Will anybody in this country excuse the Minister of Militia or the Government for having depleted our stock of ammunition by selling this quantity to Vickers, Limited, and allowing them to sell it at a profit to the Imperial authorities. That is the charge which is made to-day; that is the charge which is borne out by the record, and it is that for which we ask an investigation. I repeat what I said a moment ago: the Prime Minister, not upon one occasion only, but on occasions almost without number during the present session has stated that if a charge were made against one of his colleagues or against the Government, nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of an investigation. The Minister of Militia himself has repeated more than once that he desires the most ample investigation. The defence made to-day by the Prime Minister is that the matter has been referred to the Davidson Commission. I have to complain of one thing, and it is this: We should have had this Order in Council brought before us to-day, and long before to-day; it should have been laid upon the Table as soon as it was passed. The House has a right to be informed whenever a matter of this kind is referred to a commission to be investigated, so that the men who had called the attention of the Government to the matter might have an opportunity of following the inquiry. The charge which I make to-day is that the Government is not giving to this charge the most ample investigation.

There are two investigating commissions sitting in Ottawa to-day. Will any one pretend that the Davidson Commission will give the same degree of satisfaction to the public as the Commission presided over by Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff? Will any one pretend that it is possible to expect that this matter will be probed to the bottom—investigated out and out— before the Davidson Commission as it would be before the Commission presided over by Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff? How are the two commissions composed? One is composed of a single judge, and the other is composed of two judges. The Davidson Commission, composed of a single judge, has no counsel to prosecute this charge before the commissioner. There is only one young man, eminent in his profession, I admit, to assist the commissioner. But I have this to say against Mr. Thompson's investigating this matter. If I am correctly informed, Mr. Thompson, who assists the commissioner, is an officer in the Militia, under the Minister of Militia and Defence. Will my right hon. friend or any other hon. gentleman tell me that it is proper that the Minister of Militia should be investigated by a commissioner who is assisted by one of the officers of the Minister of Militia? If we are to have an investigation the ordinary rules should be followed. On the other hand, there is before the Commission presided over by Sir William Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff, a counsel appointed to represent the Opposition. Have they not the same right to investigate one charge as to investigate another? If the Government thought they owed it to the country, under the

existing circumstances in which we are placed, that the fuse charges should be so probed that the country could have absolute faith and confidence in the result, and that the Opposition should be allowed to select a counsel so that both sides of the case would be represented and the fullest probing of the matter ensured, is there not as much reason why this matter should also be investigated in the same manner by the same commission? The only reason given by my right hon. friend why the matter was placed in the hands of the Davidson Commission was because certain witnesses were at present available in Ottawa. Those witnesses can always be procured whenever they are needed, and if the investigation cannot take place immediately because other matter are being investigated at present, it can be delayed for a few weeks, so that his reason is not a valid one why the course I have suggested should not be taken. My right hon. friend is not living up to-day to the pledge which he has boastingly given on more than one occasion that upon any charges there will be a full investigation. The investigation before the Davidson Commission is not a full investigation; it is not satisfactory, and we must press to have the matter referred to the Meredith-Duff Commission.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, Let me say at the outset that I am delighted to see the right hon. leader of the Opposition in such good form. From what I have heard recently, I expected that he would come here in an ambulance and be attended by two or three nurses. I understand he has recently been passing through a very trying time; that he has been passing through political tribulations.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He is feeling pretty good.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There is one thing, however, that I do miss. In his enthusiastic utterances, he did not label himself as one of the old Liberal school of politicians. His voice had little of the ring that I used to hear in it in 1896, when his hair was longer than it is to-day and hardly so gray, when he used to tell the people of Ontario: Hands off Manitoba, and when he would go down to Quebec and say to the people there: Trust me, a Frenchman and a Roman Catholic and shun Tupper, who is an Englishman and a Protestant. His voice had somewhat of the pathos of the olden times but hardly the ring in it. I understood that the House was not sitting on Saturdays, and I thought the right hon. gentleman was going to take the opportunity of doing some recruiting.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This is a sort of red herring.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I beg your pardon.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This a sort of red hering which the hon. gentleman is using just now.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Recruiting is going on excellently, but in the place where the right hon. leader of the Opposition might exercise some influence, I am sorry to say that it needs a little stimulant, and I trust he will direct his attention to that matter and make use of that pathos that he has exhibited here to-day.

5 p.m. He has complained that Captain Thompson, a lawyer, is engaged before Sir Charles Davidson. The fact that Captain Thompson wears the uniform of a British officer is a good reason why he should be regarded as entirely worthy to appear before Sir Charles Davidson, and it is one of the surest guarantees that he is an honest man. I have not, however, the slightest doubt that from the great array of legal talent behind the right hon. leader of the Opposition he can select suitable counsel, in case Captain Thompson cannot find time to attend to the duties of the court, to take his place. I do not find as many of my right hon. friends in uniform as I would like to find.

I will briefly analyse this matter. The charge was made before I arrived here that the price of this ammunition was too low. I may say that it is exactly the cost of the ammunition and it is just twice the price that was offered a year or so ago for the same ammunition. The statement was made that it was not known where the ammunition was going. The correspondence brought down clearly shows that it was ordered by the firm of Vickers-Maxim, one of the most reputable firms in the world, and was shipped to them, and that the money was paid by them to the Bank of Montreal in England. The statement was made that the ammunition was resold. That statement is absolutely untrue. The ammunition was sold to Vickers-Maxim and the address given of one of their officers. The statement was made that no Order in Council was passed.

There was no necessity for an Order in Council in regard to the matter. According to the law, the quartermaster general could have thrown the ammunition into the river St. Lawrence. That is with reference to that made before 1909, and subsequent to 1909 the officer commanding the district of Quebec had the absolute authority to destroy ammunition on an order from General Macdonald, that is, on an order from a "superior authority." General Macdonald, on receiving the intimation to sell the ammunition, did not consider that to be "superior authority," and he therefore came and got me to initial the document. The reason I asked for an Order in Council in regard to the 2,000,000 rounds was because the quantity was so large that I thought the responsibility, if anything transpired, should be divided. The cost price of the ammunition, when it was supposed to be in good condition, was $20 per thousand. I have not heard of any price of $34.60, and I do not know what that refers to. Mark VI ammunition is not being manufactured to-day in any part of the British Empire, and, therefore, there is no need to refer at all to that particular size. The statement was made that the ammunition was illegally sold. As it was sold under the regulations of the department, the sale was a perfectly legal one. The statement was made that there was a shortage of ammunition. After the war broke out there was a shortage of good ammunition because we sent it all to the front, but I sent an order to the quartermaster general to replenish the store of good ammunition according to the requirements of the country at that time, until we would have a sufficient store of Mark VI ammunition. I also directed that the best of the Mark VI ammunition should be returned, but in order to get it out of the way the Militia Council decided that we had better destroy the 12,000,000 rounds ordered to be destroyed by the Barlow Commission a year before, in order to prevent any portion of it getting mixed up with other ammunition, and that the Mark VI ammunition manufactured up to the time of the Barlow Commission, which ammunition was declared to be defective, should be retained in case of an emergency in this country before we could get Mark VII ammunition manufactured in sufficient quantities.

Long before I became Minister of Militia it was known that the ammunition being manufactured in the Dominion Arsenal was defective; every rifleman in Canada knew that, and report after report brought forth only the statement: Oh, you do not understand the matter, and so forth. I remember on one occasion, after I became minister, going through the factory and putting my hand on one of the machines. I caught five or six cases as they came out, and out of five cases three were defective, as could be seen with the naked eye. The machines needed trueing up. But to any suggestion made about possible improvements, we were told that we didn't understand it and that the best possible was being done. We could buy the English ammunition which would not give any blow-backs, but in the case of our own ammunition, about six rounds out of ten would show a blow-back—that is the powder would be blown back through the cap-hole, or at the point where the case was defective, permitting the discharge from the breech instead of from the muzzle. Therefore, soon after becoming minister, I consulted the Prime Minister and we obtained authority to issue a commission to inquire into the manufacture of ammunition in the Dominion arsenal. We communicated with the British War Office, and they sent to us two of the greatest experts on these subjects, Colonel Sir H. Barlow, and Major Ogilvie. These gentlemen came here and made a very minute inspection of the Dominion arsenal. A summary of that report has been presented to the House by the Prime Minister. Twelve million rounds of ammunition made prior to 1908 were rejected on account of cracked cases and other defects, and were ordered to be destroyed. The suggestion was made that the bullet should be taken out of them, and so on. The balance of the ammunition was declared to be "under suspicion." In other words, the whole of the ammunition was declared to be defective—twelve million rounds made prior to 1908 ordered to be destroyed, and the balance manufactured up to 1913 declared to be "under suspicion and defective." That "under suspicion and defective" ammunition, I venture to say, could not be used in the Mark II Ross or Lee-Enfield rifle, with safety. But I will not go into that aspect of the case unless it is deemed necessary. We did what we could to prevent these blow-backs and render the ammunition more or less efficient, by putting it to a process which we call "ringing." One of the officers in the arsenal thought that by putting each cartridge in a slot and pressing the metal at

the base of the cartridge still tighter around the cap, the difficulty would be overcome. It was found that in some cases it did improve the cartridge, while in other cases it not only did not improve it but made it worse.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It still permitted blow-backs?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Yes, the explosive blowing-back in the face of the soldier. We are paying pensions now to some such cases, while others were injured and laid up for a long time. So, it was found that this "ringing" did not remove the trouble. Accordingly, the ammunition declared by the Barlow report to be defective ammunition made subsequent to 1908, was set aside as fit for machine gun use only. But when it came to the big camp at Valcartier in 1914, the British Government, wishing to get every round of good ammunition that was possible, and desiring that all our ammunition made subsequent to 1913 should be shipped to the front, we did ship it. We gave our boys a chance to practice by using the Mark III Ross rifle, which is much more powerful than the Mark II, and we used for rifle practice this Mark VI ammunition, the ranges being short. We inspected it carefully and used the best we could find. Even then, as the camp drew to a close, the men found that the ammunition was not right, that it was defective owing to blow-backs, explosions, detonations, and so on, and they were getting nervous over the use of it. Therefore, we held it up.

Just before the troops sailed from Quebec, on my return from Gaspé Basin, we held a council and talked over the supply of ammunition. We were deficient in ammunition at that time—it is no harm to admit it now, when our supply is ample. We decided to get rid of that manufactured before 1908 and keep the balance of the Mark VI ammunition in hand in case of an emergency. If the worst came to the worst we would use it. The Quartermaster General, as explained in his report, has steadily built up a proper store of Mark VII ammunition. I gave this order before I sailed for England. The deputy minister, the Master General of the Ordnance, the Quartermaster General and the Chief of the General Staff, each disseminated it to his officers, the object being to hold the ammunition in case of an emergency, and that is the reason of these orders appearing on the papers. In England I heard stories that a number of the soldiers had suffered at Valcartier, having blow-backs in the use of the ammunition. Once a man has a blow-back it renders him nervous in firing any rifle. A good deal of that kind of thing had occurred at Valcartier, and a number of the fellows were more or less nervous over this ammunition. Accordingly, on my return, it was decided that none of this Mark VI ammunition should be used. And the store of Mark VII was gradually coming up to the full height, and I am happy to say that it has long since passed the high water-mark of what is necessary for the defence of the country. The Mark VI ammunition was lying in store, the order of the board being that it was to be used only for machine gun testing. We have no machine guns to test, ours being tested before we receive them. This order became known to the ammunition men throughout the country, and there were requests for the ammunition. One was received, but was not fulfilled, as we did not know where the ammunition was going—something was said of its going to Mexico. In another case, I was willing that it should be allowed to go. It was sold, not in large quantities, but in small quantities here and there.

There is a misunderstanding as to Mark VII ammunition, which I might as well clear up at this time. The Mark VII is much more elaborately made than the Mark VI. It has a more pointed tip, the point being filled with aluminum inside, backed up with lead to preserve the balance of the bullet in its course. It is one thirty-third inch longer than the Mark VI. When we use Mark VII ammunition in the Mark II rifle, which is the old Ross rifle, the sharper point of the bullet sometimes prevents the ready entrance of the cartridge into the barrel. Therefore, the word was passed without any undue ceremony that in using Mark VII ammunition in the Mark II rifle it was well not to use the rifle as a magazine rifle but as a single-loader; and with green troops this is much better.

As regards the sale of this ammunition, I was spoken to about it by a representative of the Vickers firm who was then in Canada—one of the firm. The question came up of the making of ammunition in Canada, and when I told him that I understood that the British Government had ample facilities for making ammunition, the question came up whether we could spare what was understood to be defective ammunition, for testing machine guns or something of that kind. The whole con-

versation did not occupy half a minute. My answer to him was to communicate with General Macdonald, Quartermaster-General, who had the matter in charge. There was another conversation some time later, not with this distinguished gentleman, but with one who, at one time, was a good friend of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, Colonel J. Wesley Allison.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perhaps I am wrong. Perhaps I should say the reason that the gentleman does not bask in the smiles of the right hon. leader of the Opposition to-day is because he chances to be a friend of the late Hon. Mr. Blair, with whom the right hon. leader of the Opposition had some slight differences.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That may be, but I do not know that I have seen Mr. Allison more than two or three times in all my life.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Well, I myself saw the right hon. member talking to him at least twice in the olden days. If the right hon. member has the faculty of having no heart and of going back on his friends, I want him to understand that the Minister of Militia is not in that class.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If the hon. gentleman wishes to insinuate that Mr. J. Wesley Allison was amongst my friends at any time, I give it a most emphatic denial.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not insinuate it; I assert it, and can prove it to the right hon. member's satisfaction if he wants the proof.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What can you prove?

Sir SAM HUGHES: I can prove that the right hon. leader of the Opposition considered Colonel J. Wesley Allison as one of his friends.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Never did.

Sir SAM HUGHES: But if it suits the right hon. member's policy——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If it is the policy of the right hon. member to play executioner in respect to the gentlemen who sit around him—half of them sit here to-day dreading the block—let me assure him that that is not the policy that this individual pursues towards his friends. Until I find that they have proved traitor to me I do not go back on them, as was the case with regard to a number of gentlemen who sat behind the right hon. leader of the Opposition in the days gone by in the House of Commons of Canada. I am glad to see fire in the right hon. member's eye at this moment; I will light him up a little more if he wishes it.

This ammunition was first ordered, I say, by the members of the Vickers firm. Finally it was ordered by Col. J. Wesley Allison, who has the honour of being the Vickers representative, and who had, and still has, the honour of having been selected by the special representative of the British Government as agent in the United States of America in respect of very large matters of international concern. He is a gentleman who to-day stands high in the estimation of the people of the country, not from fear—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not from fear, not from trembling, not from having a solid phalanx behind his back and, to keep it there, playing one role in one part of Canada and the old English school philosopher in the other. He holds the good opinion of this House and this country to-day, and he holds it by merit. This gentleman ordered the ammunition. He saw the Quartermaster General, and the Quartermaster General consulted me. The Quartermaster General knows his business—I never yet found him wrong on a legal point—so I put my initial on his memorandum and the ammunition was shipped to Vickers in London. The money was paid to the Bank of Montreal, and a straighter transaction never was conducted in this Dominion of Canada. I did not know how much of this ammunition they would want, for they were getting thousands of these machine guns. However, our first desire was that the soldiers going to the front should not be obliged to use one round of defective ammunition; that they should get the very best that could be obtained. By securing the release of a few million rounds of good ammunition from Britain that would otherwise have been used for the machine guns—and it was pointed out in a report read by the Prime Minister that this ammunition was capable of being used for that purpose—by securing this release, I say, through letting the Vickers people have this defective ammunition, I claim that we were doing the country a service. By the way,

the right hon. gentleman forgot to talk about the retreat from Mons to the Marne. Surely he could have shown that this sale of ammunition compelled the British to retreat to the Marne—that is another of his fads that he generally makes use of. By releasing this ammunition we did the British Empire a good service, and benefited the Canadian treasury by bringing back $20 for every thousand rounds of ammunition.

The right hon. member dilates upon the argument about keeping that ammunition in store. I want to tell him that so long as I am Minister of Militia—and I intend to be Minister of Militia until I go out—I assume my full responsibility and intend to exercise it. So long as I am Minister of Militia, not one round of that defective ammunition will be given to any of our soldiers by me or by my authority to fire at the enemy. When our men go into action we want them to go with the very best materials, the very best equipment, the very best ammunition that can be got. I purpose at a very early date ascertaining where this defective ammunition is and settling the matter once for all by getting rid of it, in a legitimate way. If we do that, then the defective ammunition will be entirely out of the way; it will no longer take up storage room, and good ammunition will be served to the boys so that they shall be able to perform their duties. Not one round of this ammunition is held by me for defensive purposes. For that we have no warrant or authority.

The hon. member quotes from the Auditor General. And the Auditor General occupies a peculiar position; it is hardly proper for any member of Parliament to stand up here and criticise him. But when the Auditor General undertakes to say what he has said in the document which has been read; when he makes reflection upon a gentleman who has more honour in his little finger than the Auditor General has in his whole carcass, I want to tell him that I will find some means of reaching the Auditor General. I will permit no man occupying the position of public servant in this country, so far as I am concerned, whether in office or out of office, so to misconduct himself as to pen the letter which he has penned—I never saw it until to-day—to the Minister of Finance. Had such a letter been sent to me—indeed, I did get one of a somewhat similar character, and it was dealt with in double quick time—had such a letter as that come from the Auditor General to the Minister of Militia, it would have been returned in mighty short metre with an intimation that the writer had better study his duties and learn to pen his letters in proper form.

The right hon. member asks why this ammunition was not sold direct to the British Government instead of to the Vickers' Company. I do not see what the British Government knew about it. We sold them all the good ammunition we could spare early in the war. This ammunition was asked for; we realised that the use of it would be a good way to test the machine guns, and it went. The story was that this ammunition was being resold by Vickers for the machine gun purposes of the British Admiralty and that Vickers were making $5 per thousand rounds on it. Well, if Vickers paid the freight, insurance and exchange charges on that ammunition, which were pretty heavy at that time, then they would not be any money in pocket by turning it over to the Admiralty at $25, when they paid $20 for it. I do not know anything about it, only this: When I was in England, having heard the yarn, I asked one of the Vickers' officers—I think it was Mr. Searles—about the matter. He said he did not know the details of it, but that he had heard these stories. He said they had added this sum to the cost, but as soon as they found that the Admiralty would themselves meet the cost, they wiped out the one pound sterling that had been added and the price stood at the $20 that the Government charged them for the ammunition and for sending it over.

Let me summarize. All ammunition made before 1913 and in store was condemned as defective by the commission. All of the defective ammunition made prior to 1909 was condemned to destruction in one form or another. The balance was recommended for machine gun practice only. However, in order to have as little of this destroyed as possible, we decided to use that recommended to be used in machine gun practice or in Mark III rifles. We tried it out quietly, after ringing it as I have described; and decided to use it, not in Mark II or Lee-Enfield, but in Mark III Ross rifles. Ringing it, however, was found not to benefit the defective ammunition to any great extent, and in some cases it injured it. There were several proposals for the sale of defective ammunition. One was made by the deputy minister at $10 or $12.50, supposedly for Mexico. Another was to sell to Vickers, through their New York agent, Allison, for machine gun testing. This was for 2,000,000 rounds at

$20—that is an error in my notes, apparently, as it should be 3,000,000 rounds at $20.

The Quartermaster-General, following the usual practice in Canada regarding condemned military material, authorized the sale, and obtained the endorsation of the minister in addition. I again point out that when cases of this kind arise in a district, the district officer commanding, if he feels that he wants any superior authority to dispose of condemned material, looks to the Quartermaster-General for that superior authority. As a rule it is considered, and has been so acted upon, that the Quartermaster-General's authority is sufficient. In destroying one and a half million rounds at Winnipeg the Quartermaster-general was regarded as the superior authority; but General Macdonald did not wish to regard himself as the superior authority in time of war, so he came to me and asked me to place my initials on the order, which I gladly did. The goods were then regularly shipped to an officer in the Vickers' works in England, Mr. Searles. There was no commission paid, offered or asked by anyone in the transaction. That was brought out this morning before the Davidson Commission. We got $20, and that was all that was paid for the ammunition, so that there could not be any commission. The quartermaster general had the money placed directly to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada. Thus it passed through no one's hands.

This defective ammunition released a similar quantity of good English ammunition for the front. It has been asserted that Vickers' officer in England added, for transport, freight, insurance, exchange, handling and risk, one pound sterling additional, and then sold the lot to the British Admiralty for $25 per thousand. The Militia Department has no record of this, the sale being direct to Vickers' officer, Mr. Searles, in England. All we know is the insinuation in the Auditor General's Report and remarks heard in various places throughout this country. The sale was made direct to Vickers' officer. Mr. Searles, in England. But I am informed, on good authority, that on finding all expenses were paid by the Admiralty, Mr. Searles withdrew the charge of $5. This, however, is a matter entirely between Mr. Searles and the Admiralty; it is a matter with which this department has nothing whatever to do. This ammunition, or any of the defective ammunition, was ordered to be held in store by the minister in 1914, and ordered further not to be used in Mark II rifle in any circumstances. The part that I ordered to be destroyed in 1914 was the part made prior to 1909, which was ordered not to be used on any consideration.

The net result is that, by the sale of the 2,000,000 rounds of defective ammunition referred to, Canada has received $40,000 which would never have been received; 2,000,000 of good English ammunition has been released for the front; an ample store of good new Mark VII ammunition is held in store for use in Canada. It is now universally recognized that Mark VII, new and good ammunition, can be used in Mark II rifles, while the condemned Mark VI should not be used, and has been forbidden. Under no circumstances would the ammunition sold be allowed to be used in Mark II rifles, the one retained for arming the troops in Canada. The balance of the defective ammunition could not be used in either Mark II Ross rifle or Lee-Enfield rifle. It cannot be safely used even in Mark III rifle, even for practice. The practice in England is to treat such matters as the Quartermaster-General has treated this sale of condemned material.

I may say that, while in England, I made inquiries about this and found that such a transaction would never reach the Quartermaster-General, much less the minister, and certainly never the Cabinet. The practice is that the officer commanding in the district calls his board and the board makes a report. The officer commanding then orders the ammunition disposed of as condemned, and places any money received to the credit of the Government in the official way. Thus in every sense we have been well within our rights in the Militia Department in dealing with this matter as we have done.

I have to say, in conclusion, that no Canadian soldier will, so long as I am Minister of Militia, be requested or permitted, if we know it, to carry one round of this condemned mark VI ammunition in his pouch for service in action. When our boys go into action we want them to feel as confident as it is possible for men to feel. Napoleon asserted that the sentimental as against the material is as three to one in fighting; and if you have men poorly armed, poorly equipped, using bad ammunition, that sentimental diminishes to nothing, and you lose three-fourths of your fighting power. I want my boys to go in

feeling they have the best rifle in the world, the best ammunition in the world, and that they can handle themselves in a manner to equal the best.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, the somewhat wonderful statement of the Minister of Militia reminds me of a quotation from the Bible which I think I can quote correctly: "The wicked flee when no man pursueth." I would like to know who ever asked the Minister of Militia to send our boys to the front with defective ammunition. I would like to know what a discussion about giving J. Wesley Allison a rake-off of $5,000 has to do with sending our boys to the front with poor ammunition. I want to answer the minister in a logical, fair manner, but it is pretty hard to do so, after listening to the arguments he has used. This is not a question of whether or not there was bad ammunition in Canada. If the Government had poor ammunition or defective ammunition on their hands, this country has money enough to take charge of that and to throw it into the river, if necessary, and get good ammunition in its place. The question which we are bringing up here to-day, which was first brought up by the Auditor General—and I think, notwithstanding the dire threats made by the Minister of Militia, that once in a while it is a good thing for Canada that there is an Auditor General. The question brought up by him is the fact that defective ammunition was owned by the Dominion of Canada; that the Minister of Militia, through his counsellor, friend and guide, J. Wesley Allison, sold this, not to Vickers, but through Vickers, to the British Admiralty, at a rake-off of $5 a thousand rounds.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is a deliberate mis-statement, and he knows it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The records do not show it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The records are here and do not show anything of the kind, and the hon. member must make himself acquainted with these records.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asked by some hon. members to decide whether or not the hon. member's statement is parliamentary or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: "And he knows it."

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the authorities, I have to decide that it is certainly out of order and offensive.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I bow to your ruling, but it does not change the position.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not want to raise any more points of order with the Minister of Militia. He, as he says of my right hon. leader, has been passing through certain tribulations of late; and I certainly will not raise any point of order or do anything to add to his troubles. I sympathize with him in his difficulties. I realize that he is not a free agent this afternoon; he is not in a position to think clearly and logically, and therefore I am not going to take any advantage of his unfortunate mental condition at the present time. But in order to prove to him that I have some knowledge of what I am talking about, I want to refer him to his own report which I find on the file, and which is as follows:

> Re sale of this defective ammunition. The Canadian treasury has received $20 for every thousand pounds thereof. There are no records available to show what became of it, further than that it was regularly ordered and shipped to Vickers, one of the most reputable firms in the world. The assurance was given that not one cent was paid in commission by the firm to any one, and no profit was made on it. It is understood that, to cover the cost of transport, handling, exchange, insurance, etc., a sum was added, by one of Vickers' officers, to the price but on learning that these expenses were borne by the British Government, they were immediately removed; but that is their own concern.

How could a man who had the possession of his mental faculties state that this did not go to the British Government? That is the question with regard to which I want to address myself for a few moments. If this did not go to the British Government, if it went to Vickers for their own business, if Vickers bought this ammunition at whatever price they thought best, and it was purely a commercial transaction between this Government and Vickers, why, after the matter had received some publicity, why after questions had been asked by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and myself, why after it had been advertised in the newspapers, was it necessary for these gentlemen—these hon. gentlemen—to make restitution of the graft which they had taken either out of this Government or out of the British Government? We have the confession of the Minister of Militia this afternoon that when he went over there and discussed this matter they

had made restitution, they had paid back £1 per thousand, or whatever it might be. Yet, in the face of that, this hon. gentleman wants us to believe that this thing was perfectly straight, that there was nothing crooked in his department, that there was nothing wrong between himself and J. Wesley Allison. It is an insult to the intelligence of any ordinary man, in view of what has taken place in this country during the last three months, to believe that anything could take place between this Government and that gentleman that would not require the closest investigation before he could come to the conclusion that there was not something tricky or disorderly about it. I do not want to rehash old sores but I want the Minister of Militia to remember that hon. members on this side of the House are ordinary, intelligent beings who know something of the subjects that they are discussing.

Before I go to another branch of the case —and I do not propose to discuss it lengthily—I want to refer to my hon. friend's attack upon the Auditor General. It will be a long time before the people of this country will pray to retain him in office as they are praying that the Auditor General may be retained where he is at the present time. It ill becomes an hon. gentleman who occupies the position in the public eye that the Minister of Militia does to make an attack upon a gentleman of the high honour and unblemished character of John Fraser, Auditor General of Canada, a man who has occupied that position for some years, a man who has tried to be the watch dog of the treasury and who, I am happy to say, in many instances, has been the medium through which some of the nefarious transactions that have been sought to be pulled off in late years have been brought to light. My hon. friend might have saved the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) the chagrin of receiving the castigation which he gave him this afternoon. I do not know that the Minister of Finance will suffer very much from it and I presume he will take care of himself. It seems that the Minister of Militia is in the mood this afternoon of hitting everybody with a club of some kind. One felt that he would almost have liked to have taken a club to the Premier but he possibly felt that it would be better policy to be a little moderate in that direction. He made an assault upon my honoured leader. I can only say to him that when he has been in politics as long as my honoured leader has been, perhaps he might like to exchange reputations with him. But, in all probability, he will never reach that time in political life and therefore he will not have the opportunity of making comparisons.

I want to discuss this matter from the Government standpoint for a moment. It is to my mind one of the most remarkable things that I remember in my short parliamentary experience that the Government should have adopted the course which they did over this very important matter. This matter is not important from the standpoint of money to such an extent as it is from the standpoint of principle. It is true that there is probably $20,000 or $25,000 involved in it, which is a fairly reasonable amount of money. At this particular time, when this country is retching with the name of J. Wesley Allison, when every dirty trail leads to Allison, this Government, instead of turning the fullest light of day upon the question of Allison's connection with the matter, are trying to cover it up, to prevent the people from getting the information. And, Sir, I do not know, but it seems to me, if we are to take the statements that we hear on the street corners, that the Minister of Militia is still the master of the Administration.

Who do you think, Mr. Speaker, asked to have this referred to Sir Charles Davidson? Do you think it was the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty)? Not by any means. Do you think it was the Minister of Finance? I do not believe that in his whole political experience anything has caused him so much chagrin as this has. All we have to do to find out who probably asked that this matter be referred to Sir Charles Davidson is to refer to the cablegram sent to this country by the Minister of Militia on the 30th March last. In reply to a long cablegram sent him by the Premier giving him a very complete summary of the statements made by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) in this House two days before, telling him that he was going to appoint a royal commission to investigate fuse and cartridge case contracts, and saying that it was necessary for him to return immediately for the purposes of the inquiry, a cablegram came across, or under the waters of, the Atlantic ocean, and this is what it said:

> Please state to House on my behalf that I have no improper connection with contracts referred to, or any other contracts. If any suggestion to the contrary is made I respectfully demand full investigation by the judicial tribunal presided over by Sir Charles Davidson.

All you have to do is to read a few things like that going back just two or three months in our political history—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I would like to say that, if the hon. gentleman suggests that it was referred to Sir Charles Davidson at the instance of the Minister of Militia, he states that which is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: I am glad to give some of my hon. friends on the other side a chance to clap and feel good. I realize that my hon. friends do not get very many opportunities these days to cheer, and I suppose we should not begrudge them this little pleasure once in a while. Perhaps my right hon. friend the Prime Minister would tell me whether the Minister of Militia objected to the appointment of Sir Charles Davidson?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The Minister of Militia was not consulted about it. It was determined at a meeting of my colleagues at which he did not happen to be present.

Mr. CARVELL: We must have a great deal less respect for the Prime Minister and his colleagues than we had before that, because I want to tell the Prime Minister that it does him and his colleagues very little credit that in a matter of this importance they should select the commissioner who has on previous occasions been chosen by the Minister of Militia in order to investigate things which have turned out so rotten that the name of Canada is a disgrace and a by-word among the civilized nations of the world.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that I have chosen Sir Charles Davidson?

Mr. CARVELL: I mean what I say.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the hon. gentleman does not care to repeat what he said I am not particular; I pay no attention to what he says anyway.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not going to repeat; but what I said I stand by. I tell the Premier that if he thinks he can satisfy the people of Canada by referring matters of this importance to Sir Charles Davidson, in the light of what this commission had done during the last year, he is living in a fool's paradise. The people of this country will not stand for any more hiding and covering up of the dishonest and nefarious transactions of my right hon. friend's friends and supporters. There is no use trying to hide the thing or smooth it over. We have had enough illustrations in the last few months of the attitude of the Premier, and we might as well just come out and call a spade a spade, as Sir William Meredith said at the commission the other day. Day after day and week after week since this Parliament assembled in January last, we have sought for an opportunity to get the light of day on many transactions of the friends of this Government, and we have been balked at every turn except in one case where the Government were driven to it by a power whose name I am not at liberty to mention in this House. They have refused us investigations, and have made one flimsy excuse after another, and when driven from one citadel to another—

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What does the hon. member mean when he says we were driven to a course of action by a power he is not at liberty to mention?

Mr. CARVELL: I mean exactly what I say.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If I understand the inference, I want to say that that statement is absolutely devoid of the slightest semblance of truth.

Mr. CARVELL: I am glad I am getting my right hon. friend interested; that was my object in speaking this afternoon.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am glad you are pleased.

Mr. CARVELL: They have refused investigations of things which any reasonable intelligent man knows are so dishonest that they would stink in the nostrils of every man in Canada. They have refused to extend the scope of investigations because they dare not, on account of what would happen to their friends. They have handed this matter over to a commission appointed more than a year ago, when perhaps my right hon. friend was sincerely penitent for some things that had been revealed in the Public Accounts Committee, and at that time he said that the doors of the penitentiary were yawning for those who sold lame and decrepit horses to the British Government, and for those who boodled in bandages, boots and binoculars, and everything else they could get their hands on that was required for the army during the nation's stress. I want to tell my right hon. friend that these doors are still yawning, and unless there is greater

activity on the part of my right hon. friend and his Government than there has been in the past, the doors will still remain yawning for his friends who have been guilty of looting the public treasury. If my right hon. friend can take any comfort out of the course he has pursued during the last year and the results of the investigation of his special commissioner, Sir Charles Davidson, he is welcome to it. I am not here to attack Sir Charles Davidson personally, and what I have to say about him as a commissioner I want to say right here in the public light of Parliament. A gentleman who has occupied the high position that this man has, a gentleman who for nearly a year has been investigating such things as the Government would allow him to investigate, a gentleman who, so far as we can judge, concluded his labours three months ago, with the exception of one small transaction, a gentleman who has not the honesty—I think I may use the word—to bring down to Parliament after we had been in session for three or four months, a report on matters so important as he has been charged to investigate—such a man is not the one to whom the people of Canada want to have referred important matters with which the Minister of Militia is concerned. I say that to my right hon. friend with a full sense of the responsibility for what I am saying. A gentleman who has investigated the nefarious horse deals in Nova Scotia and driven one member of Parliament of that province out of public life, a gentleman who has investigated other nefarious horse deals in the province of Ontario and driven out of public life a member of the Ontario Legislature, a gentleman who has investigated the bandage and drug transactions here in the city of Ottawa, which, I was told early in the session, had driven another member of Parliament out of public life, a gentleman who has investigated all these things and will not make his report on them to Parliament either is not fit for the position he occupies or he is holding back the report at the instigation of the men who appointed him. I do not care which horn of the dilemma my hon. friends choose. I have tried to state my position in language as plain as I could use, and I think I have the ability of using fairly plain language when the occasion requires. I want to tell my hon. friends that if they think they can cover up their tracks and whitewash and cleanse the character of the Minister of Militia and Defence by handing these nefarious and dirty transactions over to the Davidson Commission, they are making the greatest mistake they ever made.

Sir SAM HUGHES: As the hon. gentleman has mentioned character, let me point out that I have never been caught impersonating people in New York or buying blackguards to steal papers from New York offices.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Militia is welcome to all the pleasure he gets out of this. He will get his answer, probably before many days are gone by.

Mr. McKENZIE: If there were no dirty papers, they could not be stolen.

Mr. CARVELL: I tell him right here that he cannot draw the attention of the people of Canada away from the doings of his friend Allison, and his portion of the divvy of half a million dollars, by throwing dust in the people's eyes about anybody trying to steal papers. Don't let the Minister of Militia deceive himself on that point. Don't let him feel that he can help his cause or protect a man who has practically pilfered a quarter of a million dollars from the people of Canada, by throwing out any nasty insinuations about what I or any other member of Parliament may have done in New York or elsewhere. Neither he nor his friend Allison, nor the Ottawa Free Press, the champion and organ of his friend Allison, can get the people of Canada to forget the real question by any such small-bore tactics as that.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL: It will take me only a few moments to conclude the remarks that I want to address to the House. Before I refer to the subject matter under discussion I wish very shortly to refer to a most uncalled for and insulting remark made by the Minister of Militia just before the House rose at six o'clock with reference to my taking papers from some source unknown, and from which I had no right to take them. In making that remark he followed up a course of conduct which he, his counsel, and a friendly newspaper have been carrying on for the last three or four days. I want to assure my hon. friend that shortly after the Meredith-Duff Commission was created I took every reasonable means in my power of obtaining information as to the conduct of himself and of his friend,

counsellor, and guide, Colonel Allison. In doing so I found it necessary to go to the city of New York and other places in the United States. I had not been very long on the investigation when I became well satisfied that my hon. friend the minister was attempting to put up a very nice job on me for the purpose of drawing public attention away from his own conduct, and that of his friend and his friend's friends. I therefore employed, as my solicitor and counsel in the city of New York, William Travers Jerome. I consulted two other men of such prominence that when their names are made public, even my hon. friend the minister will have no doubt of the wisdom of my course, and I consulted no man, discussed no plan and made no move without first consulting one of the three gentlemen to whom I have referred, my solicitor having been named. I want to tell the minister that when the reports of the detectives which have been furnished to me by Mr. Jerome are made public, as they will be, if and when necessary, he will not make any nasty insinuations about my trying to obtain papers to which I have no right. I want to say further that during the last four months I have been in only two legal offices in the city of New York, one being that of William Travers Jerome, and the other that of Kiddle and Margison, of 115 Broadway, on the 14th floor. My friends are at liberty to investigate those two firms as much as they like. So far as any firms of German name are concerned, I know nothing about them; I have never seen them, and I have had no correspondence nor communication with them. Whenever my hon. friend the minister wants to pursue this case any further before the tribunal having jurisdiction over it, I am ready to meet him and give him all the information which he desires, and I hope that before I am through with him I shall give him a little more than he would like to have made public.

Sir SAM HUGHES: My hon. friend has stated that I put up a plant on him. The plant was put up by the hon. member himself and his friends, as I am prepared to show. The first news which I had when I reached New York city was the intimation of the plant which this gentleman has put up with a certain gentleman to whom I have referred.

Mr. CARVELL: I am not going to discuss this question with the minister further except to say to him that I had not been in the city of New York for more than a year until at least a week after the minister returned from England. I have nothing further to say as to this, but I do not want the Minister of Militia to attempt to cover his dirty tracks by attempting to throw dirt at me.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Minister of Militia is prepared to face this hon. gentleman in this House or before any other tribunal in the world. Let me assure the hon. member that when the matter is all cleared up, the Minister of Militia will have no cause to blush for any of his actions and if the hon. gentleman does not blush, it will be because he has a rhinoceros hide on him.

Mr. CARVELL: I want briefly to refer to the question before the House. The right hon. leader of the House has attempted to show that this transaction was all right, because, he says, they got more than the ammunition was worth. If my right hon. friend can take any satisfaction or glorification out of selling through the agency of Col. John Wesley Allison condemned ammunition to the British Admiralty for twice as much as it is worth, he is quite at liberty to do so, and if his friends in this House can take any comfort out of that, so far as I am concerned, they are welcome to it. That is the question. The question is not whether the ammunition was worth $20 a thousand or $10 a thousand or $12.50 a thousand. There is no use in my friend's or my friend's friends trying to get away from the real question. While I do not make the statement, I do say that I am informed on the best possible authority—and if anything like a fair investigation is given, it can easily be proved—that the reason sent up to the Council when this matter was first brought before it, was that this was condemned ammunition and not to be used for testing purposes, and when it was pointed out that they would never be able to pass an Order in Council to sell condemned ammunition to the British Admiralty, the reason was changed and put in the form that the ammunition was being sold for testing purposes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN. I do not quite understand the point my hon. friend is making. Does he say that there was a recommendation to Council to sell this ammunition to the British Admiralty?

Mr. CARVELL: I am informed that when this matter first came before the Council, it was put on the plea or argument that this

was condemned ammunition sold to the British Admiralty or the British Government and that accounted for the reduction in the price.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: For the third time, I affirm that the statement made by my hon. friend to the House just now is without the shadow of any foundation whatever.

Mr. CARVELL: The next question is: How are you going to investigate? If this thing is bad enough to require an investition of any kind, then it requires and demands a genuine investigation. If it does not require and demand a genuine investigation, then my right hon. friend is not fair to the Minister of Militia and Defence. My right hon. friend is pillorying Sir Sam Hughes before the people of this country as being charged with doing that which he ought not to do. I repeat again—either this is of sufficient importance to be investigated, or else it should be left alone; it is too serious a matter to trifle with, too serious to play the petty game of politics with.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL: One hon. gentleman says: We are investigating it. You are investigating it by the Davidson Commission. I am not going to spend much more time on the Davidson Commission. It is the greatest farce my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has created in his four years of farcical government. At the head of it is a man who, as I said this afternoon—I do not know whether it is because he has not the ability, or because he has not the conscience, or because he is acting under dictation—has laboured for a year, has squandered about $20,000 of the public money of Canada, and has brought forth nothing in the way of a report, and nothing to justify his existence. My right hon. friend hands this important matter over for investigation to a commission presided over by such a man as I have described, and before whom business is conducted by a lawyer who is the subordinate of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I desire that the hon. gentleman should not refer to me as his friend. There is a parliamentary term for use when one member of this House refers to another, and that is "the hon. member," not "hon. friend"—I object to that.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a pretty narrow escape. This thing must be getting pretty close home when the Minister of Militia has to seek that sort of defence. But the hon. minister has his friends, one of them being J. Wesley Allison. Refer to the hon. member as you will—and I do not think it will be very long until he will not be referred to in this House as the hon. member for Haliburton or any other place—but refer to him as you will, this farce must not go on any further.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL: If the Government are going to investigate——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL: I assure my hon. friends opposite that the greatest compliment I get from them is the evidence that I am hurting them, and I think that on this occasion I am accomplishing all that I started to accomplish. For I am trying to-night to show some members of the Government of this country up in their true light. That is my real object. I do not believe that every member of the Government, and I am sure that not half their followers, are in sympathy with what is going on. If I talk plainly, I do so intentionally, and I am showing them exactly the position in which they are placed. I tell them, they are handing over the investigation of what appears to be a very, very dishonourable transaction by the Minister of Militia and Defence to a man who, while perhaps he has not been chosen by the minister, certainly, from his past intercourse, and from our knowledge of what has taken place during the last four months, is not at all contrary to the wishes of the Minister of Militia; a man who has proved himself incompetent for the position up to the present time; a man who, we know, will not and cannot, under the conditions under which he is acting, give this matter the investigation that is demanded; a commission in which there is no person representing the public, in which there is no person trying to get to the bottom of the affairs; a commission in which the only lawyer is the lawyer for the defence, and the only jury is the man who would find the minister innocent, no matter what evidence he had against him. If my right hon. friend wants to hand the investigation of this important matter over to a tribunal

of that kind, that is his business, and he can take the consequences of it. But I want to tell him, it is not good enough for the honest people of Canada, Liberal and Conservative alike. It is not good enough for the ordinary men and women of Canada, who want to see this carried on fairly and disinterestedly, and there are hundreds of thousands of these people in both political parties. Shunting off investigation into these charges has been done time and again by the right hon. Prime Minister during the present session. That may please him and some of his followers, but I know that many of those followers are not pleased. He may think that he is in some way playing the game of Minister of Militia; but he is not playing the game of the people, and he will find it out when the proper time comes.

That is practically all I have to say about it. I place the matter before the country in as plain language as I know how. I can only once more express the hope that, before this goes on, at least they will do my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) the courtesy to let him know when the commission will sit. Think of the farce of this Government starting out to investigate a serious charge against one of its members by means of a Royal Commission that sits in secret, and that has not even the courtesy to notify the man who starts the investigation where and when the commission is to sit. They held a star chamber investigation this morning, and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) did not even know that the commission was to sit—did not know that the matter was going on. No wonder some of my friends on the other side look serious when this matter is brought up. Now, Sir, I do hope that this House will adopt the motion of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria. I hope my right hon. friend will see the position in which he is placing himself and his party and that this thing will be taken out of the hands of the farcical commission in whose hands it was placed, and will be handed over to some tribunal—and the best I know is a committee of this House—where the people of this country will have at least a chance to be represented and which will try to get somewhere near the bottom of what looks like a very shady transaction.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) made his motion this afternoon, with the full knowledge that the matter which he was moving to have investigated was being investigated, I think that one might very well be tempted to draw the conclusion—which, since the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has spoken, I am sure there can remain not one shadow of doubt about—that, realizing that, once there was an investigation there would be nothing left to talk about, he thought it wise to do his talking first.

The hon. member for North Cape Breton spoke, and he was supported by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. After replies had been made by the right hon. leader of the House, and by the Minister of Militia, they had it more manifestly borne in upon them than ever that there was no case; and so my hon. friend the member for Carleton rose with the brief duly endorsed: "No case; blackguard the plaintiff's attorney." But there did not happen to be any plaintiff's attorney; somebody had to be blackguarded, so the hon. gentleman blackguards the distingished gentleman to whom in his capacity of commissioner this matter has been referred. I say that I have difficulty in qualifying the action of an hon. gentleman who stands up in this House to pour out reckless vituperation upon a man who has lived a long career of usefulness to his country and of honour to himself. The hon. gentleman said that it was not the Prime Minister who had recommended the reference to Sir Charles Davidson; he said that it was not the Minister of Justice who had recommended that reference. He suggested that it was the Minister of Militia. He has already had his answer as to that matter of fact, but let me say to him that when he seeks to relieve me of responsibility for having in the first instance suggested the name of Sir Charles Davidson to act as commissioner and for having recommended and joined in the recommendation that this matter should be referred to him, he seeks to withdraw from me not a responsibility that I shrink from, but the credit of an action of which I am proud.

Mr. CARVELL: You are easily satisfied.

Mr. DOHERTY: Sir, when Sir Charles Davidson was originally named to hold this investigation—named, I repeat, at my own suggestion in the first place—upon the recommendation of Council—and I may say that there was no consultation by me with the hon. Minister of Militia on the subject—no man raised his voice on the

subject except to commend the choice. Down in my own city, which is also the city of Sir Charles Davidson, the newspapers of both parties declared that no better selection could have been made. Even the newspaper for whose sayings and doings the hon. member for South Renfrew is responsible, announced in the most unmistakable and inequivocal terms that a selection had been made that would command the confidence of the whole of the people of the country. It is true that at that time, finding it necessary to say something, I suppose, to offset the credit to which this Government was entitled for that appointment, that paper did suggest that perhaps that bold, bad man, the Minister of Justice, might try in some way to have this investigation held in secret. The record of the commission is there to show whether there was any secrecy about it; whether the suggestion that I would have had any desire to do so was well founded. If I had any desire to exercise any influence with Sir Charles Davidson, I venture to say that it would have been an utterly useless undertaking on my part. Sir Charles Davidson was given an open commission. He was given a commission to investigate every matter connected with the expenditure of money by this Government for the purchase of arms or ammunition, of materials of any kind or description whatsoever for the purposes of this war. He was sent out with that open commission to investigate every charge, every insinuation that any one would be found to have the courage to come before that commission and make. That is all the instruction that he had, and that instruction has been, in spite of what the hon. gentleman says, carried out to the letter in a manner which has commanded the approbation of the public without distinction of party.

The hon. gentleman talked about investigations being burked. Well, it is a matter of public notoriety that that commission, everywhere it went, made its sittings public, and that it called on any one who had any charges to bring forth, any imputations to make, or any doubt to express as to whether something had not been wrongly done, to come forward and lay the facts before that commission.

Something has been said about delay in the report. The report is not yet made; it is a considerable time since that commission was appointed. But is not an explanation, in large measure at least, to be found in the very thoroughness of that inquiry and in its very wide scope? When the commission was named, comparatively few matters had been brought forward in respect of which the commission was called upon to decide. But as time went on, before those few matters were disposed of, other charges and insinuations were made, other matters were brought to the attention of the commission, with the result that during this period, during which we are told we have had no results, that commission has travelled from one ocean to the other, and has held investigations at every point in Canada where any man had one word to say, or any imputation whatsoever to make against any of the innumerable transactions which have been carried on by the Department of Militia during the course of this war. Is it to be wondered at that, having regard to the immense field of different charges and investigations that had to be covered, resulting in thousands of pages of testimony, we should not as yet have had a complete report? The hon. gentleman himself, who talks about this resultless commission, tells us that down in the Maritime Provinces it has sent one man out of public life; that right in this neighbourhood it has sent another man out of public life; that it has sent a man out of public life in the province of Ontario. I may tell him that it has sent a man in Regina behind the bars of the penitentiary, and has placed another man under surveillance waiting the decision of the American authorities in respect of extradition proceedings. The commission is spoken of as having been very useless, as having not yet reported. Surely these results are a testimony to the severity and the thoroughness with which the facts have been probed and inquired into by the commission. That very thoroughness of inquiry has taken time, and I may tell my hon. friend that very same thoroughness will be given to the preparation of the report and to the pronouncement of views that may be expressed in that report.

Mr. CARVELL: Does the minister not know that two members of this House were driven out of this House and read out of the Conservative party by the Prime Minister as the result of the work of the Public Accounts Committee, before the House prorogued?

Mr. DOHERTY: If I am mistaken I am mistaken in taking the statement of the hon. member.

Mr. CARVELL: That commission was a post mortem, not an investigation.

Mr. DOHERTY: And now the hon. gentleman imputes the fact that this particular matter has been referred to Sir Charles Davidson to some influence on the part of the Minister of Militia; and he finds the evidence of it in the fact that when a cablegram was received by the Minister of Militia in which it was intimated that matters had been brought forward involving imputations upon himself, he cabled at once asking reference to the only existing commission at the time.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is the misfortune of Sir Charles Davidson that, having the confidence of everybody excepting the hon. member who has attacked him, he finds himself enjoying, among that everybody, the confidence of the Minister of Militia too.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: That is the one suggestion that has been made why there is impropriety in naming Sir Charles Davidson. But the hon. gentleman did not quite know upon whose testimony, confirmatory of the views we all of us entertained of Sir Charles Davidson, testimony given at what was supposed to be the termination of that investigation, although it has been prolonged since because other matters have arisen—the selection of Sir Charles Davidson was made. The hon. member has paid a high tribute of eulogy to the Auditor General, and the Auditor General is the person who, with regard to this matter, stands in the position, not of the accused, but of the accuser; and if the hon. member wants to know what the view of the accuser in this matter is, of Sir Charles Davidson as a competent, reliable, impartial, careful man to conduct an investigation of that kind, I shall just read to him the opinion of the Auditor General.

Mr. CARVELL: You are reading his official view now.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall read his sworn testimony. What was the letter that the hon. gentleman read but the official view of the Auditor General? He read to us—and I do not want to minimize in any way the certificate which he gave to the Auditor General—his letter as something entitled to credit in every respect. I am going to read the sworn testimony of the Auditor General. This was at a sitting of the commission a month or two ago, and it appears by the context that it was when it was believed that the matters for investigation had been all investigated—although, as I have said, other matters have arisen since. Here are the questions and answers:

We are about nearing the completion of the taking of testimony.

Mr. McKENZIE: In whose court was this evidence given?

Mr. DOHERTY: It was before the commission.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would be very awkward to say anything of a man impairing his character in his own court.

Mr. DOHERTY: I appeal to the certificate given to the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., as the answer to what I may describe as the not very creditable insinuation of the hon. member for South Victoria. If the Auditor General——

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not an insinuation, Sir; it is a statement.

Mr. DOHERTY: Then it becomes more discreditable. I did not suppose that the hon. gentleman would take the responsibility of stating that the Auditor General of this country, to whom his colleagues has paid so high a tribute, would, merely because he was in the presence of a man, tell an untruth upon oath with regard to questions of fact that were put to him with regard to the manner of conducting the investigation.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister will permit me, there is no need of getting hot over this thing at all. I say to the minister that I do not expect any insinuations or slurs, even from a Minister of Justice. And I say I am almost as old a barrister as he is, and that I have been in a great many courts; but I never heard a counsel taking the responsibility of asking an opinion as to the competency of the court before the court itself.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman thinks that there is no occasion for getting hot, why does he get hot?

Mr. McKENZIE: Because I do not think it is worth while.

Mr. DOHERTY: I want to say at once, that I admit the superiority in age of the distinguished gentleman; and, if he desires, I will not question the greater length of his experience as a barrister.

Mr. McKENZIE: My experience as a barrister is all right, sir.

Mr. DOHERTY: If it were a question of length of temper, perhaps——

Mr. McKENZIE: Or length of speeches, perhaps—

Mr. DOHERTY: I might suggest that the hon. member's is perhaps a little shorter than my own. Let us see what the Auditor General did say, before the hon. member condemns him. He was talking about facts, and it is from the facts that I deduce the establishment of the competency of the investigator and the nature of the investigation:

Sir Charles Davidson: We are about nearing the completion of the taking of testimony, Mr. Auditor General. as you are aware.... Is there anything else now that you can think of which it would be proper for this Commission to investigate?

Mr. Fraser: No, I cannot recollect anything now that I want examination made into further than what has been made.

Sir Charles Davidson: Either here or elsewhere?

Mr. Fraser: No.

Sir Charles Davidson: We have had the pleasure of your company, Mr. Auditor General, throughout the eastern provinces and in the West.

Mr. Fraser: Yes, Sir Charles, I enjoyed your company very much—

This is where the undue politeness that the hon. member attributes to the Auditor General comes out.

—and also the experience I have had.

Sir Charles Davidson: Save at Regina and Winnipeg and Calgary, where it was impossible for you to continue with us, in consequence of your public duties, you were present at all the sittings of the Commission.

M. Fraser: Yes.

Sir Charles Davidson: Was there anything affecting the cases which arose, in which the evidence was not sufficiently thorough, Mr. Auditor General?

Mr. Fraser: Not that I am aware of. I read the reports of your meetings in the West, at which I was not present, and everything seemed to have been gone into very thoroughly.

Sir Charles Davidson: And when you were a witness of our proceedings, what have you to say?

Mr. Fraser: I was perfectly satisfied with the examinations that were made.

Sir Charles Davidson: All suggestions which you made and which you desired carried out were carried out?

Mr. Fraser: You very frequently asked me during the course of the inquiry if I had any further questions to ask, or any further suggestions to make, and whenever I had any questions to ask or suggestions to make I gave them to Mr. Thompson—

This subordinate of the Minister of Militia.

—and they were always promptly attended to, and very satisfactorily attended to.

Sir Charles Davidson: In fact, I think you could fairly say, Mr. Auditor General, that you were treated as a coadjutor in the furtherance of the inquiry.

Mr. Fraser: I was never conscious of any other treatment from the commission than that which I would desire.

Further down:

Mr. Fraser: So far as the knowledge I have of the inquiry made by your commission, it has been a very full and thorough one. If I am any judge at all of these matters, I must say that the inquiry was very satisfactory. I cannot imagine or think of anything else that could have been done. I think the matters submitted to you were very fully covered. It is true that persons who were not present at the meetings of this commission may think now that certain things should have been done which were not done, but it is impossible for them to judge, unless they have been present, as I was.

Hon. gentlemen might, perhaps, take notice of that.

Sir Charles Davidson: And if there is anything of importance to inquire into, the commission is still open for their investigation at the slightest suggestion from you.

Mr. Fraser: Yes, I presume that any ground that has not been covered can yet be attended to.

Mr. CARVELL: Did they close the meeting with prayer and the doxology?

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the Auditor General a solicitor in court? Is he a barrister?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am really afraid he is not.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would not think he would be competent to give any judgment on the conduct of a court.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has been quite a mystery to me why Sir Charles Davidson refused to permit parties to appear by counsel to cross-examine the various witnesses.

Mr. DOHERTY: On what occasion?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Sir Charles Davidson positively refused to allow parties to be represented by counsel.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Where?

Mr. PUGSLEY: At Victoria the matter came up specially. A gentleman appeared there and asked to be allowed to cross-examine witnesses. Sir Charles Davidson stated that he had no power to allow counsel to address anybody except Mr. Thompson.

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot deal with a particular case without knowing the circumstances of the particular case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the minister think that that is an extraordinary position to take?

Mr. DOHERTY: It all depends entirely on the circumstances of the case and, prima facie, inasmuch as it is the decision of Sir Charles Davidson, I should say that the presumptions are that he is right. Under the Inquiries Act he has power to name counsel to assist him in obtaining the truth, and, as I understand it, unless somebody was charged with an offence—and I am speaking of the statute from memory now—there is no provision in the statute giving the right of representation by counsel. In so far as I know the circumstances of the incident, the application that was made—I speak under correction because I do not pretend to have official information, although the hon. gentleman seems to know the facts——

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, I do know.

Mr. DOHERTY——the application that was made was that the Liberal party should be represented by counsel. The Conservative party was not represented by counsel—

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, by two of them,—both the commissioner and the counsel.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, I leave that for what it is worth. The hon. gentleman today has studiously worked and his last observation caps his work and assures him of success in making for himself such a reputation, that when he shall rise and make accusations against people, the public will assume that these people deserve praise instead of blame. When the hon. gentleman undertook to make the reckless attack that he did make this afternoon, he simply placed himself in the position that when the report of it goes to the public, that knows Sir Charles Davidson and that knows the hon. gentleman, it will draw its own conclusion, and that conclusion will be greatly to the advantage of the gentleman whom the hon. member next chooses as the object of his vituperation. The hon. gentleman says that the Conservative party were represented by counsel. He is in that respect no more unjust to Sir Charles Davidson than he is to Mr. John Thompson—Captain John Thompson—the subordinate of the Minister of Militia. There is the testimony of the Auditor General, the man who has gone into matters that were brought before that commission, and he tells you that there was no matter that he suggested to Mr. John Thompson, the so-called attorney of the Conservative party, that was not taken up and most thoroughly gone into. Application, I understand, was made for the appearance of counsel on behalf of the Liberal party, not for any individual taking any responsibility, or making any charge whatsoever. That would have opened the door to counsel for the Conservative party and to counsel for the labour party, which is a very important party in British Columbia, and which represents an element of very great importance in this country. This commission, which in its nature was a commission of inquiry, would have found itself faced by a large number of counsel, none of them representing anybody who made any accusations, and each one of them trying from different party points of view, to derive some advantage from a proceeding that had no object in the world but to ascertain the truth and which was being carried on by two gentlemen perfectly competent and, the hon. member for Carleton to the contrary notwithstanding, absolutely desirous of reaching that truth.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I hope the minister understood from me that Mr. Taylor, who sought to appear before the commissioner in Victoria to cross-examine witness, did not ask for any remuneration from the Government. The Minister understands that?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the minister think that having counsel to cross-examine witnesses is always a most important factor in arriving at the whole truth?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he is aware that the so-called Insurance Commission, part of whose direct task was to drive Sir George Foster out of public life, did not permit Sir George Foster to cross-examine witnesses by counsel, if my recollection is correct? That was a case in which he was directly attacked, and if some correspondence is ever made public as to the purpose of the late Administration in ordering that investigation, my hon. friend, I think, will not find it to the credit of those who had the particular motive of which I have some evidence.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did my right hon. friend approve of that course upon the part of the commissioners to whom he refers?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I might have denounced that course and approved this, because there was a man placed in the position of a defendant and not allowed to ap-

pear in court and defend himself by counsel before the very commission in whose court the attack was being made. It would not be possible under the amendment we have made to the Inquiries Act for such a result to be brought about. But it was possible formerly, and full advantage was taken of that possibility.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I agree with my right hon. friend that if the commission acted in the case to which he refers in the manner described, it was a great impropriety on their part, and I would not justify or defend any commission that would refuse to allow counsel to represent a man who was under accusation. I think it was exceedingly improper if they did so. I desire to repeat the remark I made to the Minister of Justice. I have seen many investigations, and when you have a commissioner with only one counsel to aid him and no counsel to cross-examine, there is the greatest possible danger of having the facts misrepresented and the truth concealed, and of an erroneous conclusion being arrived at.

Mr. DOHERTY: There was only one counsel, and that counsel was counsel for the people of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oh, no; he cannot act for both sides.

Mr. DOHERTY: That man was selected by the commissioner himself, and the purpose of that counsel throughout was to get at the truth. In effect he was prosecuting counsel, and if anybody has suffered it would be the people against whom evidence might have been brought out and who might have had an interest in cross-examining. But this is aside from the question. Surely, even if there was one erroneous decision made by the commissioner upon a question of that kind, my hon. friend will not suggest that that justifies the unbridled abuse from the hon. member for Carleton, and that is what we are concerned with now.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I could point out some other errors made by the commissioner.

Mr. DOHERTY: We shall be in a better position to discuss these things when we have the report.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let us avoid the danger; let us have counsel there now.

Mr. DOHERTY: We will come to the question of counsel later on. For the moment, when I am dealing with men of unbridled tongues who, with wonderful courage and bravery attacking an adversary that is not here, allow themselves to make diatribes such as my hon. friend from Carleton has made this afternoon, it would at least—

Mr. PUGSLEY: He has a good defender in the minister.

Mr. DOHERTY: —it would at least be fair that when one undertakes to stand up and put the defence—so far as he needs it—he might be allowed to make it without interruptions from the hon. member.

Mr. PUGSLEY: May I—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Minister of Justice has no objection to being interrupted the hon. gentleman can ask his question.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire always to be courteous. I thought the minister had given me permission to interrupt.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no objection in reality.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought the minister hadn't.

Mr. DOHERTY: All I want to say further on this subject is that any one who appeared before that commission accused of anything was allowed counsel if he desired it, and the duty of Mr. John Thompson was to act as a Crown counsel would act in any case before a court; seeing to it, from that point of view, that no evidence that would indicate wrong-doing failed of being brought out. And now, in addition to the imputations made upon Sir Charles Davidson, we have it said that Mr. John Thompson was not worthy of confidence.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the minister allow me to say that no matter how competent a counsel may be, and no matter how honourable, you cannot rely on getting justice unless you have also a counsel to cross-examine. That is what I meant to say. I was not reflecting on Mr. Thompson.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not mind being interrupted when my hon. friend has anything new to say, but he has already interrupted several times to tell us that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I understood the minister to say that I reflected on Mr. Thompson.

Mr. DOHERTY: The complaint of the hon. gentleman is analogous to the com-plaint that might be made because, in a prosecution the Crown alone was represented and the defence did not get a chance. It was the people of Canada who were endeavouring to ascertain the truth; they were represented by Mr. Thompson, and his function was to find out by every means he could conceive of, whether anybody had done anything wrong. That was the purpose of his examination. There might have been room for cross-examination to exculpate perhaps, but from the point of view of bringing out the truth as against the parties charged, certainly there was ample representation of the people of Canada before that Commission. And we have the certificate of the faithful and vigilant watch dog, as he was described this afternoon by the hon. member for Carleton, that that work was thoroughly done. The Auditor General was also there representing the people. He was not a barrister, but he was there as a representative of the people of Canada to instruct Mr. John Thompson, and he was perfectly satisfied that everything that could be done was done.

9 p.m.

But what amazed me most was the reason—and I was surprised to see it come from the leader of the Opposition himself; he expressed it in more courteous words than the hon. member for Carleton chose to repeat it in—why Mr. John Thompson is to forfeit the confidence of the people of Canada in his professional capacity, and that reason is because he is an officer in the Militia. The right hon. leader of the Opposition asked, "Will my right hon. friend tell me that it is proper that the Minister of Militia should be investigated by a Commissioner who is assisted by one of the officers of the Militia." And my hon. friend from Carleton, abbreviating that, spoke of Mr. Thompson as the subordinate of the Minister of Militia. When Mr. Thompson's name was last mentioned in this House in connection with this investigation, we had from the hon. member for Pictou an assurance of his entire confidence in Mr. John Thompson. And what has happened since? Mr. John Thompson gave months and months of his time, perfectly gratuitously, to the service of the people of Canada to help in unearthing whatever wrong-doing there might have been, and he has now added to that sacrifice by donning His Majesty's uniform, and is now in active preparation for almost immediate departure for the front. We are told that because he has done that, in the opinion of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition he is not to be trusted in his professional capacity to carry on this investigation, and he is described as an officer of the Minister of Militia, and the hon. member for Carleton caps that by calling him the subordinate of the Minister of Militia. Since when are those, our sons and our brothers who have gone forth to risk, and, if need be, to sacrifice their lives in the defence of this country and of the Empire and of civilization, to be sneered at as the subordinates of the Minister of Militia? How will the people of Canada accept even from the right hon. gentleman the suggestion that when a man dons the uniform of an officer in His Majesty's service and goes forth, as I have said, to take his place with the men who are defending us and the liberties of this Empire, he forfeits his honour, his conscience, and his reliability, and that by that fact alone he becomes incompetent to act with regard to investigations respecting the Militia Department, because, forsooth, he is the subordinate of the Minister of Militia? Surely hon. gentlemen are hard put to find a ground for insinuation against the honour, the integrity, the readiness and the capacity to fearlessly and impartially perform his duty, of a man who, though he be young and in the eyes of the right hon. gentleman—that seems also to be a reproach to be made to him—has earned for himself an enviable reputation for integrity and for ability in his profession, and a man who bears an inherited name that was in the lifetime of his father honoured, and that shall be honoured in this country as long as this country remains and keeps in mind the memory of those men to whom she owes her greatest debt.

The hon. member for North Cape Breton may ask me now: "Why do you get hot?" I would be ashamed of myself if I failed to get hot in the face of such an absolutely and unqualifiedly unworthy imputation—most assuredly unworthy of the right hon. gentleman, whether or not it be worthy of the hon. member for Carleton.

I have heard a great deal about motives in referring this matter to the Davidson Commission. Gentlemen have suggested, and we have heard in addition to those imputations on the gentleman who is

acting as counsel for the people of Canada before that commission, other imputations. It has been suggested that there is some desire or intention to carry on the proceedings of that commission in secret. I have said that the proceedings of that commission from start to finish have been open to the public. They have been sitting in this building and have been sitting last week and have resumed their sittings this morning. The fact that they were so going to resume their sittings, and the subject they were going into were given out, as I am informed, to the press in the usual manner. My understanding was—I do not state that the thing was carried out because evidently the two hon. gentlemen who were sitting here did not have an intimation conveyed to them—that besides asking the Department of Militia to send everything that they had, besides suggesting that the Auditor General should be communicated with, I did say that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had asked a number of questions a day or two ago, and that I understood that the hon. member for South Cape Breton had contemplated making a motion, which at that time it was not intended to go on with. I suggested that they should be communicated with.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) might not care to be associated with this matter, as he is not here. My constituency is North Cape Breton and Victoria.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, I suppose it is easier to keep cool in North Cape Breton than in South Cape Breton. My information is that endeavours were made to reach the hon. member for Pictou, and that they were not successful, and that with regard to the hon. member for North Cape Breton, what I had said apparently had not been understood, so that the accident did happen that the sitting opened this morning without these gentlemen having been communicated with. The Auditor General, however, was communicated with, and we must remember that upon this record, so far as it goes, the basis and source of any imputation that may be involved in the documents that are produced is the letter of the Auditor General. The Auditor General, as I have said, was communicated with, and interested himself in the gathering of information. Now, I am informed that the meeting this morning was really intended as a preliminary opening of the inquiry. It was held, as I understand it, in the usual place. Newspaper reporters, who had been informed of the fact yesterday or the day before, were present. The commission adjourned. It is to sit on Tuesday at ten o'clock in the morning in the same place. The witnesses that were heard this morning will all be there and all available for examination.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will counsel be allowed?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am coming to that. Since hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious with regard to counsel in this particular matter, I am not disposed to make objections to counsel being given. I am prepared to admit that this matter is on a different footing from matters of the nature of those that have been investigated in the past, and above all, in view of the imputations which hon. gentlemen have seen proper to make upon the gentleman who occupies the position of adviser to the commission—whether he continues in that position or not is for him to decide after the conduct which we have witnessed this afternoon—if any hon. gentleman is prepared to assume the responsibility of such imputation or charge as may be contained in these papers and desires to be represented by counsel, I myself am quite ready to represent to the commissioner—I cannot undertake to control his action in the matter—that so far as I am concerned and this Government is concerned—and I am satisfied I speak for the Minister of Militia as well as for every other member of the Government—there is not the slightest objection in the world to counsel appearing before the commission upon this particular matter.

In all the imputations which hon. gentlemen are so ready to make, I sometimes wonder whether we do not find verified in this House, on one side of it at least more perhaps than anywhere else, the truth of the saying that people are prone to judge others by themselves. In view, however, of the imputations that have been made, and to make it perfectly clear that, notwithstanding those imputations, there is in this Government absolutely no desire in the world other than that anything that can be given, by any possible construction, the face or appearance of a charge against this Government or any member of it, should have the most ample and thorough and competent investigation possible. I am free to say that, so far as this particular matter is concerned, and under the circumstances I have mentioned, if any hon. gentleman desires to assume the responsibility of those charges, there will be no objection to his having

counel to conduct such prosecution as he may be advised before the commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. minister, but with his permission I desire to ask him a question. This commission of Sir Charles Davidson is appointed under the very same Act under which the Meredith-Duff Commission is appointed. In the Meredith-Duff Commission the Government agreed that the leader of the Opposition should name counsel, and counsel was appointed. Now these are very important charges made by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr McKenzie). Will the Government adopt the same course in this matter before Sir Charles Davidson as has been adopted in the Meredith-Duff Commission —arrange for the appointment of counsel and give that counsel the same status as counsel before the Meredith-Duff commission? If so, that would be an approach to reasonable fair play.

Mr. DOHERTY: What I have said, perhaps, goes further than we said we would do with regard to the Duff-Meredith Commission. What was said with regard to the Duff-Meredith Commission was that the Government would appoint counsel to assist the Commissioners, and that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should be at liberty to select one of these counsel. We have actually now counsel to assist the commission. I am going further; I am saying that if hon. gentlemen opposite take the responsibility of this charge and want counsel to prosecute, for whatever purpose may run in their minds, we will be willing that they should have counsel before the commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister seems to be not quite fair. All I ask him is this. We have here two cases. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) made certain charges with regard to the purchase of fuses, and for that the Government appointed a commission under the Inquiries Act to make investigation. Now, the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie has made certain charges with regard to the sale of ammunition. All I ask is that the Government should appoint counsel, having the same status exactly—neither more nor less—that Mr. Johnston has in the Meredith-Duff Commission. That is all we ask; will the minister do that?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have used the words of the English language, as I understand them, which convey the idea that we are willing that counsel should be appointed. I do not know that I have anything more to say. I do not follow what it is I am asked to define.

Mr. CARVELL: Take away the condition you imply.

Mr. DOHERTY: Do I understand that what is asked is, when we are giving counsel to act for the people of Canada generally, hon. gentlemen opposite say: That is no good, we want counsel to act for somebody who is not the public of Canada? Surely that somebody else must be the somebody taking the responsibility of the charges.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member for North Cape Breton is making the charges.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have said that there may be counsel before this commission to prove these charges the best he knows how. What further I can say I do not understand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am done. I did not rise to discuss the subject-matter of the so-called charge which the hon. member for North Cape Breton has made, and I have not gone into it. It is now before a competent tribunal of investigation, and I am absolutely satisfied to leave it there and to abide by the result which shall be reached. I rose only, I may say, because I felt that it was incumbent upon me, as a duty, not to let go unanswered such absolutely reckless vilification——

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think that is out of order, Mr. Speaker; the minister is forgetting himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. minister was referring to the words used by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie, or by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr Carvell), I think he is out of order; but I understand that not to be the case.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that under your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will have to admit that I was making that reference, and will have to withdraw the expression. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) suggested that I was forgetting myself. May I say that I was not forgetting myself that I was remembering the language of the hon. member for Carleton. However that language may be characterized, I felt that I should be doing very much less than my duty if I did not stand up to make—I do not know that I should call it a defence, because I am sure that the reputations of

the two gentlemen who have been attacked stand so high that they might be left to stand as the sole defence against the attack (I hope that is parliamentary) made upon them by the hon. member for Carleton. We had some discussion this afternoon on comparison of reputations. May I say to the hon. member for Carleton—and in this I am not depreciating in the slightest degree the height of his present reputation—that if he ever succeeds in attaining the reputation which Sir Charles Davidson has attained, after a long career lived out in the public eye, and under conditions in which his qualifications for such a position as he now occupies were put to the severest test, the hon. gentleman can flatter himself that his life has been that of one of the most honourable, the most distinguished of men whom Canada has produced.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, the matter now before the House may be said to be a sequel of what began as long ago as the 9th of March. The Minister of Justice charges my hon. friend from North Cape Breton with being in this position in bringing this matter before the House—that he desired to have something to talk about, having found that the Government had referred the matter to Sir Charles Davidson. The hon. minister should not have made that remark; it was totally unwarranted. It is just as well that we should be clear as to the facts. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), on Monday last, informed the Prime Minister that he proposed to make a motion based on the papers that had been brought down. It was after my hon. friend from North Cape Breton had intimated that he would move in this matter that the Prime Minister moved.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. There is no foundation whatever for that statement.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why not?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have already explained, but the hon. member must have overlooked it, that on Thursday or Friday last I spoke to the Minister of Justice and told him that Sir Charles Davidson should be instructed to proceed with that inquiry. He saw Sir Charles Davidson on Saturday, I think. On Monday he reported to us that Sir Charles Davidson thought that an additional Order in Council would be necessary, and the recommendation was brought to Council on Monday by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MACDONALD: It appears, then, that my right hon. friend discovered last Thursday that this was a matter that ought to be investigated. My right hon. friend was very slow in bringing down information to the House in regard to this question. It took him two months to give to this House information which he might have given within two weeks after the matter was first called to his attention.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not think it was as long as that.

Mr. MACDONALD: I will give the House the story of the way in which this matter came before Parliament. Last Thursday it developed in the mind of the Prime Minister that this was a matter that ought to be investigated, and he communicated the fact to the Minister of Justice. He knew, or ought to have known when the idea first developed in his mind, that there was no power in Sir Charles Davidson, under the Order in Council under which he had been appointed a commissioner, to deal with this matter. My right hon. friend knew that last Thursday.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The statement that my hon. friend has just made is not a correct statement. It was not presented to my mind at all that any further Order in Council would be necessary. That was first brought to my attention on Monday by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then my right hon. friend did not know the extent of the powers that he had previously conferred on Sir Charles Davidson?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I did not have the Order in Council before me, and it did not occur to me that it related to purchase and did not include sale.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why did my hon. friend not have in mind that according to the statement which he made to the House, and under the Order in Council creating the Meredith-Duff Commission he could have sent this matter to that commission without specially dealing with it? My right hon. friend intimated here more than once that the Order in Council creating the Meredith-Duff Commission contained powers which were sufficiently wide to enable him to send to that commission any matters coming up in Parliament that might require investigation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would have required an Order in Council even in that case. My hon. friend ought to know that.

Mr. MACDONALD: My right hon. friend some weeks ago constituted a commission which for the purposes of this discussion we will call the Meredith-Duff Commission. He announced and re-announced to the House that the Commission was constituted for the purpose of dealing not merely with those charges in which the name of J. Wesley Allison was mixed up, but with any other charges of a kindred nature that might arise. Some days after having brought down to the House the papers which, produced only a week ago Monday, he could have brought down long before that day, he decided that the papers which he himself had produced indicated the existence of a state of affairs which demanded an investigation. Instead of referring the matter to the commission which he had led the country to believe was constituted for the purpose of investigating matters relating to J. Wesley Allison, my right hon. friend in some inscrutable way decided to utilize the services of Sir Charles Davidson. Last Monday the member for North Cape Breton went to my right hon. friend and intimated to him that he purposed moving a resolution in the House based on the facts disclosed in the return brought down by the Prime Minister, and then and not till then did my right hon. friend disclose to the member for North Cape Breton the fact that he intended to refer the matter to Judge Davidson. What did my right hon. friend do subsequent to that? On Tuesday the Order in Council was passed. He did not notify Parliament; he did not bring the Order in Council down to the House. No one in the country except my right hon. friend and his colleagues knew that such an Order in Council existed. It was his duty to give us the facts.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I have already stated that when the member for North Cape Breton spoke to me on Monday last I told him that the matter was referred to the Davidson Commission.

Mr. MACDONALD: As a matter of fact, it had not been at that date.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The recommendation had been signed and sent to the Governor General for approval at the time that I made that statement to the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. MACDONALD: We have here in this file the memorandum of another Order in Council which had apparently been prepared but had never been approved or passed. It is rather curious, therefore, that my right hon. friend's Order in Council was in that position. But my right hon. friend has not told us why he failed to place on the table of the House the Order in Council which was passed on Tuesday.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I told the hon. member for North Cape Breton that the matter had been referred to the Davidson Commission. If the Order in Council had been asked for, I should have been perfectly willing to lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Prime Minister does not say that he mentioned anything about an Order in Council to me?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I told my hon. friend that the matter had been referred.

Mr. McKENZIE: There was no mention of an Order in Council.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It could only be referred by Order in Council of some kind.

Mr. MACDONALD: My right hon. friend admits that he did not tell the member for North Cape Breton that an Order in Council had been passed. He simply used the word "referred," not the words "Order in Council." How could we ask for the Order in Council when we never knew it had been passed? It is a peculiar fact that though my right hon. friend mentioned to the member for North Cape Breton and Victoria the fact that the matter had been referred, the member for North Cape Breton and Victoria had no notice of that, and never knew that such an Order in Council had been passed. The memorandum of Council, which is like the one in the Militia Department of January 5, which was never passed, might never have been passed at all. My right hon. friend can find no good excuse in the assertion which he makes that if the Order in Council had been asked for he would have brought it down. My right hon. friend should have brought down the Order in Council, because no one but himself and a few of his colleagues knew that such a document existed. I think my right hon. friend ought to tell us here and now what are the contents of the ref-

erence which has been made to Judge Davidson. I pause for a reply.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A copy of the Order in Council is here; it will be laid on the table of the House to-night. I handed it just now to the Minister of Justice; I will send it over to my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: At this juncture I might as well read this document. It is dated the 9th of May, and is as follows:

> The committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report dated 8th May, 1916, from the Minister of Justice submitting with reference to the commission of 2nd June, 1915, issued to the Honourable Sir Charles Peers Davidson to investigate the purchase of arms and munitions, etc., and the expenditures and payments therefor, that it is deemed desirable to extend the powers of the commissioner so as to enable him to inquire into and investigate the facts and circumstances of or connected with the sale or disposal by Your Royal Highness's Government of small arm munitions since 4th August, 1914, referred to in returns made to the House of Commons on the 1st and 2nd of May, 1916.
>
> The minister therefore recommends that Your Royal Highness cause inquiry to be made pursuant to part 1 of the Inquiries Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapter 104, concerning the aforesaid transactions and that a supplementary commission be issued in the case conferring and charging upon the commissioner all the powers and duties for the inquiry aforesaid which the commissioner has under and by virtue of the aforesaid commission of 2nd June, 1915.
>
> The committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

The Minister of Justice had the temerity to denounce my hon. friend for North Cape Breton for bringing on this resolution this afternoon because the Government had referred this matter to a commission. Yet no one ever saw this Order in Council outside of himself and the Prime Minister until this moment. The Minister of Justice really had the temerity to charge my hon. friend with having brought this question on for the purpose of discussing this matter in advance. That suggestion is not worthy of my hon. friend, and he would not have made it had he not been in a temper, and were it not for the fact that he was indulging in a species of buncombe such as I never heard him attempt to perpetrate in this House before.

The minister appealed to the House and the country to regard with indignation the suggestion made by my right hon. leader that Captain John Thompson, wearing as he does the King's uniform, engaged as he ought to be and no doubt is, in preparing himself to go overseas, and being a subordinate for the time being of the Minister of Militia and, as the Minister of Justice knows, under his control and direction, would place himself in an anomalous position by continuing to act in that investigation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD: As a friend of Captain John Thompson, as a professional man, I want to say that both from a military and a legal standpoint, and in view of all the ethics that apply to the professions both of law and of arms, my friend Captain John Thompson knows that he would occupy a most anomalous position before the people of this country if he undertook to go on with an investigation into the conduct of the man who is, at this moment, his superior officer. Such a suggestion as was made by my right hon. friend was an eminently proper one. My hon. friend's criticism was pure buncombe and playing to the gallery, and my hon. friend knows it very well. Not only was it unworthy of him, but I venture to say that I never saw him before descend to such tactics in discussing a public question. He complains because this resolution was introduced. Why sir, what are the facts of the case? The story is a long one. On March 9, over two months ago, I ventured to ask this question in the House:

> Mr. Macdonald:
>
> 1. Was any small arms ammunition disposed of by the Militia Department since August 4, 1914? If so, to whom?
>
> 2. What was the price received?
>
> Mr. Kemp: All serviceable ammunition has been issued to Canadian contingents. It would not be advisable to give the details during the present emergency, in the public interest.

The moment I saw that answer in Hansard I knew, as every hon. gentleman who read it must have known, that there was something very peculiar in regard to the question of the sale of small arms ammunition. I had no detailed information in regard to the matter; I had no means of knowing whether there was anything incorrect in the transaction. But the very answer given by the Minister of Militia at that time was an indication that he was concealing something that was suspicious. I proceeded to put further questions, and, quite unconscious of the fact that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) was moving along the same lines, and without any communication with him, I asked, on March 14, a general question in regard to the whole matter, while my hon. friend

asked a similar question on March 13. These questions remained unanswered for quite a number of days. On March 23rd my question was put and this occurred:

Mr. Macdonald:

1. Did any one purchase from the Militia Department, since August 4, 1914, any small arms ammunition?

2. If so, what quantity, and what price was paid therefor?

3. Who was the purchaser?

Mr. Kemp: Stand.

Mr. Macdonald: How long does my hon. friend expect this question to stand. It has stood for two weeks now.

Mr. Kemp: We will give the information just as soon as possible. We are doing everything possible in that direction.

One would think it was necessary to make some very involved and deep exploration in order to answer the question; yet all the papers relating to the transactions were lying in the Militia Department, and the transactions had been closed on the 1st day of January, 1916, and every hon. gentleman comprising the Government knew that a memorandum had come to council and had never been passed. Yet the Acting Minister of Militia wanted the House to believe that he was straining every energy to get this information in order to give it to the House. Finally, on March 27, an answer was given to the question of my hon. friend from Carleton. That answer was to the effect that this ammunition, which we are told to-day is no good at all, had been sold for money to various rifle clubs throughout the Dominion for the use of men who were practising and learning to shoot. At the end of the answer there came this statement:

To Vickers, Limited, a certain number of rounds of Mark VI, at $20 per thousand rounds represented to be for the purpose of testing machine guns.

The sale of a quantity of ammunition to Vickers-Maxim to be used for testing machine guns, coupled with the suspicious circumstances in connection with the returns up to that time, at once suggested to one's mind that here was a field in which further information might be desired. So following that, on March 29, I moved for an Order of the House, and I was met by my right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden), who told me that it was contrary to the public interest to disclose the quantity of ammunition that was sold. My right hon. friend indicated that I must amend my motion before I could have it passed. I was compelled to amend the motion, eliminating the matter of quantity, because, forsooth, there was liable to a national menace if the quantity were published. All this time the quantity that was sold, apart from the sale to Vickers-Maxim, was sold to people in this country for practising with the rifle, rifle clubs and organizations of that kind, so that the theory that the disclosure of the quantities would be liable to hurt somebody or be dangerous to the public interest was entirely illusory; it had no justification whatever.

What follows? On April 5 my question was answered. Varying slightly in terms from that of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), it had been dropped from the Order Paper in my absence from the House on the theory that the answer to the question of the hon. member for Carleton was a sufficient answer to my question. I was compelled to call the attention of the House to the fact that I had asked for certain information and that my question varied from that of the hon. member for Carleton. It was not until April 5 that my question was answered. On April 5, in a discussion with my hon. friend on the subject, he said:

I have no objection to this motion passing, subject, of course, to some consideration as to giving the quantities. I shall also endeavour to expedite it.

From April 5 to May 1 nothing was done with regard to bringing down the return, but on May 1, two months after we had started to get the most ordinary information in regard to this matter, the return was formally brought down. These facts indicate a condition of affairs which naturally would cause suspicion to be aroused in the public mind.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: On what date was the order passed by the House?

Mr. MACDONALD: April 5.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: When was the return brought down?

Mr. MACDONALD: On May 1.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is not two months.

Mr. MACDONALD: Two months, I said, elapsed from the time at which the matter was first broached in the House until the Government were able to bring down the return. My right hon. friend was not then in charge of the department, but the acting minister who was in charge knew that the subject was not only a matter of interest but that it was to come up in the

House and he ought to have been able to have got the return in much less time than it took. Well, the return was brought down. It goes into a lot of ancient documents that have no relevancy whatever to the question. Notwithstanding this unnecessary and irrelevant matter, what does the return disclose, beyond the shadow of a doubt? It discloses this and I speak from the official statement:

On September 8, 1915, Col. J. W. Allison, representing the Vickers, Limited, applied to purchase 236,000 rounds of Mark VI ammunition required by Sir Trevor Dawson.
Application approved by the minister.

These hon. gentlemen talk about the Quartermaster General having the sale of bad ammunition. Any theory of that kind, such as we heard put before the House this afternoon, vanishes in the face of the official statement. I find on page 13 of the return:

Application approved by the minister. The shipment in question was made on September 22.
On December 18 Col. Allison applied for 2,000,000 rounds of Mark VI ammunition.
Application approved by the minister.

No Quartermaster General is selling that ammunition. The minister sells it as this document shows. Imagine the temerity of hon. gentlemen in talking about bad ammunition and the Quartermaster General having power to sell it. It seems absurd in the face of this positive statement that this application was approved by the minister. Then:

On November 11, Col. Allison applied for 1,000,000 rounds of Mark VI ammunition for his principals.
Application approved by minister.
Later Col. Allison asked that this amount be increased to 2,000,000. This was authorized to be issued—

By the minister.

On December 18, Col. Allison applied for 2,000,000 rounds of Mark VI ammunition.

He applied in a telegram from New York in which he said he was there with the minister and that the minister had authorized the sale of this ammunition, but he wanted to let the Quartermaster General know about it. Inquiry was made by the proper officials to know if this quantity should be issued and at what price and it was:

Approved by minister—

On the 20th December, 1915.

—later endorsed by minister to ascertain by whom to be used, and if sold, to be by Order in Council. The deputy minister endorsed the application that this sale would only be by Order in Council.

Then we have the

Application for Order in Council as finally settled.

There was a memorandum from the minister asking the Governor General in Council for approval not merely for the sale of the balance of the 5,000,000 rounds of ammunition but for approval of the sale that he had effected without any Order in Council permitting him to do so. There the matter stood. No Order in Council was ever passed, and as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition pointed out this afternoon, the result was that a Minister of the Crown undertook to sell the property of the Canadian people without the authority or consent of the Crown which, under the law, he must and should have got before undertaking to dispose of that property.

These are the facts in connection with the matter. When you remember that this gentleman, Mr. J. Wesley Allison, was the man who negotiated this unusual and peculiar sale, you have a further condition under which investigation becomes absolutely imperative. Mr. J. Wesley Allison went to the minister first in regard to the purchase of this ammunition and the minister sent him to the Quartermaster General. Mr. J. Wesley Allison writes the Quartermaster General telling him, and his letter is to be found at page 16 of the return:

Referring to my arrangements with you some time ago for the purchase of 236,000,—303 Mark VI cartridges for Sir Trevor Dawson, I have just received a cable requesting me to have these shipped.

J. Wesley Allison arranges with the Minister of Militia that he is to get this quantity and then he writes to the Quartermaster General for the purpose of getting it. He writes to the Quartermaster General that he has been instructed by the minister to apply to him for the purpose of getting the ammunition. Then we find a statement made to the House and made in the memorandum accompanying the application for the Order in Council to the effect that this ammunition was required for testing purposes. There is not a line or word in any of these documents on record to show that the Vickers Maxim Company ever asked to get this ammunition for testing purposes. That is purely the creation of the minister in preparing the memorandum for council. No one of his subordinates made a statement of that kind. It is not here stated from any source that it was to be used for

testing purposes. Yet, the Government undertake to ratify that assertion by stating to Parliament, in answer to my hon. friend from Carleton, that they had sold a large quantity of this ammunition to the Vickers Company to be used for testing purposes. I would like to know where the minister who answered that question got that information. Is it to be found in any document? If it is contained in any document it should have been brought down. This House was entitled to see that document and to know whether the Vickers Maxim Company wanted this ammunition for testing purposes. It turns out when the minister does bring down the return, that he has placed on file a memorandum, a sort of apology or excuse or justification for the sale in which he intimates that this ammunition was not used for testing purposes at all but that it was wanted by the British Government.

Right here I want to ask the right hon. gentleman who leads the House what possible explanation he has for a department of this Government selling ammunition or anything else to the British Admiralty through the intervention of Col. J. W. Allison. If the British Admiralty wanted to buy ammunition, how is it that my right hon. friend was not communicated with? How is it that the British Admiralty did not communicate their wishes to this Government in the proper and official way? But that is not the situation; J. W. Allison appears in this transaction. This House and country is being absolutely deceived by the official statement made to the House that this ammunition was sold to Vickers-Maxim for testing purposes. It was not sold to Vickers-Maxim for testing purposes; the Government knows that, and the Minister of Militia knows it. But in some way this ubiquitous individual, J. W. Allison, who turns up at every corner in this country where there is a dollar to be made, is thrust into the position of mid-

10 p.m. dleman between this Government and the British Admiralty. My right hon. friend took very great care this afternoon not to refer to J. W. Allison. He said nothing whatever to defend or excuse him, or even indicate that he had any existence at all. True, the Minister of Militia once more rushed to the defence of his friend in his usual vigorous style; but the right hon. gentleman left J. W. Allison alone; he was not going to father him. He has not assumed any responsibility for him up to date, although this afternoon he did endeavour to assume responsibility for the righteousness of the sale of this ammunition. But he was not going to assume responsibility for J. W. Allison. He told us that this ammunition was no good. Why was it no good? Because it was under suspicion. And he quoted Colonel Barlow's report that the ammunition was not to be used in Mark II rifles.

And yet the ammunition was sold. During the past year I find that Major J. S. Thom, of Sarnia, for instance, purchased 1,000 rounds of this very same ammunition; the Prince Edward Island Provincial Rifle Association also purchased a large quantity; the Amherst Canadian Rifle Association purchased 1,000 rounds of this ammunition on two occasions; the 63rd Regiment, in the constituency of my hon. friend, purchased 4,754 rounds of this very same ammunition, which the minister says he will never allow to get into the hands of our boys who are fighting at the front. But he is willing to let the 63rd Regiment take the chance of shooting themselves while practising rifle shooting with this ammunition; he did not care about them. Then the 183rd Rifle Association purchased 1,100 rounds; the Morven Canadian Rifle Association, 600 rounds, and the 20th "B" Horse.

Mr. OLIVER: What did they pay?

Mr. MACDONALD: The price varied according to the amount purchased. Some paid $20, and here it says that $25 was paid by the 20th "B" Horse, but it does not indicate whether that was the price per thousand rounds, or for the total quantity bought.

What did the Minister of Militia mean this afternoon when he talked about the Quartermaster General having power to dispose of this ammunition without an Order in Council? Did he want the House to believe that Quartermaster General Macdonald had sold this ammunition without his authority? If he did not mean that, what was he talking about the Quartermaster General for? In addition to the names given in the main return, there appears in the supplementary return a list of other parties to whom this ammunition was sold. Under the authority of the Minister of Militia we find that Vickers, Limited, of London, bought 236,000, 2,000,000 and 750,000 rounds at different times. The man who was responsible and whose authority was given for the sale of

these three lots is given in the official document as the hon. Minister of Militia. It is clearly proven beyond the shadow of a doubt in regard to these various items that the Minister of Militia himself directed the sale of the ammunition to Allison. There is nothing in these returns to indicate for one minute that the ammunition was to be used for testing purposes. The first time any suggestion was made about its being used for testing purposes was in the memorandum sent by the minister to Council on the 5th of January.

It appears further from this return, from the statement of the minister himself justifying this transaction, that the sale was not to Vickers-Maxim at all, but that the ammunition ultimately went to the British Admiralty. These are the facts, unquestioned and undoubted, that are given in the return. These are the facts that the Government was fooling with from March 5 to May 1, and were preventing from getting to the public. I should like to ask the Prime Minister why the answer was given on March 5 that serviceable ammunition had been issued to all Canadian contingents, but that in the public interest it would not be advisable to give details during the present emergency. Why was that answer given if it was not to prevent the information from being given to the public? The defence made this afternoon was that the Quartermaster General had disposed of this ammunition, but I have proved from the return that he did not sell it, and that it was sold directly under the authority of the minister. Other documents in the return indicate that in December the minister and Allison were conferring in New York, and wired up to Ottawa that a large quantity of ammunition be provided, but the deputy minister made a memorandum, which is on the return here, to the effect that the requisition would have to go to Council for sanction. So much for the Quartermaster General and his power.

My right hon. friend this afternoon went at great length into Colonel Barlow's report as to the quality of the ammunition. It is needless for the Minister of Militia to make assertions that he is not going to let any of his boys at the front fight with this ammunition, as if there was any chance of them getting bad ammunition unless he put it into their hands. He need not make doughty assertions of that kind, as if we were forcing bad ammunition upon them. Who is doing that? No one. If this ammunition was of no value why did the British Admiralty want it, and why did this Government sell it to them through its own minister? If the ammunition was no good, why did they put through a transaction, through their own middlemen, whereby the boys on the ships and in the naval brigades in England were provided with ammunition which the minister would not allow the boys in the Canadian regiments to use? Having regard to the fact that all the forces of the Empire are one, what difference does it make whether the ammunition explodes in the rifle in the hands of a boy in one of the naval brigades in England, or in the hands of a Canadian soldier? Why should an attempt be made to mislead the public in regard to this ammunition? Why is it asserted that the ammunition was of no value, when the British Admiralty got it and used it? And this Government knew that the British Admiralty got it and used it. If they knew this ammunition was no good, they were guilty of a crime against the state and against the Empire in permitting improper ammunition to go into the hands of any portion of the forces of the Empire. Yet they did that, and they kept on selling to the men in the rifle club throughout this country this ammunition for practice. It is no wonder that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister came to the conclusion that the matter deserved to be investigated. The question is as to whether he is going to give that full and complete investigation which he avowed to the country he was prepared to do in regard to all matters. He can choose two tribunals, both in existence at the present time, one presided over by two distinguished judges with ample counsel representing all possible parties, a tribunal in active operation which can proceed with the inquiry at once. My right hon. friend said that there were witnesses available in town which could be heard at once. Who were the witnesses? Col. J. Wesley Allison is in town. Does my right hon. friend mean to say that that gentleman may skip out before the Meredith-Duff Commission would get through with him in regard to this matter? What other witnesses are in town? This transaction is not one in which Americans are involved; it is a transaction in which men of the British race are involved, and I am quite sure that if it is necessary to get information from England, means could be adopted to get that information. We are not dealing with aliens in this matter, and it is within the purview of the

Meredith-Duff Commission if my right hon. friend would give it the power to deal with the matter. His only excuse for not giving them that power is that there were some witnesses in town.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is not correct.

Mr. MACDONALD: What is the excuse?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is not an excuse; it is a reason. The reason was that the Meredith-Duff Commission had been appointed to deal with expenditures made by the British Government. The Sir Charles Davidson Commission had been appointed to deal with matters that directly concerned this Government, as that matter does. Therefore, it was thought advisable that it should be referred to that commission.

Mr. MACDONALD: If my right hon. friend will pardon me, that is not a very good reason, and if he will stop to think for a moment, he will see that this is peculiarly a matter that ought to go before the Meredith-Duff Commission, because it is a matter affecting the sale of ammunition by this Government to the British Government. According to the facts that are admitted, the British Government purchased from this Government certain small arms ammunition.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not admit anything of the kind. I have already stated that no such proposal ever came to the attention of the Government, so far as I am aware. The proposal that came to the Government was that this ammunition should be sold or its sale ratified to Vickers, Limited, of England.

Mr. MACDONALD: This is the statement of the minister himself. My right hon. friend has seen this memorandum.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: What does the hon. member say contrary to that?

Mr. MACDONALD: The memorandum says:

> It is understood that, to cover the cost of transport, handling, exchange, insurance, etc., a sum was added, by one of Vickers' officers, to the price, but, on learning that these expenditures were borne by the British Government, they were immediately removed.

My hon. friend the Minister of Militia this afternoon stated that this ammunition went to the British Admiralty.

[Mr. Macdonald.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Does not the statement that my hon. friend holds in his hand state definitely that the ammunition was sold to Vickers, Limited?

Mr. MACDONALD: Certainly.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That was what I was alluding to.

Mr. MACDONALD: But it was resold by Vickers, Limited, to the Admiralty, according to the statement of the Minister of Militia this afternoon.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not remember that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not only that, but he says in this memorandum:

> The assurance was given that not one cent was paid in commission by the firm to any one, and no profit was made on it. It is understood that, to cover the cost of transport, handling, exchange, insurance, etc., a sum was added, by one of Vickers' officers, to the price, but, on learning that these expenses were borne by the British Government, they were immediately removed.

These munitions went to the British Government; they went to the Admiralty. I say this is essentially a case that ought to have gone to the Meredith-Duff Commission because it referred to relations between this Government and the Admiralty in regard to ammunition. The Meredith-Duff Commission was the proper tribunal; the counsel were there, everything was in readiness to proceed; J. Wesley Allison was before the commission or going to be before it. My right hon. friend must admit that it was an unnecessary and unusual act on his part when he proceeded to resurrect Sir Charles Davidson and hand the matter over to him. We have the question before the House and the country as to which would be the better tribunal, and after a long discussion this evening, the Minister of Justice indicated that he might be prepared to appoint counsel, but he was very careful in regard to that; he was making very large reservations in regard to what he was going to do, and he did not speak with frankness in regard to the subject. I say that the Davidson Commission is not the proper commission to try this matter. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister knows that; he knows that Sir Charles Davidson is a jurist who has retired from the bench; that he is a very old gentleman; that the task of dealing with this matter or any matter of an investigation is one that requires strenuous virility on the part of any judge. I remember, when my right hon. friend was leading the Opposition, that the present Mr. Justice Lennox,

who was one of his lieutenants, discussed year in and year out the lack of wisdom in appointing judges as commissioners to deal with matters of this kind. I say without hesitation that the Sir Charles Davidson Commission is not one which has the confidence of the country at the present time.

Just let us see what was said to-day in one of our papers in regard to the subject. I agree that in this country the maintenance of the fair name of the judiciary is one of the highest possible importance, because anything that would create a lack of confidence in the mind of the public in the men who have to sit as judges would be an unfortunate thing for the people and for the state. This is a letter which I think is worthy of the attention of the House:

> The following is some of the evidence given by Mr. Allison as it appeared in the press report of the 8th instant, before the Davidson commission
>
> Have you any letter to act as agent for General Hughes?—No, I had letters of introduction from him and I found the minister's influence was of great assistance to me.
>
> Was the introduction to the Colt Company one?—I am not sure. I think I knew the Colt officers before that, but not in a business way.
>
> "I am to understand," asked Sir Charles, "that while you had letters of introduction from General Hughes you never utilized them?" —Not for business, but for social purposes.
>
> Is there anything in that evidence which would possibly give Sir Charles Davidson to understand 'that while you had letters of introduction from General Hughes you never utilized them'? Is this not rather the evidence of Commissioner Davidson than of Allison? Then look at Allison's answer.

So says the wily Allison.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Who signs the letter?

Mr. MACDONALD: The letter is anonymous.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD: The fact that it is an anonymous letter does not make any difference because it draws an inference which an eminent lawyer like my right hon. friend would draw himself. The letter goes on:

> —and yet Allison says at the commencement that he found "the minister's influence was of great assistance to him." Socially or commercially, which did he mean? We don't know who he met socially; we know what he did commercially. Is it any wonder the public grin when they read the report of a commission such as this?—Reader.

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice dilated upon the tremendous work of this commission and the fact that it had been sitting for a year.

Anyone who stops to think will realize that what Judge Davidson has been doing is trying a number of different cases during the past year, just as every judge who sits in the Supreme Court of any of our provinces. But, although he has been trying these cases, and began to deal with them last autumn—September or even earlier—he has never given judgment in a single one. What is the reason he does not decide in regard to the question of the purchase of horses in Kings County, Nova Scotia? He tried that case last fall. It has no relation to anything that he is trying to-day. Any judge would be almost driven off the Bench, or, at the very least, difficulty would be raised, if he should reserve judgment as long as Sir Charles Davidson has reserved judgment in this case. Everybody knows that Mr. Foster, the gentleman who was concerned in that matter, is telling his friends that he is going to be whitewashed, and that he will be the candidate of the party in Kings County again. My right hon. friend (Sir Robert Borden) has heard that.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN I have heard nothing of the kind.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then all I can say is that the right hon. gentleman is getting very badly out of touch with his own home constituency. Is there any warrant under heaven for Sir Charles Davidson, who tried that case in regard to the Kings County horses not giving judgment? That is what the people of the county are asking. It is a very singular thing that even though the evidence in these cases is all in, this gentleman cannot take time to consider the question of fact involved and sit down and write a judgment. Though Parliament has been sitting for four months, and though we have asked that some suggestion be made that this report should be brought down, we are going to close next week and there will be no report. And there may be no report when we come together for next session. Yet the Prime minister in giving another case to this judge who never decides anything, another case to be put away, never to be decided and never heard tell of. Had my hon. friend committed the task of inquiry in this matter to the Meredith-Duff Commission, he knows there would be a finding within a reasonable time. If it is given to Sir Charles Davidson, who has worked so hard that he cannot decide the cases he tried nearly a year ago, when can we hope for a declaration from the commissioner as to his opinion on the facts of the case?

Now, just a word in regard to Mr. Thompson. The heroics of the minister about Mr. Thompson were most amusing. Mr. Thompson is a very estimable gentleman, no better and no worse than hundreds of young men of his age and experience at the Bar. It has been pointed out that this gentleman is in active training to go overseas. He is asked to intermit his duties of preparing to go to the front, to go before the Davidson Commission and sit in condemnation of his superior officer, the Minister of Militia, the supreme commander of the forces of Canada. To say that this is not an anomaly is to say something absolutely ridiculous. According to the ethics either of the Bar or of the military profession, it is not open to Mr. John Thompson to conduct this inquiry into matters that affect the Minister of Militia. The Minister of Justice might well have spared us his heroics. He is dropping into an imitation of the Minister of Militia in the curious speech we had this afternoon, casting slurs upon hon. gentlemen on this side because they were not in uniform. I look about me here and see two men whose boys are at the front, one of them wounded —twice wounded. I see about me vacant chairs which were filled by men who are preparing to go to the front. This suggestion from the Minister of Militia or from any other man that we are not answering the call is a disgrace to the country. The Minister of Justice ought to have hesitated before indulging in the rhodomontade in which he did indulge following the Minister of Militia. The speech of the Minister of Militia, even his friends must realize, is a very singular one. When he undertook to compare this gentleman, Mr. J. Wesley Allison with our right hon. leader on this side of the House, he sunk to a very low level. I care not what politics men have when a man occupying the position of the Minister of Militia talks about our distinguished leader in the same breath as this nondescript individual, J. Wesley Allison, there is not a decent person from one end of the country to the other who will not wonder if the man has lost his senses. Such utterances are so ridiculous that one feels he should hardly mention them. But when, in Parliament documents are laid on the Table, and the statement made in those documents—not statements made outside—show such a situation to exist that the Government of their own volition determine that an investigation must be had, that the House and country must listen to the diatribes we heard this afternoon from the minister affected, seems a most anomalous and peculiar condition of affairs. The Government admit that the matter requires investigation. The natural and proper tribunal to deal with this matter was the Meredith-Duff tribunal. The right hon. gentleman has failed in his responsibility, and the House and the country knows that he is not doing his duty, in suggesting that Sir Charles Davidson should investigate this subject. Why, Sir, are we to have the farce going on of a matter in which the name of a minister of the Crown is involved being sent before a tribunal in which no person is interested in bringing out the facts? That is the position; that is what the Government proposes. I say, such an investigation would be a farce, and my right hon. friend knows it.

The issue, therefore, before the House, is whether we will or will not have a proper investigation. The act of the Government was forced by the persistence with which this matter was kept before the House, and if it had not been kept before the House continually by questions and motions, the Government would never have moved even to commit this investigation to hands that will not deal with it vigourously, to a tribunal from whom we probably shall not have a report for a year or more. And then it will be urged that because there has been no finding on the facts, no action should be taken. That is not the way to deal with it; it should be dealt with vigorously, sternly. Is it to be said that in one of the great dominions its ammunition in war time can be juggled with by fakirs and speculators and middlemen, eventually to find its way to the hands of the Mother Country and to the men who are fighting our battles? This story about the Quartermaster General is all moonshine; this story about ammunition not being good is all moonshine. If this ammunition was good enough for the boys of the Naval Brigade in Great Britain to shoot with, it was good enough for Canada to keep for herself, or, if she wanted to sell it, to sell it after direct negotiation, in a proper, legal way, with the Imperial Government.

There is no question about the facts. The only issue, Sir, is as to whether this matter will be investigated thoroughly and completely in the manner proposed by the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria, or whether we shall have a farcical investigation which will give no satisfaction to the people of this country.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. McKenzie.

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Chisholm (Antigonish),	Nesbitt,
Copp,	Oliver,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Knowles,	Pugsley,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Sinclair,
Lemieux,	Turgeon,
Macdonald,	Turriff,
Maclean (Halifax),	Warnock—17.
McKenzie,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Ball,	McCurdy,
Barnard,	McLean
Bennett (Simcoe),	(Queen's, P.E.I.),
Best,	Marshall,
Blain,	Meighen,
Borden (Sir Robert),	Merner,
Boyce,	Morphy,
Boys,	Rhodes,
Casgrain,	Robidoux,
Clark (Bruce),	Roche,
Clements,	Rogers,
Currie,	Schaffner,
Davidson,	Scott,
Donaldson,	Sexsmith,
Fisher,	Stewart (Lunenburg),
Fripp,	Sutherland,
Gray,	Walker,
Hazen,	Wallace,
Henderson,	White (Sir Thomas),
Jameson,	Wright—40.
Macdonell,	

PAIRS.

Government.	Opposition.
Messieurs	
Alguire	McMillan
Arthurs	Truax
Baker	Kay
Bristol	Bickerdike
Bradbury	Cruise
Burrell	Douglas
Casgrain	Lemieux
Cockshutt	Charlton
Chabot	Beland
Clements	Knowles
Crothers	McCoig
Davidson	Chisholm (Antigonish)
Doherty	Marcil (Bonaventure)
Fowler	McLean (Sunbury & Queens)
Green	White (Victoria)
Hartt	Thomson (Qu'Appelle)
Hazen	Pugsley
Kemp	Robb
Lewis	McCraney
McLeod	Carvell
Middlebro	Guthrie
McCurdy	McLean (Halifax)
Morrison	MacNutt
Nickle	Martin (Regina)
Rainville	Seguin
Reid	Power
Sharpe	Ross
Smyth	Tobin
Stanfield	Pardee
Steele	Loggie
Stevens	Buchanan
Stewart (Lunenburg)	McKenzie
Taylor	Carroll
Tremain	Chisholm (Inverness)
White (Renfrew)	Devlin
Wilson (Wentworth)	Wilson (Laval)

Mr. DOHERTY: I was paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). Had I voted I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CROTHERS: But that I was paired with the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. McCoig), I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. MORRISON: I was paired with the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt), otherwise I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. CARVELL: I was paired with the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. McLeod), otherwise I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan), otherwise I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. GREEN: I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria, Alta. (Mr. W. H. White), otherwise I should have voted against the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Canadian Northern Railway Company—loan not exceeding $15,000,000.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations in order to have them placed on Hansard and to direct them to the attention of the Government, particularly of the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of the Interior. I purpose making them upon this item. The problem of the best solution of our railway question is one that I cannot discuss in any very full way. Different speakers have had different solutions to offer, and different observations to make. The observation that I desire to make is that there is one way to render our railways successful, and that is to develop our country, especially the West, in such a way that there will be more business for the railways. The facts and figures which I propose to offer on that bear out

the contention I desire to make, namely that we have at our disposal in Western Canada an enormous quantity of arable land which, if put to use as it was meant to be, would give a sufficient production of wealth in this country to enable us to better bear our burdens, speaking in a general sense, and would afford increased business for the railways. The three railways we have on our hands, I suppose, like other business concerns, are for the purpose of doing business. No business man, and no association of business men, having established a great factory or plant, would say that they had arrived at the goal which was before them when they had merely constructed their plant. The building of our railways is in itself only a means towards an end. It is worse than useless to build railways unless you are going to use them. It is worse than useless to build a factory unless you are going to use your brains to get grist for your mill, goods to manufacture, and markets in which to sell them. We in Canada have these railways, and they have a certain thing to sell, namely transportation; and you cannot sell transportation unless there is something to transport and unless there are men who are able to pay for that transportation, or, in other words, are able to buy the thing that you are ready to offer on the market. While there may be many suggestions to be made as to other ways in which this principle might be applied, such as in the development of our manufacturing industries, I, coming from the West, wish to call the attention of the committee to something which I think worthy of the attention of this House and of this country, from the viewpoint of the great resources we have lying in the West.

Last year we had in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and I speak of those two provinces alone, nearly 15,000,000 of acres of land under cultivation. I take the figures from the statistical departments of this Government. The total amount of arable land which is at our disposal in those two western provinces is 190,000,000. We had 15,000,000 acres, approximately, under cultivation, producing wealth for this nation, and 175,000,000 acres lying idle. There must be some reason for this. There must be something that is standing in the way of using that great national resource that we have there, and my point this evening is, without any reference to party issues whatever, that whatever is standing in the way of the development of these western acres, surely there must be in Canada brains enough to find out how to use and develop and make productive that great national asset that is lying there, not being developed in any way. Of course we cannot develop it all in a day, or in a year, or perhaps in a decade. During recent years, and I shall not weary the House with comparative figures, we have not been stretching out our arms to take into the national use these great national assets. We are not developing in the direction of even gradually exploiting that great national asset which lies before us. Last year according to the statistics of the Government, and I have no reason to doubt their accuracy, the value of the crops produced on those 15,000,000 acres in those two western prairie provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, was over three hundred million dollars. If we could apply the same proportion to these unused arable lands, we would have, not three hundred million dollars, but three billion, nine hundred million dollars. When we are through with this war we are going to have an enormous debt; it may be one billion dollars; it may be two billion dollars. The interest on it will be probably fifty million dollars per annum at the least. Here there lies in our hands and in our possession 175,000,000 acres of land which, if they were to produce at the rate the acres in use last year yielded, would produce in one year three billion, nine hundred million dollars worth of produce, a value four times as great as this terrible war debt that is staring us in the face. I desire to say to this Government, and especially to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, that the responsibility that rests upon him at this time is very great. We have other resources. We have the fisheries, the mines, the lumber; we have our industries, our manufacturing plants, and all of these can, no doubt co-operate, and can in a very great way help us to meet this tremendous obligation that is before us. But, all said and done, while I may be partial to the West, and, like many a western man, may think more of it in a comparative sense than I ought to think, yet. when you see lying there, unused, 175,000,000 acres of land, you must realize that we have in our hands an asset that it is our duty to develop to the greatest degree possible.

There may be some difficulties in bringing this about. Of course there is the difficulty of immigration, and of that I shall say nothing, because there are reasons why to-day, and for the last two or three years, we are not able to achieve all we should like. But I make this suggestion to the

Minister of the Interior and to the Minister of Finance, that, in the case of such of this land which is lying idle as is owned by private owners, they should penalize the holding of that land in such a way that men would have to use it. Men are holding enormous stretches of land, within 5, 10 or 20 miles of the railways, just waiting for the rise of the market. They went in at the low prices, they went in for the purpose of speculating and trafficking in the unearned increment of this country; and I declare that I would penalize the holding of this land. That may seem a strong word, and there are many upon whom it would bear very hardly; but the financial desperateness of our country is going to be such that I would feel quite justified, for my part, in penalizing men who hold land not for use, because we have no time in Canada to-day to waste pity on the men who want to lie still and wait for the unearned increment to make millionaires of them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Would that not be a matter for the Provincial Governments rather than for the Dominion?

Mr. KNOWLES: I think the observation of the Minister of Finance is well taken, and I had that in mind when I said that surely there are in Canada men who could devise some remedy.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are not the provinces in the West doing that now by the super-tax?

Mr. KNOWLES: They are doing it now in a degree, about $10 per quarter-section. But that is not meeting the purpose that I have in view. It is true that this matter really comes under the provincial jurisdiction, but we are a democracy, and surely no man will say that because it happens, by the accident of our constitution, that the provinces have a more direct and more customary control of the taxation of land, we are going to lie down and say that we can do nothing. Immigration is under the Federal jurisdiction; the administration of the war is under this Government; and those things to a certain extent would justify this Government in saying that the interest of trade and commerce, the interest of the war, the interest of immigration, require that this Parliament should exert its powers and pass such legislation as is necessary to ensure the cultivation of that land.

If it were only a matter of amending our constitution that would be in itself a very simple thing. These provinces down here do not realize the necessity because the matter has not pressed itself upon them as it has upon us. This fetish of the British North America Act which you invoke when any change is proposed is only a fetish after all and it is a small thing to stand in the way of bringing under cultivation 175,000,000 acres of land. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) would agree with me that in a democratic country like ours, possessing great resources, a great part of which belonged to the Crown, when you find great areas in the hands of speculators, men who are not using the land for cultivation, the question of amending the British North America Act is a very small thing to stand in the way of the cultivation of this land. Make it gradual. Undoubtedly it would force down the price of land.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would my hon. friend give us an idea of what portion of the 175,000,000 acres is owned by the Crown and what portion is granted?

Mr. KNOWLES: I am sorry I cannot do that. I might have anticipated that question and I recognize my oversight in not having informed myself on that point. But in regard to that which is owned by speculators, and there is an enormous quantity owned by private individuals, I would adopt means such as I have suggested. In regard to the other, surely we can get experts to advise us if the minister thinks the task is too large to be undertaken by himself. We have a countless number of commissioners trying to find out academic things, and you might as well try to find out what the moon is made out of for any good that that is going to do. If there ever was a commission that would be justified, I think it would be a commission that would tell us how to go about this question so as to enable men to get on these other lands which are still in the hands of the Crown. We are going to have 175,000 or 200,000 soldiers coming back from the war. Many of them will be able to work on the land while others will not. With all the modern agricultural machinery now in use, a man with an arm off, or otherwise incapacitated, can often do a great deal more work on the farm than he can in the city. I do not see any reason why a tax should not be put on companies, and on those men who are rich enough to hold land for speculation, and why you should not use that money for the purpose of developing the lands still in the hands of the Government. Surely something of that kind could be worked out in order that men could go on the land.

Mr. WRIGHT: Is there not a scheme before one of the legislatures to put a tax of 30 cents an acre on uncultivated land? I understood there was such a proposal.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes, there is an extra charge of $10 on 160 acres of uncultivated land.

Mr. WRIGHT: But I understood there was a proposal to impose a tax of 30 cents an acre.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am not aware of it. I was speaking only of my own province, and there, I understand, it is $10 per quarter section. The expense incurred in getting this thing under way would not be very great. It might have to start in a small way, but we should not allow that land to lie idle for such a long time. We cannot speak of conditions as if they were normal conditions. We can only speak of the last conditions we know of as being normal. In Moosejaw we had men walking the streets by scores who were crying out for work, men who wanted simply to make a living, and they could not get work of any kind. Out on the prairies there was this immense number of acres crying for men to come and work. There was something wrong when these two could not be brought together—the men seeking work and the land belonging to this Government crying out for men to come and work it. Then we saw that there was no encouragement for these two to be brought together. The raw material was there, and the men were there ready to exercise their muscle on the raw material, but the conditions were not sufficiently encouraging to bring the two together. Surely we could make these conditions encouraging enough to bring these two elements together. You are bonusing every kind of industry. By protection you are bonusing them all. It may be hard to work out, but surely we can work out some system by which men will go on the land and use it for the purpose for which it was meant to be used. No doubt the minister can throw many difficulties in the way. Suppose a man owned one section of land instead of the millions of acres we own. He has been a man of comparative wealth before and has had no trouble in meeting his payments. But, suppose he met with reverses and had to live more economically, to use other resources for his income, the first thing he would do would be to go to his section of land and start work at farming. I have seen many a man in Moosejaw do the same thing. A man got "busted" in real estate, or in trading jack knives that had been making a fortune for him, he took his land and he is doing better than he ever did before. We, the Government, are in one sense a great big farmer with an immense farm of 175,000,000 acres, we are in a desperate position financially and we have the ability to produce $3,900,000,000 worth of grain in one year. Why not use that immense farm in such a manner as to increase our income and thus create a business that will make us able to meet our financial obligations?

Hon. W. J. ROCHE (Minister of the Interior): Just a few words in regard to western land settlement. I quite agree that we have a very large area of unsettled land but it must be remembered that a very large proportion has already been alienated from the Crown. It has passed into the hands of railway companies in the form of land grants. Whether we have had a judicious system in the past or not it would be altogether useless to discuss at the present time. In the early history of Canada it was absolutely essential to hold out extraordinary inducements to get the great West opened up by means of railways and as a consequence of this a very large acreage was alienated from the Crown. There is also a large area in the hands of private speculators, land companies and individuals, in addition to regular homesteaders and others holding Government land. The question of compelling these people to bring this land under cultivation is a very important one, a very complex one and one which more directly comes within provincial jurisdiction. The provincial legislatures have attempted to grapple with it during the last few years by means of taxing wild land and a surtax on uncultivated land. I do not know of anything that they have quoted in the United States to discredit immigration very much more, with the exception of conscription, than the question of provincial taxation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Or the duty on grain.

Mr. ROCHE: No, I heard very little about the duty on grain when I was there. A great deal of fault has been found on the part of residents of the United States with the provincial taxation on land companies. Representatives of these companies have been down here giving their

evidence before the Economic Development Commission, complaining bitterly of the discouragement to the investment of capital in Canada by reason of the very large taxation that has been put on land by means of that surtax. I am not finding any fault with the local legislatures for having adopted that policy. I think it is the best policy to penalize people who are holding out uncultivated land in order that it may be brought under cultivation. But at the same time it has its side of criticism and the premier of Saskatchewan, when I invited him to attend the conference of immigration agents in February, devoted almost his entire remarks to a justification of his Government in imposing this surtax.

One thing the American papers have made a great deal of in trying to keep the American farmers at home has been the printing of facsimiles of the tax notices sent out through western Canada. In one column they will show general taxes, in another school taxes, and in another gopher taxes, and so on, giving the American people the impression that the Canadians are taxed to death. America is, of course, more thickly populated and their lands are higher priced than ours, and the American farmers would not look so much to the total of these taxes as to the number of different items, and those interested in discouraging immigration have made the utmost possible capital out of this. The hon. gentleman has said that this is a large question which should be referred to some commission. That has been done already. The Economic Commission has been working on it during the past year.

Mr. KNOWLES: Were the commissioners selected for their fitness to grapple with an economic question of this kind?

Mr. ROCHE: It is an honorary commission, but an honorary commi sion is, as a rule, composed of competent and representative men. This commission is comprised of farmers, business men, land men, transportation men—representative men from every province of the Dominion almost. I think it is a very good commission.

Mr. KNOWLES: It is too big.

Mr. ROCHE: They can collect information just the same as any other commission; I know that they have had this question under consideration, and that they have had a number of witnesses before them. Perhaps they are not getting on as expeditiously as we should like, but Senator Lougheed, of course, has been very busy during the session and probably has not had the time that he would otherwise have been able to devote to it. In this problem of land settlement the provincial Governments should act in co-operation with the Dominion. The provincial Governments themselves have a great deal to do with land settlement. I think one of the essential questions for Canada to determine is what we are going to do with the immigrants who come to this country after the war. I am afraid we are going to have a large immigration, probably of those who have never been brought up on the farm, and who know little about agriculture. To put these men on the farm without previous agricultural experience and without capital would be useless. They must have training of some kind, either at an agricultural college or by seeing the demonstrations or experimental Farms, and so on. That is a matter that should be taken up by the provincial Governments. Manitoba is grappling with it already. They set aside a sum of money last session to purchase stock to assist poor farmers. These men, of course, have to be hand-picked. Then there is the system of agricultural credits. A few years ago I understand that the various Governments in the West sent a commission to nearly every country in Europe and the United States, gathering evidence on this question. The commissioners made a report to their respective Governments as to the policy that should be pursued with regard to agricultural credits, but I do not think there has been any practical outcome as yet. In Saskatchewan some law was placed on the statute-book, but it has not been taken advantage of. I think we should do everything we can to encourage those who come out to this country to go upon the land. That would involve the expenditure of a very large sum of money; there is no question about that; and that is one reason why, at the present time, when all our energies should be devoted to the winning of the war, we should not launch out upon any expenditure in this direction. As a matter of fact I do not look for any large immigation to Canada until after the war is over. History teaches us that there is little immigration to any country at war. But after the war I think we shall have abundance of immigration although I will not pledge myself that it will be of the kind that we have been endeavouring to secure—that is, agriculturists. We have had a very large immigration in years gone by. In the year ending

March 31, 1914, 385,000 immigrants came to Canada, and in the year before, 402,000—the largest number in the history of Canada. It may be true that not so many are taking up homesteads, but that is not a good criterion by which to judge. Many of these immigrants did not go to our western provinces at all, but located in the East. Then many of those who went out to the West went out as agricultural labourers, and never put in homestead entries. For the years ending March 31, 1914, and March 31, 1915, there was a larger immigration into the province of Ontario than into the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta combined. So you cannot say that the immigration is not of the right sort, simply judging by the homestead entries. I quite realize the importance of the subject the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has brought before the House. We expect a report from the Economie Commission in the very near future. It does not necessarily follow that their recommendations will be adopted in toto, or even in part, but at any rate we shall have the benefit of what information they collect, and shall then be in a better position to judge what policy to adopt.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): I think the question raised by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) is one of the most important this House could discuss. No one doubts that when this war is over Canada will have a tremendously large debt, with a large fixed sum to pay annually on account of interest and sinking fund. Unquestionably, also, if we can increase the population of Canada we shall lessen to just that extent the per capita payments on that debt. For instance, if within the next ten years the population of Canada doubles our per capita payment will be halved. It is quite true, as the minister says, that a great part of the 175,000,000 acres that the hon. member for Moosejaw spoke of has passed into the hands of private owners, and there is no object in going into that subject now. But there is in the northern part of the three Prairie Provinces many millions of acres that are not prairie lands in the sense that the plains of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are. In that area north of the Saskatchewan river from lake Winnipeg westerly there is a large stretch of park lands north of Prince Albert. There are some stretches of prairie and great stretches of timber land; but the timber is mostly poplar, and poplar is nearly always found on dry land. It is first class land when it is cleared up, and grow splendid crops. Every one in the West knows that poplar bush is easy to clear up; the stumps come out very easily, or in the course of a few years they will rot out. When you get as far west as Edmonton, that class of country extends four or five hundred miles north of the Saskatchewan river, and in some places a great deal more, and as you go further west, the country is much more open. Probably only part of that country could be called first class land, as compared with the country in the southern portions of the province, but it is very well suited for mixed farming. I know that in the southern portion of the province of Saskatchewan there are districts that are not well suited for raising wheat; where, although a good deal of wheat is grown, at the same time the land is more suited for mixed farming. My hon. friend will know, because it is the country he lives in, that there are some parts a little north and west of that that are better for stock raising than wheat. The farmers who, during the last 25 years, have gone into those parts that I have mentioned and have gone in for mixed farming, are the farmers who are most prosperous to-day. In my own constituency, on the eastern and northern side of the Moose mountain, where the land is more broken up and rougher than the general run of the land, the farmers who have adopted the system of cattle-raising and mixed farming are to-day amongst the most prosperous settlers in the whole province of Saskatchewan. In that country to the north of the Saskatchewan river there are millions and tens of millions which some time in the future will be settled by a thrifty, contented and prosperous population that will pay its share of the revenues of the country. If you wish, however, to have that country bring forth its best resources, it will be advisable to give a certain amount of assistance to the settlers, and I have in mind a scheme somewhat along the following lines. Supposing a settler goes into that northern country and takes up one of those more or less rough quarter sections and builds a little house and stable, thus showing the Government that he is a bona fide settler, and that he knows how to handle his farm and to take care of cattle, I think, instead of doing as we have been doing for the last twenty years, spending a huge amount of money annually on public buildings and other public works throughout the country, many of them necessary and proper if times are prosperous, but unneces-

sary in times such as we are having now and such as we are going to have on account of the war and the railroad situation that is confronting us, the Government should commence a grant of, say, $1,000,000 a year, gradually increasing that amount to $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 a year, and appoint a body of men to buy cattle and give such settlers as I have described from two to ten cattle each according to his capacity for looking after them. Then they should charge that settler the full cost of the cattle laid down at his station, but charge him no interest on the cattle for, say, three years, then for a couple of years charge him interest on the cost, and then after he has had the cattle for five years, charge him a certain percentage of the cost so that at the end of ten years he will have paid back to the Government the cost of the cattle with five or six per cent interest according to the rate at which the Government could borrow the money. In that way you would have thousands and tens of thousands of settlers in that part of the country who would be making a living out of those cattle and who at the end of those ten years would be able to pay back the amount that was put into the cattle by selling off the increase as they grew up to be three or four years old. In that way, at the end of those ten years, those cattle would be paid back and the farmer would have a big herd of his own from the increase of the original stock. Even those who have watched what some farmers in our own neighbourhood, starting with a couple of cows, have done, can hardly appreciate how a herd increases and how a farmer can get a good herd around him. To make that scheme a success, care, of course, would have to be taken that stock would not be given to men who could not take care of them. That is one difficulty in the way, but difficulties are made to be overcome. Many of our settlers from the old country are men who come from the cities and do not understand the care of cattle, and it would be impossible for those men, in the course of one or two years, to know enough about the care of cattle to enable them to handle a proposition of that kind successfully. The average foreigner knows more about stock raising and can make money out of caring for cattle, so that the difficulty might arise that our English-speaking friend might say: You are not treating me as liberally as that foreigner. But the matter would have to be dealt with according to the merits and the ability of the man. If we would take the money that we spend annually in unnecessary and unproductive work and put it into cattle, and distribute them amongst the settlers in that new country to the north, we would accomplish with that money ten times as much good as we could accomplish by spending it in the way that we have been doing in the past. Nineteen out of twenty of those settlers would make a success, and the loss to the Government would be very little, if any. You would have to keep up that grant for, say, five years, and then, as the money came in from paying for stock, it could be put out again. I am merely outlining the scheme as I have it in mind, and when this Economic Commission reports, the matter can be taken up.

Mr. ROCHE: Would it be confined to the holders of unpatented lands?

Mr. TURRIFF: My idea would be that in that country the land would be all unpatented for a number of years after the settlers went in. The Government could not only take security on the stock itself, but could register a lien against the unpatented homestead. In case the land was patented, if there were any in that part of the country, to which the Government might apply under such an arrangement as this, security could be taken on the stock itself and also on the man's covenants, and, if the land was not encumbered, take security upon the land as well. I do not think there will be great difficulty in the matter of security. My hon. friend mentioned a few moments ago that something of that kind was being done in Manitoba. I discussed this matter with some of the members of the Government of Manitoba, and they told me they were going to make an experiment along that line applying to the country lying north of Winnipeg, which is very much the same class of country, as the minister is well aware, as that lying north of the Saskatchewan river in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. In fact, it was more wooded, I imagine, around Winnipeg. The difficulty they have had there is that of getting the land under cultivation for grain, but it is a good stock country, and any men in that part of the country who have been able to make a start in raising stock have done remarkably well. It will only take two or three years for the Government of Manitoba to try this plan out and prove whether it is feasible or not. I remember that when I went into

that country first, about forty years ago—I settled in the vicinity of Manitou, Manitoba—certain people there who had a little money for investment would buy, say, ten head of cows and give them to a farmer on shares, the farmer to look after the stock and to give the capitalist or financial man one-half the increase when they arrived at three years of age. At the end of the term of agreement, five or ten years, the farmer had to return the ten head of cows. In the course of that time, the farmer would have a great big herd of cattle from half the increase, and the man who put up the money would have received a higher rate of interest than he could get by loaning the money on mortgage, on farms, or in any other way. If the same success should attend the Government in furnishing the money, it would be a profitable thing for the settler and the Government would not lose anything. Even if action should not be taken for a year or two, the experience in Manitoba, I imagine, will have gone far enough to enable the Government to judge whether this scheme would appeal by them. No one would want to see such a thing tried on a very great scale at first, because it is, to an extent, experimental. The matter would have to be placed in the hands of somebody who would be absolutely outside of political control. I say that regardless of what Government is in office, or whether the Liberals or the Conservatives are in power. If this matter were the subject of political patronage that would go a long way to kill it, and would certainly make it unsuccessful. I feel sure that we have a huge stretch of country there that would be occupied by settlers, settlers who would become wealthy and will do just as well as they could in the best grain-growing parts of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or Alberta. For many, many years to come cattle and stock of all kinds will command high prices. There will always be a market, and it does not matter in a case of that kind whether a man is forty or fifty miles away from a railroad. I lived for many years in the West, and I was in one case sixty miles and in another case further from the railway. Settlers who had cattle had no trouble in marketing, because, in a couple of days, they would drive out a big herd when it was ready for the market. I believe the suggestion I make to the minister is worthy of consideration, for I have seen it carried out most successfully in individual cases. This plan will help to populate a country as large as the whole settled area of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. ROCHE: The Canadian Pacific are doing it now.

Mr. TURRIFF: They are doing something along the same line, advancing money to settlers. But I have never been much in favour of putting men on lands in the West who had no money of their own, starting them out with a debt of $500 or $600 and expecting them to pay interest right along and pay the money back. But where a man has shown his ability as a farmer, and has the stabling, or can put it up, and will grow the hay in the vicinity, he will be all the better settler for having a little help and will not only pay back the money but, while he has it, his use of it will add materially to the wealth of the country and the revenues of the Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is getting near to Sunday morning, and I should think that the Government, whatever we may think on this side, will hardly feel like holding the House longer. I have an amendment of which I gave notice, and I would like to move it, as the chairman (Mr. Rhodes) has stated a point in regard to it. The resolution is as follows:

That after the word "approved" in the third line from the bottom of the particulars of the proposed vote, there should be added the following words: "Before making such loan the Governor in Council shall require the Company to give to His Majesty the King an option to acquire at any time within five years from the date thereof the railways and other property of the company and of all other railways and property included in the Canadian Northern system at such price as to the Governor in Council may seem reasonable under existing circumstances."

I do not propose to say anything in support of that amendment to-night.

Mr. ROGERS: We came here at two o'clock expecting to get some business through. And here it is half-past eleven, and the hon gentleman proposes to adjourn with nothing done. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite have discussed this matter at sufficient length to have said everything that they desire to say concerning it. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) has reduced everything that the other side desire to say into the motion he has presented, so I think hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be satisfied to vote on the motion and let us get the item through. My hon. friend knows that we are getting close to the end of the session. We are

hoping to prorogue on Tuesday and we have a considerable amount of business yet to do on Monday. If our hope of getting through on Tuesday is to be fulfilled, I would like my hon. friend to consider the idea of letting this item go through tonight if possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister can readily see that the reason why nothing was done to-day was because the Government would not let the proposed amendment carry. If it had carried, it could have been said that a great deal of progress had been made. We on this side of the House, therefore, are not to blame. The minister says very truly that in the discussion of the Grand Trunk Pacific item the Canadian Northern also was pretty fully discussed, but there are some gentlemen who want to express some views on the subject. Although I could give no definite assurance in the matter, I do not think the discussion would take very long, and I think I can assure the minister that every reasonable effort will be made to conclude the discussion in a comparatively short time. I do not think that much could be accomplished, at any rate, by remaining here for twenty-five more minutes to-night. So far as I am concerned, I will do the best I can to bring the discussion to a close on Monday at an early hour.

Mr. KNOWLES: Just a word to the Minister of the Interior. He intimated that I myself suggested the appointment of a commission. I wish to say distinctly that I feel it my duty to put the responsibility for that on the minister himself. If we are here next session I purpose bringing this matter up and making reference to the observation I have made this evening, lest the minister might then say to me that I myself had suggested a commission. I say now that I suggested a commission only incidentally. It is the minister who has the responsibility. In these war days there is danger of ministers standing aside and watching the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Finance—particularly the Minister of Militia—look after their respective departments. I do not purpose discussing the salaries of ministers of the Crown, but they are not paid, even in war times, to sit around and let the country run itself. The minister has been a long time in office, and we have never had anything startling from him.

Mr. ROCHE: No scandals since I have been here.

Mr. KNOWLES: No, but if a man is asleep there can be no scandals—I do not say this offensively. The hon. gentleman is our minister, and we would like to be proud of him in the West. We would like him to have some really startling programme for next session that would show what a real live minister we have. Whatever might be the case in Ontario, we would like him to show that the Minister of Interior, who lives in the prairie provinces, is really on his job. Then, when the question of salaries comes to be considered, as I think it ought to be, we from the West would give the matter favourable consideration.

Mr. ROCHE: The hon. gentleman evidently overlooks the fact that this matter had been referred to a commission when he himself suggested that it ought to go to a commission; therefore he ought to qualify his remarks. Whether it is incidental or not, the policy is there all the same. It is something like the policy of protection that my hon. friend used to advocate; it was only incidental, but the protection was there all the same. So, in connection with suggesting a commission, and it has gone to a commission. Of course, I do not think that I ought to anticipate any action of the commission, now that the matter has been referred to them, by making any comments before the commission reports. As I said before, we cannot expect to do very much in these war times. We have to get through with the war first, at any rate. I admit that we should have a policy promulgated in relation to procedure after the war.

Mr. KNOWLES: I think serious consideration and discussion ought to be given to these matters in the House long before the war ceases. I think the minister would be justified in appointing a commission, but I do not wish to be understood as saying that that would exhaust his duty.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have asked the Minister of Finance twice in connection with these railway matters, whether, if this vote of $15,000,000 for the Canadian Northern carries, he intends to ask them to hand over to the Government, in addition to the 40 per cent of the common stock of the company that the Government now owns, additional stock to the amount of say $15,000,000 or $20,000,000. I suggest this

not because I consider that this stock would be of any particular value, but in order that the Government might be ready to handle the situation and be in a position to avoid being taken by the throat in connection with the matter in the future. My hon. friend is asking for $15,000,000 for this company and the company cannot get along without it. The company will hand over that additional stock, which is not now of any commercial value, if my hon. friend the minister insists upon it, and in the interests of the country I think he should insist upon it. What is his policy in the matter?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The question that is raised is cognate to the amendment which is being moved by the hon. member for St. John city, and for convenience I had intended to take the two together on Monday.

Mr. ROGERS: Upon the assurance given by the hon. member for St. John city that he will facilitate this matter on Monday, we will not waste more time this evening.

Mr. KNOWLES: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that time was wasted to-night? I do not like that expression "wasting more time." I do not think that the minister would say that time devoted to the consideration of western problems is wasted. The people will be sorry to read that in the Winnipeg Telegram on Monday.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.41 p.m.

Monday, May 15, 1915.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication notifying me that a vacancy has occurred in the representation in the House of Commons by the death of Bowman Brown Law, Esq., member for the electoral district of Yarmouth, Nova Scotia; and also that I have received the resignation of Joseph Octave Lavallee, Esq., member for the electoral district of Bellechasse, Quebec; and that I have issued my several warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts.

[Mr. Turriff.]

PRIVATE BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill No. 100 (C-2 of the Senate) to incorporate the Manitoba-Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Blain.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

THE LAUNCH WALRONDO.

Mr. PARDEE:

1. Has the launch Walrondo, formerly used by the superintendent of dredging at Victoria, B.C., been sold? If so, to whom, and at what price?
2. What was the original cost?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.
2. $12,000.

LUNENBURG COUNTY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service on the Church Lake, New Cornwall and Mahone Bay route, Lunenburg county, N.S.?
2. Were tenders asked for the said service? If so, what were the names of persons who tendered, and the amount of their respective tenders?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The contract for this service has been awarded to the lowest tenderer. The names of the tenderers and the amounts will be furnished when the contract has been executed.

QUEBEC REFEREE ON BUTTER AND CHEESE.

Mr. BOIVIN:

1. Did the Government receive a petition signed by about 300 factorymen of the province of Quebec asking for the appointment of Mr. John O'Dell, formerly of Montreal but now of Abercorn, Quebec, as referee on butter and cheese in that province?
2. If so, has this petition been considered by the Government?
3. Has the said appointment been given to Mr. ODell? If not, who has been appointed?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Such a petition was received signed by 15 produce dealers and 46 factorymen.
2. Yes.
3. No. It is not proposed to appoint any one to the position of official referee. Before the receipt of the petition J. E. D. Gareau was appointed inspector of weighing of butter and cheese.

THE RAINBOW.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: By your leave, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention

of the hon. Minister of Naval Service to a despatch, published last Saturday, stating that the Rainbow had actually taken possession of a ship which, though Mexican in origin, as I understand, was chartered by a German company and was carrying a valuable cargo of sugar, copper and corn. May I ask if there is any truth in the information?

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine): On a former occasion I gave answer to the House that the department had been advised that the Rainbow had captured a power schooner called the Oregon, but that in the opinion of the department it was not advisable to publish at this time any details with regard to the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not want to ask for more information on that point, but are we to understand from this that the Rainbow is patrolling the waters of the Pacific with a view to protecting our commerce?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask if the two submarines which were purchased at the opening of the war are also so engaged?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, they are both in commission all the time and actively engaged.

SALE OF SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION.

COUNSEL FOR OPPOSITION BEFORE DAVIDSON COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask the hon. gentleman who is leading the House to-day to tell me whether or not it is the intention of the Government to allow the Opposition to have counsel appear on its behalf before the commission of Mr. Justice Davidson in respect to the charges made the other day by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie)?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, I think I may say that counsel will be arranged for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In what manner?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know in what manner. The Prime Minister himself is away, but I think I may go so far as to say that counsel will be provided.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend cannot tell me whether counsel will be arranged to represent each side of the House, as was done in connection with the Meredith-Duff Commission?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, I cannot tell my hon. friend anything as to details.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not a detail; it is important.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It may be important, but I have not the details.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I suppose, then, the matter being under consideration, that the commission will not proceed to-morrow with the investigation?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I believe that the commission is called for to-morrow. I think my right hon. friend will have to wait for an answer to his question until the return of the right hon. the Prime Minister, who will be here to-night.

EXTENSION OF TERM OF PARLIAMENT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Can my right hon. friend give me to-day any information as to what has been done with reference to the petition of this Parliament for an extension of the term of Parliament? We were informed by the right hon. the Prime Minister a few days ago that the petition of this Parliament had been forwarded to the Imperial authorities; but he has not told us that any information has been received of the action taken upon it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The last information that I know anything of was that this resolution had been forwarded, that the matter was in the hands of the British Government, and that legislation will be introduced in the Imperial Parliament. It is in their hands.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Canadian Northern Railway Company—loan not exceeding $15,000,000, repayable on demand, with interest payable half yearly at the rate of six per centum (6%) per annum; to be used for expenditure made or to meet indebtedness incurred in paying interest upon securities of the companies included in the Canadian Northern Railway System having priority over the guaranteed securities authorized by Chapter 20, Statutes 1914, and instalments of principal of equipment securites and upon construction; the whole of said loan to be secured by mortgage upon the undertaking of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and so much of said loan as may be applied for the benefit of any company included in the Canadian North-

ern Railway System, to be secured in addition by mortgage upon the undertaking of such company, such mortgages to contain such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve. The disposition of the loan to be subject to the direction of the Governor in Council, $15,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the committee proceeds further with the consideration of this item, I wish to say that on Saturday evening, when this item was under consideration, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) proposed to this resolution the following amendment:

That after the word "approve" in the third line from the bottom of the particulars of the proposed vote, there should be added the following words. "Before making such loan the Governor in Council shall require the company to give to His Majesty the King an option to acquire at any time within five years from the date thereof the railways and other property of the company and of all other railways and property included in the Canadian Northern railway system at such price as to the Governor in Council may seem reasonable under existing circumstances."

On the subject of amendments in committee, May, 11th edition, at page 615, says:

Each resolution for a grant forms a distinct motion, which can only be dealt with by being agreed to, required, negatived, superseded, or, by leave, withdrawn; . . . here the power of the committee ceases. The committee may vote or reduce a grant, or may reduce the amount thereof, either by a reduction of the whole grant, or by the omission or reduction of the items of expenditure of which the grant is composed; but the committee have no other function.

Again, at page 616:

Nor can the committee attach a condition or an expression of opinion to a grant.

The powers of the committee in this connection are so circumscribed that it does not appear that the House itself could give instructions or authority to the Committee of Supply to propose such an amendment. On this point, I quote May, 11th edition, at page 607:

An instruction to the Committee of Supply cannot be moved, as, following the Speaker's ruling; "nothing can be brought on in that committee of which notice has not been given in detail, by the Estimates laid before the House."

It, therefore, in my judgment, appears to be clear that the amendment of the hon. member for St. John is not in order, and I so rule.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Chairman, I, of course, cheerfully bow to your decision. My object has, I think, been attained by bringing the motion before the committee and to the attention of the Government,

[Sir George Foster.]

because, of course, if the Government decided against the amendment, I recognize that I could not hope it would be carried by the committee, even if you, Sir, had ruled it to be in order. But I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the resolution itself provides that the loan shall be secured by a mortgage on the undertaking of the company, such mortgage to contain such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve. I submit that, under the resolution as it is, it will be quite open to the Government to stipulate that the company shall give to His Majesty an option to purchase the Canadian Northern railway system at a price which may be agreed upon, and I do hope that the idea which I have endeavoured to put forward in the amendment will commend itself to the Government. I hope so for this reason, that there is to-day a rapidly-growing sentiment among the people of this country in favour of the Government acquiring this transcontinental system of railways. That feeling has, of course, been given a very great impetus by the fact that this company has been coming pretty often, I think quite too often, to the country for assistance. When this loan of $15,000,000 is made there will be in the vicinity of $70,000,000 or $80,000,000 which the company has obtained from the Government under conditions which make it apparent that, but for the Government assistance, the company could not have pulled through. The Minister of Finance, in proposing this vote, frankly stated that unless the Government gives this assistance to the company it will, in all probability, be obliged to place its railway system in the hands of a receiver. The same statement was made two years ago, when the Government guaranteed the bonds of the company to the extent of $45,000,000. Now, does it not seem that, the company having been obliged to come again to the Government for an additional $15,000,000, the Government ought to take an option from the company, on reasonable terms, for a reasonable amount, which option could be exercised or not as Parliament in the future might determine. I would not suggest that any injustice whatever should be done to the company. I should think that it ought to be recognized that these two gentlemen, Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann, notwithstanding what may be said by their critics, are deserving of a large measure of praise, a large degree of credit, for the enterprise

and foresight they have shown. They have succeeded in building up a great railway system, consisting of some 8,000 or 9,000 miles, traversing many of the richest sections of Canada, a system which in the future must prove an enormous factor in the development of this Dominion. I think that these gentlemen are entitled to all reasonable consideration, and that the Government ought to deal with them on some equitable basis. But it does seem to me that it would not be fair to the people of this country that the Government should, by continuing to assist this company, take all the risk of the company pulling through and getting in a good financial position in the future. Then, when the day of prosperity comes again, as we all hope that day will soon come again, and if the country should deem it wise to take over this system, the company would be in a position before arbitrators, or before the Exchequer Court, to demand an enormous sum running into many millions of dollars, claiming prospective profits, and compelling the country to pay a very large sum of money indeed for this property which to-day is practically in the hands of the Government, and which, if the Government were to exercise its powers, it could now acquire for the amount of the securities which are outstanding against the road.

In 1914 I moved a resolution, the effect of which would have been that the Government would have the right to take over the equity of Mackenzie and Mann, Limited, which means Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann, at a sum not exceeding $30,000,000. I was greatly astonished to hear the Solicitor General, speaking for the Government on that occasion, say that $30,000,000 would be no temptation to Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann, and that rather than accept $30,000,000 for their equity, over and above all the securities and obligations, they would let the road go into the hands of receivers. I could not believe that statement. I could not believe that the Solicitor General was warranted in making that statement to the House; though when he made it I presume he must have consulted them. But the time has arrived when with the company coming back again for assistance, for the enormous sum of $15,000,000, the Government should come to an understanding with Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann, and have it clearly understood that if, within a reasonable period, say within five years, the Government and Parliament should, in the interests of the people of Canada, take over this road they will affix to it as a condition a reasonable sum at which the equity of these gentlemen should be acquired for the country.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT (Calgary): I desire to make a few observations this afternoon on this item. I ventured two years ago to say that I believed that the largest problem in domestic politics was that related to transportation in this country. I still think so. Unfortunately, no recriminations that we may engage in will take from us the question, and no deception will delude us for a moment as to the conditions that confront us. I cannot conceive of any question of greater importance to the country as a whole, and to the individual, than the question which is now before us.

Before I make a few observations regarding the matter, I should like to place myself on record, not in a spirit of hostile criticism, but rather in the way of suggestion, that there should be, if possible, some rule adopted by this Parliament by which railway legislation shall be brought into this House in the first fifteen days of the session. For many years, since 1900, at least, and for many years before that, legislation involving the appropriation by Parliament of millions of dollars has usually been submitted for consideration in the closing days of the session. The result has been that only a few members are conversant with the question, and these few usually make it their business not to disclose what they know as to the real purpose of the legislation introduced. I think something should be done to prevent legislation of this character from being introduced during the last days of the session. I am perfectly certain that this House, at this critical stage, has not had ample opportunity to consider this matter in all its phases. Might I suggest that legislation of this character, involving an appropriation of public moneys for the support of public utilities of the character of railways, should be introduced in the early days of the session, and be left for the consideration of the members, even if it is not passed until the closing days of the session.

There is no problem perhaps that is engaging the attention of thoughtful men in England more than the making effective of that system of democracy which is embodied in our representative institutions, whether we call them legislatures or parliaments. At the present time, the com-

municating link between the private member in this House, and practically in every House of Parliament in the British Dominions, and the Government, which initiates legislation and under our constitution, which appropriates public moneys for public purposes, is the caucus. How inefficient that is, it is unnecessary for me to state. There is not a man in this House who does not know that the caucus is a wholly inefficient method of communication between the private member and the Government which initiates legislation. The theory of the constitution that a cabinet is a Committee of the House of Commons or of Parliament is an excellent theory, but the tendency of our history has been, for the last 50 years, to increase and strengthen and magnify the powers of the cabinet, while destroying and minimizing and lessening the authority of the private member. Any student of the political history of England during the past 50 years is conscious of that fact. In England they have been endeavouring by various methods to overcome that difficulty. They realize that not only has the power of cabinets become greater, but that the supreme authority of the Prime Minister in the cabinet has become greater. I think it was Mr. Paul who in his political history of England pointed out that fact with great authority and with great power.

There must be some method, short of that, which is used in the United States, by which the cabinet has no representation on the floor of Congress at all, and where every member has the power to initiate legislation of a far-reaching character—there must be some method by which the power and strength of democracy can be maintained, and, at the same time, the cabinet system of government, which we have as a Committee of Parliament responsible for initiating legislation, is maintained. I make these observations because I think there is no subject which better illustrates the point than that to which I am alluding. It is absolutely impossible for the members of this House to grasp in all its magnitude the issues that are involved in this railway legislation. It is perfectly absurd to expect that in a few days men can appreciate all the bearings which this legislation may have on the future of this country.

Fortunately, to-day, we can at least feel that what we are asked to do does not commit this country to any permanent policy as some of us regret we have been committed to permanent policies in the past. What we are doing to-day we are doing because it is necessary; because there is that necessity which knows no law, and to which we must at all times yield if we are to maintain the credit of the country, which is a matter of paramount importance. I make these observations because conditions and not thories confront us. Might I analyse in a few passing sentences what these conditions are. We have a vast area, one of the largest countries in the world, as large as the United States of America, and larger; half a continent, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the 49th parallel to the Arctic regions, with a population of less than 8,000,000. and to-day, whether we like it or not, we have over 35,000 miles of railway. I suppose this House is aware that only four countries of the world have a greater railway mileage than Canada, namely, the United States of America, British India, and the Empires of Germany and of Russia. In railway mileage we rank fifth among the nations of the world. The mere statement of that fact, coupled with what I have already said as to our limited population and the immensity of our area, will at once bring home to every member of this House the magnitude of the problem that confronts us. And if we look further into that problem we find that we have in this country practically four great systems of railway: the Government-owned system, which we have had since 1867, and which had its origin in what might be called one of the terms of Confederation—the derivation of the word "Intercolonial" itself indicates the purpose and intent that was in the minds of those who created that system of transportation. To the Intercolonial railway has been added, during the intervening years, many miles of road. The railway has been extended to Montreal; that was certainly a necessity, and was one of the first acts of hon. gentlemen opposite when they came to power. Its branch lines have in some cases been built, and in others acquired, by taking over small feeders in the Maritime Provinces. There are still in the Maritime Provinces some small lines that have not yet been taken over, which cost but little, and which, in my opinion, should be taken over before any other lines are taken over. I make that observation because of personal knowledge of the conditions.

Next, we have the Grand Trunk system. That system, as has been pointed out by many, was never conceived with the idea

of occupying the place in the transportation business of this country that it does to-day. This road, originally extending only from Portland to Montreal and Toronto, was pushed through to Chicago, and has gradually absorbed, during all these years, a large number of smaller roads, and its unfortunate financial position has been brought about not through the operation of the system itself, but because in taking over other small lines it has frequently paid larger prices for them than should have been paid, and very often has guaranteed obligations that were wholly incommensurate with the value that was being received by the system. Speaking broadly and generally, that is how the Grand Trunk system has been built up. In connection with the Grand Trunk we have the Grand Trunk Pacific system, about which I shall make a few observations later on; dealing with them both under the term Grand Trunk system.

It may not be known to all the members of this House, but the fact is that practically every dollar in the Grand Trunk system is British money. Except for a small loan made upon the New York market within the last two years there is not a dollar in the Grand Trunk system that is not English money. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen are aware of the fact, but it was certainly a surprise to me to learn that over $100,000,000 in the Grand Trunk system has never seen a cent of dividends. I believe that the security holders of that company number now 90,000 persons, most of whom live either in the British Isles or in British possessions scattered throughout the world.

The next system, in point of time, is the Canadian Pacific railway. Of that system it is only necessary to say that it is one of the richest, most powerful, with the most diversified interests of any corporation in the world.

The last system in point of time is the Canadian Northern. It is true that the Grand Trunk Pacific was launched after the Canadian Northern, but I am dealing with it as part of the Grand Trunk system. The Canadian Northern system, as I pointed out two years ago, owed its origin to the ambition of a couple of gentlemen for whom apparently the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has a very warm feeling to-day, and as to whom I will not say anything other than to point out, and point out in stronger terms as I proceed, that any proposal to take an option on the Canadian Northern and pay these gentlemen a single dollar for their charters would meet with the just disapproval and condemnation of every Canadian; for to commit this country to paying them a single dollar would do violence to every principle of reason and every dictate of common business sense.

As I pointed out two years ago, the Canadian Northern system has grown up gradually, extending its ramifications from the province of Manitoba westward to the Pacific, and now eastward to Montreal and Quebec. As to the policy that actuated the gentlemen who built that road, I am not concerned to-day. I have had my say as to that, and I am reminded of the words of a very great exponent of principle who said, "Not Heaven itself can change the past. What has been, has been." And he closed with these words: "And I have had my day." That may be true also. These, then, are the systems of railway that we have in Canada to-day.

Then there are scattered throughout the country some small lines in the lower provinces, quite a few independent lines in Ontario and Quebec, and a few in the far West, but these latter are closely associated with the Great Northern system in the United States. In the East, the Michigan Central, the Wabash and the Pere Marquette connect with their termini at Chicago, Buffalo, or on the Atlantic seaboard.

That is the situation. I have heard a great deal said as to who is responsible for it. But all the talk in the world as to who is responsible for this situation will not relieve us from the condition that now confronts us. If there is one thing this war has taught us, it is that recriminations do no good; we have learned that at least. On this point I would only say that there is, I think, a certain definite principle that may be laid down that will fix the measure of responsibility as between the Liberal and Conservative parties. A party that initiates legislation must assume responsibility for it, and unless the other party in the House opposes, it must share with the initiating party the responsibility. So I have already pointed out that the government owned system of railways was part of the arrangement by which we reached Confederation. The extending of the Intercolonial to Montreal was part of the policy of the Liberal party, and to them must be given the credit, and they are glad, I doubt not, to accept this responsibility.

They should have extended the Intercolonial further to the Great Lakes, by taking advantage of the opportunity they had of acquiring the Canada Atlantic; there is no doubt about that. The price paid for the Canada Atlantic by the Grand Trunk was at least $1,000,000 too great.

The responsibility for the Grand Trunk rests with pre-Confederation men like Hincks, Macdonald, Cartier, and other men who lived, moved and had their being in this country prior to 1867, had much to do with shaping the course and guiding the destinies of that road.

I understood the hon. member for Edmonton the other day to make some observations that would lead me to believe that he thought the attitude of the Conservative party after they came into power had something to do with the ill-fortune that has overtaken the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental. I should like to say this: In my opinion the Liberal party must assume the whole responsibility for the Grand Trunk Pacific. The hon. member for St. John quite realized that when he rejoiced in this ill-fortune, because he said that it reflected great credit upon the Liberal party; he did not say so in those very words, but that is what he meant in the ultimate analysis. So far as the Grand Trunk enterprise is concerned I happen to remember the late Mr. Hays and his party coming west to look over that country before determining what the policy of the company should be. I remember that the Board of Trade and others of us met them at Calgary, and I went on to Banff with them, and spent Sunday there. I know something of the dreams they had, something of their hopes and expectations, and certainly what they now have on their hands does not in any sense represent the hopes and expectations they then held. It is only fair to say that at that time these gentlemen believed—at least they so expressed themselves—that the great cities and towns of eastern Canada where manufacturing was being carried on vigorously, and where traffic was being produced in large quantities, and which were served by the old Grand Trunk, should be linked up with the prairies of the West, in order that the Grand Trunk could share in the great development that must inevitably take place in that country.

I believe at that time that these gentlemen would have been quite satisfied to project their line to Winnipeg and Edmonton, and make adequate connections in the East by using existing facilities or by extending existing facilities, and ultimately carrying their road through to the Pacific. Unfortunately, however, the proposal submitted to Parliament bore no resemblance at all to the proposal which these gentlemen had in mind and which they desired Parliament to pass. I suppose it is a matter of public knowledge that the late Mr. Hays placed himself on record as to what he asked the late Government to do, and that, as a matter of fact, the late Government did not do it. It is sufficient for my purpose to say that, as that legislation was initiated by the Liberal party and as it was opposed by the Conservative party of that day, the Liberal party in this country must take the responsibility for it. That is a fundamental principle of our constitution. Had the Conservative party agreed to and accepted that legislation, it would have been equally blameable, because one party must initiate legislation and the other party may oppose or support.

The National Transcontinental, built at an expenditure by the Canadian people of $152,000,000 up to the present time, was built largely for political purposes. It is my belief that hon. gentlemen opposite, then in power, had hopes or expectations that that road would one day be useful; but in the light of the knowledge we now possess—and I do not altogether blame the Government of that day, and I am going to say something as to that in a moment—it must be apparent that to build that road from Winnipeg to Quebec, to span the St. Lawrence by a bridge and continue it to Moncton, New Brunswick, under the conditions that existed (commencing, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said last year, to build the chimney first and the house afterwards), was little short of a manifestation of absence of all business judgment. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite think that now; they must think it, they cannot get away from it; but I do not go so far as to blame them entirely for that. After carefully studying this railway matter during the past year, the best conclusion that I can arrive at is that all of us—and I mean the people of Canada as a whole—were somehow infected at that time with a disease which came from over-speculation and optimism run riot, or run mad. There was no real warrant for the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental in the way in which it was built, having regard to the

Canadian Northern, than there would be for an endeavour to create, for instance, a House of Lords in this country, and I have never been quite able to understand how strong-headed business men permitted themselves to be led into building that road. I have never yet heard any explanation from anybody that would either justify it or excuse it. I had the hardihood, on a public platform in my community, to give my opinion in regard to the matter, and I remember that I was very severely criticised by my own friends, and was told that I was lacking in faith in my country and was filled with a spirit of pessimism. So, in the ultimate analysis, under our democratic institutions, the people themselves must accept the responsibility for the conditions that exists, and neither the Opposition nor the Government is vitally concerned, because no Government would have initiated the legislation in the terms in which it was initiated except upon the demand of the people manifested by resolutions passed by boards of trade, municipal councils, farmers' unions and associations, and merchants throughout the country, who were all asking for the building of railroads, wholly oblivious to the fact that those railroads must be paid for; who gave no reasons, simply demanding the building of railways and the spending of money, reckoning not the evil day when the cost would have to be borne, caring not except for what they called the development of the country and the maintenance of a fine spirit of optimism.

Let us pass to the Canadian Northern, which was partially commenced at that date. I have never yet heard an adequate explanation for the building of it, although I have heard, from two gentlemen who are now no more, a reasonable explanation. I have never yet been able to understand how the right hon. leader of the Opposition ever permitted those two roads, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific, to be built. I remember, in 1905, the Canadian Northern system reached the city of Edmonton, and I remember something of the rejoicing that took place because it was built through to that point. Then I remember that, instead of amalgamating those two systems into one, or instead of by some method preventing the Grand Trunk Pacific from parallelling the Canadian Northern, they launched the Grand Trunk Pacific system and permitted the Canadian Northern to push forward its enterprise by branch lines, which were perfectly justified; but they also, in 1911, placed upon the statute books of this country, in fulfilment of a resolution which passed this House, an Act by which they declared in the preamble, and in the terms of the resolution, that the Canadian Northern was to be a transcontinental system reaching from the Pacific to the Atlantic, just as in similar terms they had made a similar declaration with relation to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Surely that will stagger any one who merely sits down and thinks of it. Less than 8,000,000 people, just when times were beginning to get bad in 1911, permitting the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to introduce and have passed through this Parliament, legislation giving to the Canadian Northern railway $35,000,000 to bring its system from the head of the lakes east, when we all know that the expenditure of a much less sum than that would have brought efficiency to existing facilities and caused no such embarrassment as that which now confronts us.

I have been asked by a hundred business men—and I am sure every other hon. member has been asked the same thing—what explanation can you give for this? The reasonable explanation—and it is a very simple one— is that an election was coming on. We ought to face that proposition very frankly; and, what is more, that is a case in which both parties must accept responsibility, because the Conservative party of that day, sitting in Opposition, did not oppose that $35,000,000 grant to the Canadian Northern railway; they did not challenge it. The records show that, and the Conservative party must accept responsibility with the Liberal party, because if the one party initiated this legislation, it is a case in which the other party did not oppose, and, not opposing, must share the responsibility. Why did the Conservative party not oppose this legislation? I suppose the obvious answer is—because there was an election pending. Therefore you have an election forcing upon the people of this country a grant of $35,000,000 to bring the Canadian Northern railway east from Port Arthur.

The Conservative party on the defeat of the Liberals succeeded to these legacies. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) does not usually make unfair statements, but the other day he said that the Conservative party's attitude towards the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental had been in a sense respon-

sible for the evil days that had overtaken those enterprises. I wonder whether he has paused to think what the Conservative party did. In January, 1912, I was in the city of London, England, and the broker for the Dominion of Canada, speaking to me in one of the banks, said: "I suppose Canada will not disregard her obligations with relation to the Grand Trunk Pacific." I was happy to say to him, as any Canadian would have said: "Governments may change, but the obligations of the State continue." So, instead of the Conservative party doing anything to embarrass the Grand Trunk Pacific or the National Transcontinental, they did quite the opposite; they placed upon the statute books from year to year, provisions whereby the time for completion was extended in order that that railroad might not show its continuing deficit upon operation, but might possibly, with changed conditions and improved times, be able to meet its obligations.

So far as the National Transcontinental is concerned, I am sure that there is not a member of this House who does not know, not only that the Grand Trunk Pacific could not have taken over the National Transcontinental, but that to have suggested that they should do so, as we see now in the light of their then financial position, would have been to have added to their deficit three per cent upon the cost of that road, which would have been not less than $5,000,000 a year.

There is the situation: the National Transcontinental was still unfinished; the Canadian Northern nor the Grand Trunk Pacific were not built through to the Pacific coast; the Canadian Northern rights in relation to the $35,000,000 available for construction east had been established; the building of branch lines over the prairie had made much progress; and signs were showing of the financial depression that followed. What was to be done? For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying that had I been dictator I would have stopped the building of the Canadian Northern railway east of the lakes; I would not have assumed the responsibility of guaranteeing the 3½ per cent on the $35,000,000; I would have stopped the building of the road;—and more, I was going to say this to the House and will say it now, that, in my opinion, many miles of track on the National Transcontinental must be taken up and put in some other place where they will serve some useful purpose. It was under these conditions that Parliament granted cash subsidies to the Canadian Northern Railway, they voted them year after year. I had not hesitation in saying what I said two years ago. We should not have done it. As I now see it, I was derelict in my duty in not then pointing it out. But we voted those subsidies. It is impossible for any member of this House to say truly that this Parliament is primarily responsible for the carrying of the Canadian Northern to the Pacific. With an optimism which is not properly described by that name, the province of British Columbia guaranteed the securities of the Canadian Northern, and the road was built from the Yellowhead Pass to Kamloops and from Kamloops to the coast. It parallels the Canadian Pacific at some points and the Grand Trunk Pacific at others.

As to the prospects, there is no local traffic that can be developed for many years to come that will pay the interest on any mile of its track. It has good grades and curves; it has every quality to make a railway, except one, and that is traffic; and it will take some time, under existing conditions, before traffic is forthcoming. This Parliament voted cash subsidies to assist in its completion. I do believe that possibly there was a situation when, finding the road in the position it was in, with the province of British Columbia only responsible, when it would have been better to leave it as it was until we could take stock of the situation, until we could see if by some system of re-arrangement we could find a way to make something out of the road crossing the mountains. But recriminations and retrospective views in the light of present knowledge do not assist us. Two years ago we voted a guarantee of $45,000,000 to the Canadian Northern upon representations of fact which, I have no doubt, were believed, but which are now shown to have been absolutely erroneous. To-day we are confronted with the appalling situation of the Canadian Northern in default and the Grand Trunk Pacific practically insolvent. What are we going to do?

It has been pointed out that there are three courses any of which we may pursue: we may take them over to-day; we may assist them; or we may put them into the hands of a receiver. For my own part, I have never hesitated in my belief as to what should be done. I have listened to all the arguments that have been given and

they have not changed my mind. In my opinion, we ought to let both roads go into the hands of a receiver. That sounds very serious, and in the minds of many it is an absolute impossibility. I can only point out that eighty per cent of the railroads of the United States have been in the hands of receivers; and one-seventh of the railway mileage of the United States is now in the hands of receivers. There is only one way by which you will get rid of all the accumulated water and of all the difficulties that belong to taking over these systems, and that is by a receiver or by a reorganization which has the effect of a receivership.

Look at the Grand Trunk Pacific for a moment; I will not deal with it at length. The Grand Trunk Pacific has three kinds of securities; those guaranteed by the Government; those guaranteed by the Grand Trunk; and its own class of securities. Those guaranteed by the Government place upon us a responsibility which we must discharge in times of stress and strain, as well as in times of prosperity. And I trust that in any balance sheet of the public accounts which the Minister of Finance may put out hereafter, he will show at the foot of the page "contingent liabilities," because no statement of the finances of the Dominion is a correct and complete statement that does not show the contingent liabilities that belong to us by reason of our guarantees. So, we have to pay the interest upon the Grand Trunk Pacific guaranteed securities for its lines in the mountains and on the plains, for which we hold a mortgage. We must pay this, whether we wish to or not, we must pay this to maintain our place among the nations of the world and our credit in the markets of the world; we must do this, or, ourselves become insolvent. As to the securities guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) pointed out that we should take over this railway to-day; but I should like to point out to the House and to the country that we are confronted with the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway system its guarantee upon the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific. For my part I am not prepared at this moment to say that the tax-payers of the Dominion of Canada should be substituted for the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway. It may be that when we have before us all the information to enable us to deal with this matter as adequately as we should, the common sense and wisdom of the House will conclude that it is better that we should ourselves be put behind the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific by accepting the obligations of the Grand Trunk system, by relieving them, and taking over the system as a whole. But to-day, for the Grand Trunk Pacific, there is the guarantee alike of the Dominion of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway system behind it; and until such time as the obligations of the Grand Trunk have in some sense been settled with relation to the Grand Trunk Pacific, I do not think that this House would be discharging its duty to the people by now taking the system over. It is all very well to say: there is $15,000,000 due to the Grand Trunk by the Grand Trunk Pacific, and $15,000,000 due to the Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company, and that we have only to take over the stock. That is very true; it is a simple thing to acquire the Grand Trunk Pacific. But in the acquisition of that road, we substitute for the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway system—a guarantee given thoughtfully and after careful consideration by the shareholders duly assembled in London to deal with the matter—the guarantee of the tax-payers of the Dominion of Canada. I want to know that adequate safeguards have been provided, that we have proper agreements with regard to traffic that will secure us against the building up of towns and ports outside the Dominion of Canada, before that is done. It is for that reason that I gladly vote a sum of money to enable a proper investigation to be carried on in order that we may know, in the light of expert information and advice, just what can be done to save a situation which is very acute. So much for the Grand Trunk Pacific, in so far as taking it over at the present moment is concerned

With regard to the Canadian Northern, I am not going to deal at length with figures to-day, because they are only painful to read and my voice is bothering me very greatly. What are we going to do about the Canadian Northern? My hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), says that we should take an option for its purchase. The crux of the Canadian Northern situation may be very simply stated. It has $107,000,000 of provincially guaranteed securities and $101,000,000 of Dominion guaranteed securities; that is, $208,000,000 of guaranteed securities of the provinces and the Dominion. That means that the people of this Dominion must protect the credit of the Dominion or of the provinces

to the extent of the interest on those sums of money. In addition to that, whether we will or not—it is now too late to look back except to take stock of it—we have promised to pay the interest on $45,000,000 Dominion guaranteed securities for two years and on $35,000,000 of similar securities for three years, and British Columbia has promised to pay the interest on an enormous sum involved in the construction of that road to the Pacific for a period of three years. So these sums must be met anyway.

According to the figures that we have before us, something like $147,000,000 of unguaranteed Canadian Northern securities are outstanding. How are they secured? They are secured primarily by lodging with a trust company the certificates of title to Canadian Northern properties called subsidiary companies. There are the Lake Superior terminals, there is the telegraph system, there is the express system, and in addition they are secured, of course, by a charge upon the Canadian Northern system. It is true that two years ago we put $45,000,000 behind that again. I think we could afford to lose the $45,000,000 now rather than put ourselves behind that; I think that must be apparent to every thoughtful Canadian. The problem is a simple one with the Canadian Northern. You say you will not have a receivership, because it would hurt our credit. Then I ask this question: how are you going to adjust that $147,000,000 of unguaranteed securities? You have your federally-guaranteed securities, your provincially-guaranteed securities; now you have your unguaranteed securities. I, for one, will protest as long as I have a seat in this House against the substitution of the Canadian taxpayer for the Canadian Northern with relation to these unguaranteed securities. I will not become a party to the people of this country being told that they must insure and guarantee unguaranteed securities. If men in England bought $25,000,000 of income certificates of the Canadian Northern and paid par and more for them; if they bought $147,000,000 of unguaranteed 4 per cent perpetual debenture stock and paid par for it, that is their business. But I do protest against the substitution of 8,000,000 Canadian people behind an unguaranteed security of any railroad company. I go further. Not only is it unsound business, unsound in principle and in detail; I say further that it puts a premium upon watering railroad securities and stocks. A point to which I shall presently direct attention is this: If we are to take over this Canadian Northern railroad, or if we are to prevent a receivership occurring; if we are to act the part of the receivers; if we are to reorganize the system, then we must proceed to reorganize even as the receivers of the Wabash reorganized that road two years ago; even as the receivers of the Frisco system are now endeavouring to reorganize that system; even as the receivers of the Rock Island system are now endeavouring to reorganize that system. We must proceed upon business principles, and if these 4 per cent unguaranteed securities are to be taken care of by this country they can never be taken care of on the basis of making them worth 100 cents on the dollar. I am not adverse to any system of reorganization by which these securities would have some value placed upon them; but I would deprecate greatly any endeavour to substitute for the Canadian Northern Railway system, which was the security upon which they were sold, the collective credit of the people of this Dominion. That is the reason why it seems to me that we must go further than we have gone; we must do that very shortly, in order that an opportunity may be afforded by the lodging of these securities with a trust company, or otherwise to bring about some scheme of reorganization, because I think the time is gone by when men of business and intelligence, sitting in this House, should be frightened by the word "receivership." It is a great bogey, this word "receivership." All it means is that you put somebody in who takes charge of the property to conserve it and save it for the people whose money built it.

I would just like to say this to the hon. member for St. John, who talks about the magnificent undertakings that have been carried forward by Mackenzie and Mann. The Canadian Northern Railway Company is a corporation owing its origin to this Parliament. It was created by nothing more or less than a statute that gave corporate powers and existence to two or three men. and clothed them with the responsibility on the one hand and the opportunity on the other of building a transportation system. They organized themselves as a corporation, and with one hand they borrowed hundreds of millions under that name, and with the other hand they paid it to themselves as contractors, to build what we now have—a railroad. That is the story, just as tersely put as I think it can be put. And, mark you, the money that was borrowed with the one hand was, with the ex-

ception of the $140,000,000 to which I have referred, borrowed upon the collective security of every man in the Dominion or in the provinces. In the one instance it was the collective credit of the people in the provinces, and in the other of the Dominion as a whole. And with that money they, under another name and with the corporate existence which is given to them in another place, are building this transportation system and handing it over to whom? To the people whose money built it? To the people whose credit built it? To the people who made it possible? Not so. Year after year they have come back to us and asked us to give them more money to continue the operation of something that they themselves did not create nor build, but which owes its very existence and continuance to the collective credit of the people of this country. We are unable, however, to get a receivership, because the attitude of the Minister of Finance, may, after all, be the correct one. Moreover, in a period of war we must accept the inevitable; the opinion of those who are charged with financial responsibilities and the obtaining of large sums of money with which to carry on the war should at least be respected to the full. So, conceiving that the hon. Minister of Finance is right and that I am wrong, what are we to do? We are confronted with this situation; we must either assist the road or let it default, and since we are not to let it default, for the reasons which the minister has given, then we must help it.

What are the conditions upon which I, speaking as a western man, am willing to help save the credit of this country? To me the conditions are very simple. First of all, any loans made to these roads must be demand loans. I would not permit myself to become a party to a single dollar more going to either of these systems unless it be upon demand. Because, as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat knows, that if loaned upon demand you may demand it to-day and go to action to-morrow; or you need not demand at all but commence action for payment.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Which you would not do.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know whether or not my hon. friend's remark reflects his own mind; but, speaking for myself, if the systems were conducted as they have been, I would not hesitate to commence proceedings to-morrow morning. First of all, then, a demand loan. That insures for me absolute control of the situation; I know when it is a demand loan that I at least have control. I know when it is a demand loan that I can call, and by calling it I can get my money back, or take possession. If the days of prosperity come to-morrow or the day after, then so much the better for us; we shall get our money back, and in a period of years we shall have made good the $45,000,000 loaned two years ago to the Canadian Northern and the $25,000,000 loaned the Grand Trunk Pacific. First, then, a demand loan. I have no hesitation in saying that, so far as a loan, if it must be a loan at all, is concerned, we must do this.

Then, having made a demand loan, what is the next condition I insist upon, so far as I am concerned? The rate of interest, the terms, having been settled, I ask that this country shall have absolute control of the distribution of that money; in other words, I want the Minister of Finance to be responsible to this Parliament for every dollar of it. I do not want this money to pass through the exchequer of these people, for them to do with as they please; I ask the Minister of Finance to accept the responsibility for its expenditure, for and on behalf of the people, who make the loan. He will say to me, I suppose: "Why should I accept this responsibility? I am only lending money." It is more than lending money. We are saving bankrupt enterprises from destruction, and because we are endeavouring to save our credit we are not putting a receiver in charge. But the Minister of Finance, sitting here to-day, is to me the receiver of the system, and as such I ask and I expect, and if I am permitted to live will demand, that he shall see to the distribution of every dollar of that money—every cent of it. I want to know that every dollar of it is used for the purpose for which this Parliament is voting it. I want to know that every cent of it is used for the purpose of meeting the demands which have arisen, and which must be paid by reason of fixed charges accruing —for the purpose only of preserving the credit of this country.

Then so far as the Canadian Northern is concerned, there is a large question—this is the third demand that I make upon my friend the Minister of Finance. The operating revenues of the Canadian Northern Railway far exceed its operating expenses. According to its estimate, which has been laid upon the table of this House, the Cana-

dian Northern Railway, for the year ending 30th June, 1917, will have, apparently, a net revenue of nearly ten millions of dollars. I say to you, Sir, that I protest against Mackenzie and Mann being left in charge of that ten millions of dollars.

Mr. TURRIFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: I protest against the men who have been guilty of the misrepresentation they have, between their statement of two years ago and their statement of to-day, being left in charge of the operating revenues of that system. They are not worthy of being left in charge of the operating revenues of that system. I do not trust them. The people of this country do not trust them. The people of this country will not for a single moment submit to taxation being put upon them to save this system from going into the hands of a receiver if, Sir, it is proposed to leave these men in charge of the operating revenues of that road. I am satisfied that that must not be done. I want to point out to this House that this vote, which we are making here to-day, means a tax for both railways upon the people of Canada of $3 for every man, woman and child in it, for the purpose of meeting the interest charges and demands that may be made upon us by reason of the default of these railway systems. There are worse things than default in payment of money, and it seems to me that, when this record is written in the history of this country, the default in comman sense on the part of the Canadian people will be in evidence quite as much as the default in payment of interest. Now, having taken stock of the situation, realizing where we are at, I believe that I but voice the opinion of the community in which I live when I say that we demand that these men shall not be left in charge of the operating revenues of that road.

I am not casting any reflection upon the operation of railways; I am not a railway man. But I wish to give one illustration of the wasteful methods of these men in the operation of this road. The hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) spoke the other day. Doubtless he and I frequently go down to the station to take the train for Toronto. Sometimes we take the Canadian Northern train; sometimes we take the Canadian Pacific railway train. That train on the Canadian Northern between Ottawa and Toronto has no more license to be there, no more license to be running there than there would be for running a train from here to Kamchatka. It has no license whatever. Any man in this House knows that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the hon. gentleman explain why?

Mr. BENNETT: The reason is this: there is a sufficient number of trains without this one, to meet the demands of night traffic between Ottawa and Toronto. The Canadian Northern is operating a day train between these points. I have passed through the night train and counted the passengers, night after night, for the purpose of satisfying myself what the revenue may be. I know how many passengers are necessary for a train to pay operating expenses. The maintenance of that train means nothing more or less than a fixed charge upon the revenues of that road; and, as a matter of fact, that money should have been spent in building freight cars to supply the Goose Lake system, of which my hon. friend spoke the other evening, to haul out the farmers' grain. That is what I mean.

Mr. MORPHY: Why would the hon. gentleman not take off the Canadian Pacific Railway train?

Mr. BENNETT: The Canadian Pacific Railway train is operated by a system that shows a surplus of $20,000,000 and was there first.

Mr. MORPHY: Let the other road have a little of the money, then.

Mr. BENNETT: I hope my hon. friend is not so lacking in intelligence as to make a remark of that kind seriously.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not ask you to submit me to any impertinence. Of course, we will stand almost anything from you.

Mr. BENNETT: I am surprised——

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman is an advocate here for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BENNETT: At least, my hon. friend, who occupies that proud position for the Canadian Northern Railway, has been able to show that animus which actuates him. I am not an advocate of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MORPHY: You have that reputation.

Mr. BENNETT: I want to say once more that I am unfortunately in the position of sacrificing a large sum of money per annum because I was, and am not now, an em-

ployee of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have sacrificed more money per annum than the hon. gentleman ever earned in his profession in a year for the purpose of being here rather than being an advocate of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I simply say that the duplication of unnecessary railway facilities is best indicated by the running of that train between these two points. There are four trains a day on the Canadian Northern railway between Toronto and Ottawa: one leaving each point at noon, arriving at the other point in the evening, and one leaving each point at 11 o'clock at night, arriving at the other terminus the next morning at 7.30 o'clock. The local service is not taken care of by the night trains; that is obvious. How did the Canadian Pacific Railway—and I thank my hon. friend for reminding me of it—reach its present position? Just in the manner indicated by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the other day—by making its service consistent with the demands of the travelling public. That is how it was done. When I first went West the train between Calgary and Edmonton ran three times a week; it went up one day and came back the next. My hon. friend from Edmonton will say it was a poor train. It was a poor train. And yet it was by the maintenance of that service that the Canadian Pacific Railway was able to permit the system between these two points to exist. Had it run night trains, as it now does, there would, of course, have been a deficit as between the operating expenses and the revenue. But it did not run night trains until three years ago. But getting back to my illustration, you have on the Canadian Northern a beautiful Pullman train leaving here at 11 o'clock at night. May I remind my hon. friend from St. John that every one of those cars would put 20 freight cars upon the plains, where the profitable business of that road comes from. In other words, according to the best computation that I can make, each of these two night trains between Ottawa and Toronto would involve an initial expenditure at least equal to the cost of one hundred 1,000-bushel freight cars. I leave it to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), who is much more familiar with these facts than I, to say whether or not one hundred freight cars would not handle 100,000 bushels of grain; and whether the moving of 100,000 bushels of grain would not help to relieve the congestion in that country. In constant service between the grain-producing centres of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the head of the lakes, these cars would produce five times the revenue that will be produced in the next five years by the operation of the night trains between Ottawa and Toronto.

nd the money that my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy) wants the system to get, I want it to get by carrying the freight that is lying there to be carried by reason of the development of the country which the railway was built to serve. The people of the West realize that the expensive passenger equipment and service is being maintained at a loss. I do not care what the company says, or what their traffic returns show. I have the evidence of men who have gone over the system for the purpose, and the Board of Railway Commissioners will give you the actual statement. It is a losing service, and the 100 freight cars that could be built, with the expenditure necessary to maintain them, would move 100,000 bushels of wheat out of the congested areas, and be productive. What we demand is that this system be no longer managed by the men who created the existing conditions, but by men who will be responsible for meeting the traffic demands of western Canada, and who will see that the money is not diverted for other purposes. I think it is only fair to ask that.

You ask, how is it to be accomplished? It is to be accomplished in two ways: (1) by the appointment of a board of directors, and (2) by the appointment of adequate auditors. These are the two methods by which I propose to meet the difficulties to which I have directed attention. Left in charge of the $15,000,000, these men would do what they have done in the past. We want not local auditors, not men who have merely good reputations in the particular communities in which they live, but men of international reputation, men who will be responsible in the largest sense of the term for the audit of the railway system, men of large business training and experience who, by reason of their great position in the business world, will enjoy the esteem and confidence of the Canadian people.

So far as directors are concerned—I can only speak for some of us in the West—we ask that those appointed, and I think the Minister of Finance said he would give us three directors, be not dummy directors, not men who will not direct, but men who will be able by reason of their skill, experience and knowledge of railways, to see that the money of the road is used for

the purpose of supplying facilities to the public. After all, the obligation of this railway system is to do what? It is to supply the people with an efficient transportation service, and the demand for that will not be met unless there be appointed directors who have the requisite knowledge, and who will be responsible for the effective administration of the system.

The next safeguard which we ask, and it is not too much to ask, in view of the circumstances, is that no new work should be commenced that would commit the system to great expenditures. I agree entirely with the observations that have been made as to what has been going on in various parts of Canada with regard to the launching of new enterprises connected with this system. We ask, and we have a right to ask, that the money lying in the banks upon the guaranteed securities of the Dominion and the provinces should be used for the purpose of completing the roads for which they were loaned, because we are bound as a matter of law to that, and further, that no new undertakings be commenced. A few years ago, they launched a vast steamship enterprise; they launched a system of hotels, and they have also on hand great terminal enterprises. We must insist, and I ask the Minister of Finance to see to it, that no new expenditures are made until such time as we have had an opportunity to consider them

I go further. The last demand is that there should be an adequate commission for the purpose of ascertaining all the facts connected with these and other railway enterprises. It is not sufficient to say to this House that you are going to appoint a commission. If a commission is to be appointed, it should be appointed before the end of this month. It should be appointed before the month of June, because there will remain only the months of June, July, August and September in which it could carry on its work. It must be a commission, if possible, of men who do not reside in Canada. I do not believe that you can get in Canada men who would not be more or less influenced by local conditions and circumstances, or who would take a disinterested view of the matter, and present a report of a disinterested character upon which we could act. My hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy) referred to the attacks that have been made upon me at various times, the suggestion being that I am partial to the Canadian Pacific railway because I once acted as their legal adviser. These attacks reflect a state of mind common in this country and one which might find expression in any report made. We do not want men who are likely to be influenced by the Canadian Pacific railway, by the Grand Trunk railway, or by the Canadian Northern. What we ask is that you get the biggest men that you can get for money on the American continent, for the purpose, not of studying the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk enterprises, but of looking over the whole railway situation of this Dominion and of determining how the 35,000 miles that are now in Canada can be so co-related and so co-ordinated that they will be of the greatest use to everybody, and that we will get out of them the money to meet the charges against them.

I do not think it is unreasonable or unfair to ask that the commission get to work at the earliest possible moment. I have talked with a gentleman who has travelled over Canada and he informs me that 2,500 miles of railway in this country should be torn up, because they are of no good and never will be of any good to the people. By co-ordination and by co-relation, by linking up this piece of system or that branch line with a new main line, by using the branch lines of the Grand Trunk or Canadian Northern, by using the lowest grade of this road here and another there, we may be able by a system of co-operation to save many miles of railway from destruction. Should a man ask for more than that; can he ask for less? It is not too much to expect that a commission composed of such men would be able to do invaluable work for this Dominion, and would be able to bring in a report which would enable us to arrive at a conclusion in relation to the whole matter when Parliament met again. But it is not for any commission to determine the policy of the Canadian people. That must be determined by themselves. I do not believe that the railway question has ever been as seriously considered by the Canadian people as it should be, and I think that when a report, such as I have indicated, is ready, we should have if possible a special session of this Parliament to deal with this whole matter. I have advocated that privately, and I repeat it publicly. I believe that Parliament should be called together, if possible, without the Government assuming the responsibility for the carrying out of this or that policy. There should be placed on the table of the House a report such as I have indicated, and we should sit together in special session

and determine once and for all what we shall do with regard to a matter which is of great importance to the Canadian people. It would be a report made by men of outstanding position in the railway world whose knowledge and experience would command the respect and esteem of the Canadian people. There should be a financial report that could be read and understood by every hon. member of this House. I would supplement that report, if I had my way, with the annual reports of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk systems of the 30th June, 1916, and let the members of this House study the situation which demands the greatest possible care on the part of every person. Then there is left the question, what shall be done after that? I am not going to say whether or not I believe that government ownership would serve best the interests of this country. I am not here to say whether I believe in the nationalization of all Canadian railways. What I have been struggling for for years —and, so far as I am concerned I will not be content until I get it—is the necessary knowledge to enable me to arrive at an opinion on this question. A former president of the United States, President Taft, in a recent address pronounced himself as strongly opposed to government ownership of railways, as strongly opposed to the nationalization of railways in the United States. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) the other evening said he was not sure that it would serve as a useful purpose in this country. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) was sure that it would be a panacea for all our ills. I am not sure; I have not definitely made up my mind. I have recently looked through the traffic returns of all the great railroads and am satisfied of one thing: the economies that could be effected in operation if the railroads of Canada were nationalized would amount to a stupendous sum. The surplus revenues of the Canadian Pacific railway are very great, for the fixed charges of that road last year were only $10,000,000; and when you remember that their fixed charges were only $10,000,000; while the fixed charges of the Canadian Northern were $15,000,000 per annum, you can get some idea of the burden that would be placed upon us if we dealt with this question in every phase and took into consideration every road that has been built and will be built in Canada. So I am not here to declare either for or against public ownership. But what I ask in the strongest possible terms is that we should not procrastinate in the creation of this commission. We should deal with these matters in the earliest possible moment, and should receive a report that will command respect, that will be the last word of authority on the subject. There are great men in the United States who have been employed by the great railroads for a similar purpose—by Mr. Hill and the late Mr. Harriman, for instance—men of transcendent ability in railroad work, and who have done much in the reconstruction work of railroads in the United States. In addition to that, there are great financial men who would be able to give their assistance in the preparation of a report that would enable us to understand, first of all, the physical value of the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific system—the replacement value—and, secondly, their franchise value, if any. We should also have prepared by proper solicitors a statement of the legal position and of the securities that have been issued by these roads, together with recommendations as to how they can best be dealt with.

In connection with the question of physical value, I should like to turn for a moment to the last condensed balance sheet of the Canadian Northern railroad system. This values the railway and equipment of the Canadian Northern railroad, as on the 30th day of June, 1915, at $430,052,428.55. Let us compare that with the Canadian Pacific railroad. You will find in Poor's Manual a statement of the Canadian Pacific railway system, and it is one well worthy of consideration, because, with all its vast mileage of railway, aggregating 14,000 miles, with all its steamships and lands, it carries its railway and equipment at only $503,584,725.07 (Poor's Manual, 1916, page 1499). When you reflect that the Canadian Northern railroad system is carried in their balance sheet at over $430,000,000, and the Canadian Pacific railroad, with all its equipment, at $503,000,000, or only $73,000,000 difference, you can form some adequate conception of the real situation in regard to the railways of this country. Nothing could more clearly indicate the character of what has been going on during all these years than these two sets of figures. Take that in conjunction with the figures that were put on Hansard the other evening by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), comparing the Canadian Nor-

thern Railway cars per mile with the Canadian Pacific Railway's, and showing that the Canadian Pacific, with some 14,000 miles for traffic purposes, owns something like 87,000 freight cars, 2,781 passenger cars, and nearly 8,000 service cars, as compared with a system which shows not one-third of that equipment, yet whose railway and equipment is declared on its books to be only worth $73,000,000 less than the Canadian Pacific Railway and with several thousand miles less track. That, it seems to me, is something to which the attention of the country cannot be too strongly directed, and I should like the figures placed in possession of every member of this House, together with a copy of the annual statements of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway for the year ending June 30, 1916; so that hon. gentlemen might study these figures in the light of the report of the commission and determine how economies may be effected such as will, by co-relation and co-ordination, enable us to save, if possible, the Canadian taxpayer from further demands on his purse.

I should like hon. gentlemen also to bear in mind the obligations of this road which carries its railway and equipment at $430,000,000. On the 30th of June, 1915, the assets of the Canadian Northern were represented in round figures to be worth $562,000,000, while the Canadian Pacific Railway's assets were valued at $931,000,000 only, of which nearly $100,000,000 was in cash and active securities. Does not that suggest to the House the necessity for the most watchful care in relation to the expenditure of the revenues of the Canadian Northern Railway and of the moneys we are advancing?

But that is not all. Two years ago, you will find in the Sessional Papers for 1914, representations were made by Mr. Hanna, vice-president of the Canadian Northern Railway, over his signature, as to what would be the earnings of the Canadian Northern Railway system for the year 1916. He estimated that the gross earnings for 1916 would be in round figures $54,000,000, and the net earnings $15,000,000; for 1917, gross earnings $61,000,000, and net earnings $17,000,000; and for 1918, gross earnings $67,000,000, and net earnings $20,000,000. Now I find by the documents that were laid upon the Table of the House the other day that the estimated gross earnings for 1916, instead of being $54,000,000, as represented by Mr. Hanna two years ago, are now estimated by him at $34,900,000, and the net earnings at $9,770,000 instead of the $15,000,000 that he estimated two years ago. In view of that the country may well question whether the glorious prophecies of Sir Donald Mann as to the traffic of the future will be realized, and whether, let us say in 1917, the gross earnings of the company will be $61,000,000, as Mr. Hanna estimated them to be in 1914. This year he says they will be $41,000,000. In 1914, when he was after $45,000,000, he estimated that the gross earnings for 1917 would be $61,000,000, and this year, when he is after only $15,000,000, he estimates that the gross earnings will be only $41,000,000, or $20,000,000 less. Then as to 1918, he estimated in 1914 that the gross earnings would be $67,000,000 and to-day he estimates that they will be $47,000,000, a shrinkage of $20,000,000, and so on for 1919 and 1920, and as regards the net earnings in the same ratio.

There is one other matter I should like the House to consider. There are outstanding, according to the figures placed upon Hansard by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and the documents we have before us Canadian Northern railway liabilities to the amount of $492,000,000—$107,000,000 and $101,000,000 and $149,000,000, then $92,000,000 of apparent debt then $17,000,000 for equipment, besides $25,000,000 which we have outstanding for income bonds, or nearly $500,000,000 of securities outstanding, outside of capital stock which is another $100,000,000. Think of that in the light of the fact that the total value given of the railway and equipment is only $430,000,000. It is no wonder that people are asking: Where are we going to get off if this thing continues? There is a limit to the resources even of the Canadian people; there is a limit to the power of the Canadian taxpayer, and I say, in all seriousness: This country cannot continue year after year putting up money to meet deficits that arise in the operation of railroads owing to the promoting tendencies of the contractors who build them. Hence, I rejoice that the Minister of Finance has seen fit to appoint three directors on the Board of Directors of this road. If they are dummy directors like our present director on the Grand Trunk Pacific, who is a station agent at Levis, they will not be very valuable, but if they are men like Sir Thomas Tait, who gave the best of his life to the Government railroads in Australia, then I know that not one dollar will be diverted from its proper source, and that

every dollar that comes from the system will go back into the system or in payment of its just debts.

There are other figures of tremendous interest. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said the other day—and he seemed to think it was true, I think he believed it absolutely—that since we came into power in 1911, there had been a shrinkage in railway earnings, and he attributed that to the fact that the people of this country were not as prosperous as they were before. All I can say is that the railway statistics show quite the opposite. I wish every hon. member would study the volume issued by Mr. Payne every year, and if my hon. friend will turn to page 32, he will find that the railway earnings per year in Canada have increased since 1911; that on the 30th of June, 1911, they reached a higher point than they ever reached before; that they increased since then; that the number of passengers and tons of freight carried per mile until this past year also increased. A summary of the whole railway situation is given on page 39, and it indicates that for the year ending the 30th June, 1911, the gross earnings per mile were $7,430.45; the operating expenses per mile, $5,158.85, and the net earnings per mile, $2,271.64. In 1912 the net earnings increased; in 1913 they increased and in 1914 they increased, but in 1915, they showed a falling off, so that instead of there being a diminution in the traffic returns of the railways as to the number of passengers or as to the tons of freight carried per mile, or as to the revenue per mile, either gross or net, there has been a constant increase since the 30th June, 1911, until last year.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the hon. gentleman saying that I made some allusion, in the remarks I made the other night, to railway traffic since 1911?

Mr. BENNETT: The remark that I understood my hon. friend made was that unfortunately, shortly after the Conservative party come into power, there was a shrinkage in the prosperity of the country, and that that shrinkage affected the railroads.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not specify the railways. What I mentioned particularly was that there had been a yearly increase in productive area and in production in the West, and that that increase in production and in productive area did not continue after 1911. I did not allude to the railway traffic at all.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, it was referable to the railway traffic.

Mr. OLIVER: Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT: And I only read from page 39 of the statement to show that in 1911 we had reached a higher point in railway earnings per mile than at any time before or since 1907, and that there was a steady increase every year until 1915. I merely mention that in passing as it seems to bear upon the observations which the hon. gentleman made.

There can be but two ways by which we can effect improvements in our present system. One is by practicing economy. In relation to economy, I will not deal with that at any greater length than to say that I believe the railways in question can be managed much better than they have been in the past, because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was last year able to show economy amounting to many million dollars that enabled it, with a shrinkage of 25 or 30 per cent in gross revenues, as the hon. Minister of Finance said, to show a very large net return, almost in keeping with the previous year. Everyone who lives in the West will bear me out when I say that the most drastic economy can be effected in relation to the Canadian Northern in the East, and that great benefit will accrue to the West by better facilities for the handling of freight, because freight facilities are demanded in western Canada, and most railway men are constantly engaged in the study of how to bring the handling of freight to the highest state of perfection.

I have had letters from almost every part of the western provinces during the past few months, complaining of the handling of traffic by the Canadian Northern. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has had the same sort of letters, and I doubt not that my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has had the same. Every one of us have received complaints of the slow movement of freight. While there has been congestion of freight, and no cars, these unnecessary duplications of services go on in eastern Canada. Where is the traffic to come from? Economy in service can effect some improvement, but the reorganization of the railway system of Canada, the saving of the taxpayer from the demands that are made upon him an-

nually, can be brought about only in one way, and that is by increasing traffic. Increased traffic in the East must largely mean passenger traffic, because there can be no great increase for some years to come in freight traffic, but in the West, colonization and settlement are the two things that must bring about increase in traffic. Linked up with the transportation problem is the problem of settlement and colonization. After this war there can be no material progress, no material move towards prosperity until such time as we settle our lands with suitable persons and increase the population of this country, and that increase of population will mean that we shall thereby be adding traffic to the railways, so that the solution of this problem of transportation ultimately must rest with the men of western Canada and with the development of that great country west of the lakes. I care not how much discussion may be indulged in as to what passenger facilities are required here or there. So far as the West is concerned, in the hands of the producers of the plains, and not with the residents of the cities and towns, rests the solution of this problem, for until such time as the great body of mileage that is now unproductive, that is now not being utilized to the extent to which it can be utilized, is supplied with traffic, although there may be congestion at this or that point, in the ultimate analysis you find there is not sufficient traffic for all those roads to take care of. There is a limit to the traffic production of 8,000,000 people, and that limit has been nearly reached. This year, with lessening crops, and with lessening traffic, there will be lessening returns.

Let me point out some figures that have been prepared by a gentleman who is now engaged with the Economic Commission, and that show what we have in the West at the present time. We have a population in the four western provinces of 2,212,576. In Manitoba 56 per cent of the population is urban and 44 per cent rural; in Saskatchewan, 27 per cent is urban and 73 per cent rural; in Alberta, 40 per cent is urban and 60 per cent rural; in British Columbia, 55·4 per cent is urban and 44·6 per cent rural. We have a total of 955,653 people in the towns and 1,256,923 people in the rural parts of the four western provinces. Let us look at the railway mileage:

[Mr. R. B. Bennett.]

Railway mileage.

	Miles.
Manitoba	4,576
Saskatchewan	6,011
Alberta	4,153
British Columbia	4,378.9
Total	19,117.9

That is, in these four provinces we have more than half the railway mileage of Canada—and with a population of less than two and a half millions of people. How does that work out with relation to the population?

Relation of Railway Mileage to Population.

	Total. 1 mile to.	Rural. 1 mile to
Manitoba	116	51
Saskatchewan	115	84
Alberta	120	72
British Columbia	114	45
Four Western provinces	116.3	66

This does not take account of certain miles of railway in British Columbia not yet completed. Now, if this House and this country will keep these facts in mind, it will assist in the realization of the vastness of the problem that confronts the Canadian people. It means this—that we must get into the West more people. For there is no chance of 66 people ever being able to produce or consume traffic sufficient to maintain a mile of railway the average cost of which in Canada is between $40,000 and $45,000, and the fixed charges upon which will amount in the aggregate to nearly $2,000;—sixty-six people cannot contribute $2,000 a mile net, which really means after all the production of $6,600 a mile. People cannot produce at the rate of $100 each for the purpose of maintaining the railways, for that is what it comes down to. So, this problem of transportation is indissolubly connected with the colonization and settlement of western Canada; and I say to the Minister of Finance, unless some policy is outlined by which these plains are settled year by year and day by day, you will have a demand made upon the tax-payers of this country to pay a deficit upon the operation of these railroad systems. There are the facts that stare us in the face; and it requires courage, determination, imagination, and a vision of the future that is to be to deal with them as they should be dealt with. We must settle this country, for until the country is settled the transportation problem will not and cannot be settled. In the eastern part of Canada, I believe, you have only one method by which you can possibly hope to succeed in solving

4 p.m.

the problem, and that is by increasing largely your passenger traffic, and you can only do that when you have roads sufficiently strong to take care of these passengers. I have long had a dream that the terminal facilities at Halifax might be used by bringing, let us say, the Mauretania to that port to ascertain what time she can make in carrying passengers from Liverpool destined for Chicago and other American cities; and then have well-equipped trains such as we have provided in some cases, to see how many days quicker we can land passengers in Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul and other western points, than can possibly be done by way of New York. In that way we may be able to develop passenger traffic for our railways. But we cannot look to that alone for a solution of the railway problems. It is borne in upon my mind—that, when, out of thirty-five thousand miles of railway in the whole Dominion you have nineteen thousand miles west of the Great Lakes, the problem must be dealt with in the West; and, that being the case, it is incumbent upon those who have the power and responsibility, to see to it that our population is increased by a vigorous immigration policy.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman come to settlement of the West. Will he state briefly what are his views of a progressive policy for settling the West?

Mr. BENNETT: I have a well-defined idea on that subject, but the statement of it in this House might not serve any useful purpose. It would be only a statement of the ideas of one person.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the hon. gentleman is very influential with the Government.

Mr. BENNETT: No, not very influential. I wish he were. I will go this far—any settlement policy to be effective in this country must have reference both to the East and to the West. I am not one of those who believe that when this war is over you will find people flocking into this country. I believe that the darkest days of this country's economic history in the near future will be, first the period of readjustment to follow the war, and after that the period of reconstruction. When the war is over, and our soldiers are paid off and return; when dislocated industry is being adjusted from the manufacture of munitions; I believe you will find a time of very great depression in this country, a time that will require the greatest courage and determination on the part of all of us to meet. After that will come the reconstruction period, and that, in my judgment, will be not of rapid development. There are two reasons why it should come slowly. The first is, that the settlers we shall get into the country will be of limited numbers, and the second is that the economic strain which we shall have undergone will be so great as to prevent us from readily finding large sums of money for the purpose of the undertakings necessary for a large inflow of people. I do not know that I should take up time to talk about this, and perhaps the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) will excuse me if I do not enter upon the question at length, because I do not think that the presentation of the views of one individual upon an abstract question will serve any useful purpose. I have said that I have well-defined ideas of how this is to be accomplished, and I have also said that the carrying out of the policy necessary to accomplish the end will require great courage, great determination, some imagination, and a vision of the future that is greater than the present. I believe that the abandoned farms of the eastern provinces can be settled. Upon these farms I would settle men who have lived out of doors for the last two or three years, men who will be glad to come here with a little money, to seek educational advantages for their children, and who desire to escape high taxation and to continue to live under the British flag. These men will settle in the East. But the younger men, more vigorous, with a spirit of adventure, and who want to be in the open, must come to the West. And in coming they should be given the assistance of the state, with money to go upon the land and to find for them agricultural implements. We must provide modern facilities to make this the best country to live in in the world; because, unless it is better than other countries, other countries will get the settlement that we need. For we know that settlement does not always follow the flag. We know that after the Boer war thousands of men went to the United States who should have come to Canada. And they went there because we could not offer them the facilities that were offered them elsewhere. We must have rural telephones, good means of highway transportation, and some community life such as can only be brought about by putting the state behind it all. No policy of colonization can be made efficient or useful or worthy of the

name of a policy, that does not put behind it the power of the state. I am sure I shall be excused, if for no other reason than because of the difficulty with which I speak from making further observations on the subject.

I do desire to reiterate and to press upon the attention of this House the fact that the transportation question cannot be settled other than by the West, because, fortunately or unfortunately, 20,000 of that 35,000 miles of railway are there, with a population so sparse that we have one mile of road to every 66 of our rural population. That being so, I am giving my support to this measure at this time because I believe that it means the end. Two years ago I was frank in stating that I did not believe that it meant the end. It is no joy to any man to be right if being right means that his country suffers thereby. I have no joy in relation to that, but I am profoundly concerned about one thing, which I press upon this Government and upon my hon. friend the Minister of Finance: that no time be lost; that there be no procrastination and no delay; that this commission of the biggest men that money can buy at once get to work and report to the Canadian people as to the possibilities of co-ordination and co-relation of the various units that comprise the railway systems of this country, so that, if possible, the traffic that is now being developed and may be developed, may be made productive and so that there may be no further calls upon the Canadian taxpayer. I am certain, however, that the Canadian taxpayer will not continue to pay unless some return be made to him either in the way of lessened freight rates or by his ownership of the facilities by which his trade is being transported. I want to be able to arrive at a conclusion, with my mind at least seized of all the facts, therefore I do urge upon my hon. friend the selection of the best men that he can get—men of experience, of knowledge, of vision; men who, looking to the West, will see not merely a few scattered homesteads and a few miles of track, but a great vision of the mighty influx of the human race that will one day pass over in that direction and occupy this land, for whom facilities have been supplied far in advance of the needs, far in advance of what the requirements are to-day. The constant demand that has been made on Governments being met by constant acquiescence, not refusal, has created a condition in which we find more facilities than we have traffic to take care of, although now and then, by reason of the spreading out of those facilities, there are not sufficient cars to take care of the traffic which develops at particular points. That but accentuates the force of the argument that I have been endeavouring to make. If such a commission does that, having a proper audit made by men of international reputation who will ensure to me that the money which we are voting is used for the purpose of protecting the credit of the Canadian people and not otherwise, and that the revenues which are paid by the people of this country are used for the purpose of carrying their traffic to the seaboard; if and when that is done, I am satisfied that when we come back—if I had my way it would be a special session for the consideration of this subject only—free from the fetters of restraint imposed upon men who vote to support a cut-and-dried policy —what we will do as representatives of all the Canadian people to work out a great policy, having regard to the present and looking also into the future, will redound to the credit of this Parliament and of the people who are represented here.

I apologize for having trespassed so long upon the time and patience of the committee in compelling it to listen to my remarks, made under very difficult physical conditions. There is much that might and should be said with relation to figures, but they are lessons of the past. The future problem is what must be dealt with under the conditions that now exist. Recrimination or self-deception or regrets will not get us away from the fact that the condition that confronts us is one of the most difficult that ever confronted Canadian statesmen, and that it calls for the co-operation and the united effort of every man who sits within this Chamber, whether he sits on the side of the Opposition or supports the Government.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): I assure the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that he need not apologize for the length of his remarks. He has devoted a good deal of study to this question, as is evidenced by the manner in which he has presented it to the committee. It is one of the problems, and my hon. friend has dealt with it in a manner to which no person can take objection. I regret that I was called out and did not hear his remarks in their entirety, but I shall read them in Hansard with a great deal of interest, and

I will keep them among the few Government books that I do keep, because the hon. gentleman has given us a great deal of information that is worth while. The gist of it is this: whatever our views may be, Sir, the successful solution of our railway problems depends on the results of our endeavours to fill up the western country and make traffic for our transportation facilities. That, in short, is what confronts us. The problem before the country is to devise a scheme to bring immigration or its management up to date, so that the lands of the West will be occupied and developed and so that proper returns may come to the country from that development.

A few days ago, when these railway Estimates were placed before the House, I pointed out that the manner in which they were submitted to us robbed the members of their right to deal with them in a practical manner. I was laughed at by some hon. gentlemen on the other side. I pointed out that they should have been introduced by resolution, as is the ordinary method, so that any member on either side could move an amendment. No restriction, no qualification can be placed on these grants, and I claim that that is not fair to members of the House. The Government meet and decide what they will do, but the rest of us represent the people just as much as do the members of the Government. I repeat that the manner in which the granting of this aid has been introduced precludes any motion on the part of any one on either side of the House to vary, to qualify or to place restrictions or impose conditions in respect of this proposed aid. That is not fair. The Government say to us: you have to take the responsibility of putting this road into liquidation without any condition, or you have to grant this aid. After the ruling to-day, which, Sir, was absolutely according to the rules of the House, I am firmly convinced that these items were not brought in in this way accidentally; they were brought in to put it beyond the reach of members to impose any condition upon the granting of this money. I wished to move an amendment providing that if we granted this aid the Government should take over a sufficient amount of the common stock of the Canadian Northern to give the people control, so that we could say what must be done with this road when the time came. I think it is unfair that I am precluded from proposing that amendment. I am not going to argue the matter; what is the use? As a member of this House who has given some attention to railway matters, I realize that my hands are tied. I might just as well sit down. I am absolutely helpless unless I am prepared to vote to strike out the item, which I am not prepared to do.

Mr. BENNETT: Would it not be sufficient if 25 per cent of the stock were lodged with a trust company and we had a voting power? This would give us control of the corporation and would be sufficient for our purposes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not object to that; what I want is not the stock for its value, but for its voting power, so that when the time for decision arrives the people of Canada, through the Government, will have control. But, as I say, I cannot move the resolution because the manner in which the legislation is brought in precludes my proposing an amendment. The only thing I can add is to urge the Governor in Council to make that a part of the conditions which they have power to impose, when they come to grant this aid. I have not the power. I say that the decision of the chairman, which was absolutely correct as I pointed out to the House the other night, makes it impossible for any member on either side of the House to have anything to say about this grant in a practical way, unless he is prepared to move that the item be reduced or be struck out. Under those conditions I feel that my duty has been performed. Had I the right, I would move one resolution, perhaps two. One that I would move I have just outlined, and that is, that in some way the Government should take control of the stock, so that when the time for a final decision comes, it would be in a position to practically dictate what the terms would be, and the company would be compelled, yes, I think, would be willing to be compelled, to leave it to a reasonable Government to say on what terms this road would be taken over. I protest again at this unusual method, of presenting this matter to Parliament, one which has never before been followed in this Parliament, at least in my time. When in other sessions aid to railways has been proposed, the measures have always been brought in in the usual form, by resolution; and then any member in this House could move any amendment he liked as to conditions, and these amendments could be discussed. But under this new method under which both these items

have been presented to the House, we are absolutely precluded from moving any amendment, and no member, no matter what constituency he represents, has the right to do anything practical in reference to these votes of money.

One word more: The question of the nationalization of railways has been discussed in this House. Personally I am free to say that I am not afraid of the nationalization of railways; but if I were going to do it, I would nationalize all railways and not a portion of them, for reasons which I shall not stop to discuss now. One great reason is that the systems ought to be brought in under the same conditions, and should be placed under the same management, if we are to take over the control of any of them. Mark you, the taking over of one or two might be the initial step towards taking them all over. I repeat that I am not the least alarmed at the prospect of the nationalization of railways. I have lived for a good many years in a town where the lighting system and the waterworks have been taken over by the municipality; and while we have disagreed as to details in many things, I must say that the management has been just as good, if not a little better, than under private companies, and the people have always felt that, whatever money was expended, it was their money and it was their business; and the public have taken a greater interest in the management of these public utilities than they did when they belonged to private companies. Then we have the work of the Hydro-Electric Commission in Ontario, which has been Government of a great public utility. That commission has served, and is serving, a useful purpose. I say, without any hesitation, that I believe the establishment of that commission and its working out has brought about the betterment of conditions 20 years sooner than this betterment would have been brought about had there been no Government control of this great public undertaking. I have no fear of the nationalization of railways. It will have to be a complete proposition embracing them all, if it be done at all. Perhaps, as I have said, taking over one or two at a time might be the initial step towards further enlargement of the national system until it would embrace all existing systems. But I do want to make my position clear that I am precluded as a member of this House from moving a resolution that I desire to move,

[Mr. Graham.]

imposing conditions on both these companies when we are granting aid to them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance): It appeared to the Government that it was not necessary to proceed by resolution with this Bill as was done in 1914 when the mortgage of $45,000,000 was given to the Canadian Northern Railway Company. This legislation—because it is legislation notwithstanding that the loans are embodied in the Estimates—provides for the issue of no securities. It is a simple money loan, a loan of $15,000,000 upon conditions set out in the Estimate. No securities are to be issued, no complicated legislation is necessary; and it seems to me, arguing the matter from the standpoint of the right of the Government to introduce this legislation in this way, it is simply a question as to whether or not those proposals are properly in the Estimates. I do not think that the Chairman or the Speaker of the House would rule that these items in the Estimates are out of order. If they are in order, then the Government is clearly within its rights in bringing down these loans in the Estimates, as has been done.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does my hon. friend remember the Scripture quoted by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) the other evening, "All things are right; but all things are not expedient"?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the Minister of Trade and Commerce quoted Scripture, I would pay more attention to him than to my hon. friend in doing so. There is no reason why the suggestion of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), should not be discussed, notwithstanding that no power of amendment exists in Committee of Supply. The hon. member for Assiniboia raised the matter the other night. He asked:

> Whether, if this vote of $15,000,000 for the Canadian Northern carries, he intends to ask them to hand over to the Government, in addition to the 40 per cent of the common stock of the company that the Government now owns, additional stock to the amount of say $15,000,000 or $20,000,000.

That is the idea the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has in his mind.

Mr. GRAHAM: Either that or the proposition of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett); I am not particular.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: At all events, the idea is to obtain control of the stock of the company. The hon. member for Assiniboia went on to say:

I suggest this not because I consider that this stock would be of any particular value, but in order that the Government might be ready to handle the situation and be in a position to avoid being taken by the throat in connection with the matter in the future.

I desire to draw attention in this connection to the legislation of 1914. Under that legislation, in event of default on the part of the Canadian Northern railway in the payment of interest upon its securities, or in the event of a receivership, which would be in event of default, then this Government has the power, as that legislation is existing to-day, to appoint a board of directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and of its subsidiary and constituent companies to enforce its security; to

—declare the equity of redemption of the Canadian Northern and of all other persons whomsoever in the mortgaged premises to be foreclosed, and thereupon the equity of redemption of the Canadian Northern (and of such other persons) in the mortgaged premises and every part thereof shall be and become absolutely barred and foreclosed, and the same shall thereupon be vested in His Majesty in right of the Dominion of Canada, any statutory enactment or any rule of law or equity to the contrary notwithstanding.

The effect of that enactment, which is in existence to-day, is that, in the event of default on the part of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, so far from the Canadian Northern Railway Company being able to take this Government by the throat, the Government can demand that the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway system resign their offices, and the Dominion Government may appoint directors in their places, may take complete control of the Canadian Northern Railway system; and may foreclose the equity of redemption of the Canadian Northern railway and deal with that equity of redemption as Parliament may see fit, in the interests of the people of Canada. That was the legislation brought down in 1914 in connection with the guarantee which we then gave upon the $45,000,000 securities of the Canadian Northern. In so far as my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has declared that the Canadian Northern railway can take this Government by the throat and control the situation, I desire to draw his attention, and the attention of the hon. member for South Renfrew, to the legislation to which I have referred.

Mr. TURRIFF: Would that not mean that the Government would have to take foreclosure proceedings? That would take at least a year, if not more. It would mean, if the Canadian Northern people fought the case, a long, tedious legal struggle, whereas the whole trouble could be avoided and the Government could be put in a position to act quickly and thoroughly if they controlled this stock. When my hon. friend the Minister of Finance gave the grant of $45,000,000 and the guarantee in 1914, he took over $40,000,000 worth of stock. Now that the company comes for another $15,000,000 more, why not take over another portion of the stock?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend still misunderstands the legislation of 1914. So far from any delay being open to the railway company, under that legislation the Dominion Government can at once appoint boards, take possession, and administer the system by these boards. It has as full power as if it had all the stock of the Canadian Northern railway and its subsidiary and constituent companies.

I come to the amendment which my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) had in view. No point of order was taken by myself, or, so far as I know, by any other member of the Government. The point of order was raised by the Speaker himself. Personally, I had no objection to the amendment; in fact, I came to the House to-day prepared to discuss it, because it had not occurred to me that it was out of order. The Chairman is, however, clearly right, and no amendment is possible under the rules of the House, but that does not preclude us from discussing the merits of the amendment which my hon. friend from St. John had in view. In that amendment he suggested:

Before making such loan the Governor in Council shall require the company to give His Majesty the King an option to acquire at any time within five years from the date thereof the railways and other property of the company and of all other railways and property included in the Canadian Northern system at such price as to the Governor in Council may seem reasonable under existing circumstances.

That is to say, my hon. friend from St. John had this in view, that, before extending this aid, by way of loan, the Governor in Council should now fix a price at which it would be open to the Government to take over the Canadian Northern system, and that in reaching a conclusion as to that price they should refer to the existing circumstances. I would point out to my hon.

friend that he is dealing there with the equity of redemption of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Of course, so far as the terms of his amendment go, it would be possible for the Government to fix a price, $380,000,000 or $400,000,000, or more, but included in that price, of course, would be the debt which the Government would have to assume in taking over the system. My hon. friend will agree that as there are liabilities amounting to some $380,000,000 upon the Canadian Northern system, what the Government would have to do would be to practically fix the value of the equity of redemption of the Canadian Northern railway system in its undertaking; in other words, to fix a fair price upon the value of the stock. That is what the amendment of my hon. friend comes to, and the question arises as to whether it would be wise for the Government, dealing with this matter as it is now dealing with it, to fix a price at which it would be within the power of the Government within the next five years to take over the Canadian Northern Railway system. It has to be pointed out that at present the Government holds 40 per cent of the stock of the Canadian Northern, that is to say, $40,000,000 out of a total issued capital stock of $100,000,000. My hon. friend from Assiniboia says that there is no value in the stock, but he and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) are evidently at variance as to that, because it is perfectly clear that my hon. friend from St. John, by reason of the suggestion that the Government should fix an option, has in mind that there is value in the stock of the Canadian Northern to-day. He is at variance with the hon. member for Assiniboia, who says that the stock has absolutely no value, and whose suggestion was that the Government might be better able to control, through a majority interest in the stock, the administration of the Canadian Northern Railway system.

Mr. R. B. BENNETT: Purely voting.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, purely voting. I have pointed out that the holding of a majority interest in the stock is not necessary to enable us to control the Canadian Northern Railway system in the event of default, and if we took over to-day the administration of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, no default having taken place, we should not only have to provide this $15,000,000, which we are providing by way of a loan so as to meet the temporary obligations of the Canadian Northern system, but we would also have to take upon ourselves the burden of financing the Canadian Northern system during the present war and hereafter.

Hon. gentlemen will have observed from the statements laid before the House the position of the Canadian Northern—$92,000,000 of maturities this year and next year, and obligations current. The sum of $15,000,000 is the minimum amount, upon receiving which by way of loan the Canadian Northern will be able to finance the obligations which it has still to meet during the present and the coming year. The Government is not at this moment proposing to control the operation of the Canadian Northern, because if it did propose to control it, it would have to undertake the burden of financing the Canadian Northern system. The proposals of the Government are to assist the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company by way of loans of minimum amount, upon receiving which, the two railway companies will be able to continue their operation during the present war. It is a temporary measure designed to enable these two companies to go on as solvent concerns, until we can make the investigation to which I alluded in my speech upon the occasion of the House going into committee on this subject, until we can make an investigation into the whole of the Canadian railway situation, so that we can substitute for the temporary policies which have been adopted during recent years a permanent policy which will, we hope, solve the whole railway situation.

To come back to the question of taking an option, under the legislation of 1914, in the event of default, the Government may foreclose, and it will then be for Parliament to say whether they will pay anything for equity of redemption or not. It will be open to Parliament to say: We shall pay something or we shall pay nothing. There is another feature. Not only do we control the situation through the legislation of 1914, but, as pointed out by the hon. member for Calgary, we absolutely control it by reason of the fact that this $15,000,000 loan is a demand loan, and being a demand loan, we hold a stronger position than if we held a majority of the stock of the Canadian Northern Railway Company because the rights of a creditor are higher than the rights of a shareholder. The company not being able to meet his demand, the creditor absolutely controls the situation. So that from a strictly legal standpoint it is not necessary that we should have a majority of the stock of the

Canadian Northern railway in order to control the administration of that road in case of default.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is it intended to exercise the right of calling in this $15,000,000 in case of default?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have told my hon. friend that the Government is investigating the whole Canadian railway situation. We are doing what I believe is the sensible thing under present conditions. The Canadian railway situation is exceedingly complicated and one of the most important that has ever confronted any Government in Canada. We are taking the opinion of experts, and when we have their advice we shall be in a position to act. In the meantime, by reason of this being a demand loan, our position is such that we can control the situation. There is another point. Hon. gentlemen have suggested that we should obtain control of the Canadian Northern railway stock. Now, it must be borne in mind that the possession of that stock is very valuable to them in financing the Canadian Northern railway system. As a matter of fact, I understand that to-day their stock is pledged in order to assist in the financing of the company. The company, of course, has to continue to finance itself, and it seems to me that as we are affording the minimum degree of assistance with which the company can get on, we should not take any step that would prevent the Canadian Northern railway from doing its share of the financing. As the hon. member for Assiniboia thinks the stock has no commercial value—and I am not pronouncing upon that at all—the only point my hon. friend can have in mind is the control of the Canadian Northern system, and I have already pointed out that we have that control by the legislation of 1914 and by reason of the fact that this is a demand loan. There is another aspect that I commend to the attention of the hon. member for St. John. Would it be wise for the Government at this time to place a value upon Canadian Northern stock? If we did that we should have to say that the stock was either worth nothing at all or worth a small amount, or perhaps a large amount. Now if the stock was not worth anything, as my hon. friend from Assiniboia thinks, what would be the use of taking an option on it?

Mr. NESBITT: No use except that it would give you control.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We have dealt with control. Again, if the Government put a small value upon the stock, that would unquestionably embarrass the Canadian Northern in the financing which they must do to carry on this road, for I have already stated that the stock is of value to them in carrying on their financing. So if the Government, taking the advice of the hon. member for St. John, placed a small value on the stock and took an option on it for five years, we would be fettering the company, or at least the owners of the majority of the stock, in the financing which they and the company have to do if the company is to continue as a going concern. If the Government took the other alternative and put a large value on the stock, what would be the position if by reason of default the Government found it necessary to take over the Canadian Northern railway system? Under the legislation of 1914 it would then be for Parliament to determine what should be done with the road and how much should be paid to the stockholders, whether anything or nothing. Why should the Government take a step which might embarrass Parliament in dealing with the equity of redemption should the road ever default? Unquestionably the placing of a value on the stock would fetter the Government in deciding what should be done with the equity of redemption, if it had to deal with it under the legislation of 1914.

So far as control is concerned, I have shown that we are able to exercise all the control we need under the legislation of 1914 and by reason of the fact that this is a demand loan. I have shown further that the taking of this stock by the Government would seriously embarrass the Canadian Northern railway and its shareholders in the very necessary work of carrying on the financing of this road. The Canadian Northern railway financial arrangements are not going to be completed by obtaining this $15,000,000 from the Government. There are the maturing obligations of this and next year and current liabilities to be met to the amount of $92,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How will possession of the common stock which stands behind all this security assist the company in their financing?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend knows that in the eyes of financial men the majority of the stock of a company like the Canadian Northern railway might be

regarded as of considerable value as additional collateral. It might make just the difference between the company obtaining a loan and not obtaining a loan. As a matter of fact, I understand that the stock is now pledged for that very purpose.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has it a market value to-day?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not know whether it has or not. But my hon. friend evidently has it in mind that it has, or he would not suggest that the Government fix a price at which it could take over the road at any time during the next five years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I am afraid of is that after the Government has pulled the road through, the stock will have a vast prospective value.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend does not say that. He says "at such price as to the Governor in Council may seem reasonable under existing circumstances." I have dealt with the matter of common stock from the point of view of taking an option on the equity of redemption of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Referring to one or two other matters which have been mentioned in the course of this debate, the hon. member for Edmonton, I think, charged the Government with discriminating against the Grand Trunk Pacific. When this Government assumed office it found a certain railway situation existing in the Dominion of Canada. The Canadian Pacific railway had long before that attained a degree of prosperity under which it was not necessary for it to approach Parliament for assistance, although in the past of course it had been assisted by the Dominion. The hon. member for Digby the other day placed upon Hansard a statement showing that the Canadian Pacific railway had obtained subsidies and loans from the Dominion Government, from the provinces and municipalities to the amount of $71,000,000, showing that constructed lines and surveys were handed over by the Government amounting to $37,000,000, and that the Dominion Government had given the Canadian Pacific Railway Company land grants amounting to 21,000,000 acres, while the Government of British Columbia had given some 6,000,000 acres. Therefore, in the early days the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was subsidized both in land and cash grants by the Dominion and Provincial Governments. When this Government assumed power, we found that the Canadian Northern Railway Company had an uncompleted line between Montreal and Port Arthur. We found the line through the Rockies in course of construction and we found the Canadian Northern Railway system in Ontario other than the line to which I have referred between Montreal and Port Arthur, also under construction. We found a situation in which the Canadian Northern had, as I have stated, uncompleted lines both in the East and in the West, and we found them confronted with a situation in which either they would have to cease construction and possibly go into insolvency or we would have to assist them in carrying out the construction of their lines which they were constructing under aid granted by the previous Administration.

We had the National Transcontinental in an unfinished condition between Moncton and Winnipeg, especially from Quebec to Winnipeg. We found the prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific uncompleted; we found the mountain section of the Grand Trunk Pacific uncompleted. Now, I say that any charge against this Government of discriminating against the Grand Trunk Pacific is absolutely unfair. Since this Government have come into power, we have dealt fairly with all the railways of this country. As Minister of Finance I have had no favourites in this matter. I am not saying anything as to politics; I am not saying whether the National Transcontinental should have been built or not; I am not saying whether the Transcontinental Railway agreement of 1903 should have been entered into or not; but coming into power in 1911, and finding the unfinished railway systems of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific, we acted with scrupulous fairness to both, and we are not properly open to the charge of having discriminated against the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I call to witness the facts. One of the first transactions that confronted me as Minister of Finance was a payment of $5,000,000 under the "implementing" judgment. It was proper that we should pay that, because judgment had been given by the Privy Council. We bought at par $33,000,000 of Grand Trunk Pacific 3 per cent bond guarantees by the Dominion Government and furnished the money to the Grand Trunk Pacific promptly in order that they might proceed without delay in their construction. Further than

that, we made a loan of $15,000,000 to the Grand Trunk in cash the second year we were in power, and in 1914 we gave a guarantee of $16,000,000 of the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific in order that they might complete the Mountain section and the unfinished part of the Prairie section. As a result of the legislation that we have introduced concerning these railways, their lines have been completed; the Canadian Northern has been linked up; the National Transcontinental has been taken over by the Government, and the Grand Trunk Pacific has completed its line from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert. Therefore, what the Government has done since it came into power in 1911 has been to assist in completing the uncompleted railway systems of Canada. Those systems were made possible by the aid which was afforded by the Government in power prior to 1911, the aid which was given to the Canadian Northern, first by way of guarantee upon a portion of its line from Winnipeg to Edmonton, and, secondly, the guarantee which was given by the late Government of $35,000 per mile upon the Canadian Northern Ontario from Montreal to Port Arthur. Those systems, therefore, transcontinental railway systems, were made possible by the legislation of the preceding Administration, and the task which has confronted us since we have come into power has been to assist in completing their enterprises. If we had not assisted in completing those enterprices they could not have been carried to completion. The Grand Trunk Pacific would not have been completed to Prince Rupert to-day if we had not given the assistance; the National Transcontinental would not have been completed unless we had completed it by carrying on the work of construction, and the Canadian Northern railway system would not have been completed except for the aid which we gave in 1911, a subsidy upon the line in British Columbia and a guarantee upon a portion of the line up to Summit, the subsidies which we gave in 1912 and the grant of $45,000,000 which we gave in 1914.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where would have been the difficulty, after this Government came into power, in arranging to give the Canadian Northern running rights through the mountains over the Grand Trunk Pacific, instead of giving them the subsidy and joining the British Columbia Government, which guaranteed bonds for over $40,000,000 to enable them to build an independent line down through the Rockies?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The line was under construction. Not only that, as I pointed out the other evening—

Mr. PUGSLEY: They started construction on the British Columbia grant.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But is it not true they had no assistance from Canada to go through the Rocky mountains?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The line was under construction when we gave the assistance. In the legislation of the late Government, under which a grant of $35,000,000 was given on the Canadian Northern Ontario line between Montreal and Port Arthur, it was recited that it was in the interest of Canada that there should be a third transcontinental line from Montreal to the waters of the Pacific. It was that $35,000,000 grant on the Canadian Northern Ontario line between Montreal and Port Arthur that determined the character of the Canadian Northern as a transcontinental system. There is not a doubt about that, and at the time that grant was given the late Government had in contemplation, and stated in the recital of the resolution, that it was in the public interest that the line should be carried through to British Columbia to reach the waters of the Pacific.

There is one thing about this debate that has pleased me, and that is that there has been very little recrimination. The past is a closed book. I address myself to this railway situation with no favourites. It is one of the most important situations that has ever confronted any Government in this country; it has been for the last four years. The difficulty in this country as we all know is the immense geographical area and the sparseness of our population. In the early days confederation was possible only because the Intercolonial, built at great expense, linked up the then East with the then West. The next great step taken was the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway which made a larger confederation possible, and linked up the West and British Columbia with the East. Then we had the building of the Canadian Northern railway in the Prairie Provinces. And there is one aspect of this that is apt to be overlooked, and that is the enormous importance to Canada of the railway situation which we have built up. Almost every day in this House we hear of the necessity of more transportation, of more cars, of new districts in the West that should be reached

by branch lines. What would be the condition in the West to-day if those lines had not been built.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Deplorable.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Last year 40 per cent of the wheat was carried out by the Canadian Northern Railway system. This question is not a matter of individuals; it is not a matter of the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk Pacific as a corporation. The point is, the importance of the railway system to Canada and its development; and that is the way in which this question ought to be approached. What we have before us to-day is not a theory but a condition. We have these three railway systems completed—except that railway systems are never completed, because they must always extend, must always increase their mileage as conditions permit. No question in this country since Confederation has been so vital to it as that of the railways. My own opinion is that we have overbuilt for the time being. But it must be borne in mind that public opinion has been in favour of building railways, to connect the East and the West, to develop the West, and to afford access to the remoter parts of the country in order that immigration might flow in and settlement result. The whole country has benefited by the extension of the railway systems to the West. Therefore, though, as I say, we have overbuilt, it must not be forgotten that the most vital question in this country to-day is the transportation question. That being the case, I personally do not believe in getting into a pessimistic frame of mind with regard to Canada. If, when this war broke out, anyone had told me as Minister of Finance that we should have been in the condition in which we are to-day the war having lasted almost two years, I should not have believed it. Consider the position of Canada to-day. Notwithstanding this war, Canada enjoys a very high degree of prosperity. Our exports are greatly in excess of our imports, and our trade is the largest this country has ever had. Our bank deposits are two or three hundred millions greater than they were at the outbreak of the war. I do not allow myself to take too long views of things, because I do not believe that the human mind is capable of forecasting what will take place after this war is over. I have great confidence in the people of this country and in this country's resources, and so I do not allow myself to think things are going to the bad after this war is over.

Mr. NESBITT: They don't give any reasons.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, they do not. I rely with the greatest confidence upon Canada's ability to carry out her share in this war and to come through the war with a high degree of prosperity.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In connection with the hon. minister's financial operations, which have been very successful, does he not find himself hampered sometimes by the pessimistic remarks made by his colleagues?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. Most of the pessimistic remarks come from the other side of the House. But I recognize the fact that we are in the midst of a great war and that the burdens upon us are great; no one realizes more the burden of this war than I do; the immediate responsibility is upon me. Yet, while realizing to the full the responsibilities with which we are confronted, I believe that this country will come through this war, not only having creditably discharged her duty to herself and to the Empire, but with a high degree of prosperity. What I hope is that, with this prosperity which we now have and which I believe will continue, we shall be able to bridge over, if necessary, any short period of dislocation of business which may ensue. I am putting that forward as my own opinion. Opinions differ. I do not believe that anybody's view on a matter of this kind is of much value, but I am putting forward my view as being optimistic with regard to Canada.

Now, what is the present railway situation? We have poured out tens and hundreds of millions of dollars in building our transportation system, in linking up the Maritime Provinces with Ontario, in linking up the East with the West; to promote the settlement of the West. And now that we have come to the position of having these railways completed, personally I do not believe it is the part of national wisdom to let them collapse. Having gone so far, should you now stop? Especially in the midst of a war? I believe it is the opinion of the members of this House and of the people of Canada that these railway systems at this time should not be allowed to collapse—and I am speaking now of the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk as well, for the Grand Trunk is undoubtedly bound up with

the financing of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The position is, that having almost completed their lines, these companies find themselves in a position in which they require further aid in order to continue. The Government is affording that aid, a temporary measure of aid. But, as I said on a former occasion, it is not possible that we should continue to make these loans year after year to these railways; and we must find a permanent solution of this railway question. And what has pleased me about the debate on this subject is that the speeches indicate that hon. members realize that recrimination as to the past is useless; that we are face to face with a very serious situation; that we can meet it; that the railway problem is one of the most important problems in this country; and that the course the Government has taken, in extending temporary aid to prevent untoward happening in the case of these railways and to make investigation with a view to solving the railway problem, is the proper course to pursue.

The question of immigration has been touched upon. A proper immigration policy is the key to the solution of the economic problems of Canada. Get in immigration, get your immigrants settled upon the land, and your railway problem is settled, and your other economic problems are settled. That is the great question with which this Dominion of Canada is now confronted, and with which it will be confronted after the war—getting in desirable immigration, and getting the immigrants established as producers on the land. That will mean more traffic for the railways, more business for the commercial, manufacturing, and industrial interests. It is vital and fundamental that Canada should promote in every way possible immigration and settlement. I believe we shall get immigration and that we shall settle it upon the land, and that the railway problem will in time be solved. In the meantime, here is the railway problem and we must meet it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the hon. minister any view as to a broad immigration policy?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have. At the present time the sources of immigration are largely stopped by reason of the war. But not only should the Government use every effort to promote immigration, it should encourage any auxiliary means there may be of bringing in immigration; it should seek to have its own efforts to bring immigration into this country supplemented by the efforts of others. In addition to that, once the immigration is here, the Government should assist, by some plan that I think could be devised, in getting the people settled on the land.

Mr. PUGSLEY: To my mind this is the most important question we have had to deal with. I am glad the minister has touched upon the subject of immigration. The minister has stated that the sources of immigration are stopped during the war. Is that true in regard to the vast multitude of people to the south of us, in the United States, from which in recent years we have obtained hundreds of thousands of our very best settlers? Why should we not, by a vigorous policy, continue to get people from the United States even in larger numbers than in the past?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is right so far as the United States is concerned. When I spoke of the sources of immigration being stopped, I had reference rather to European sources. At the same time, we must not disguise the fact that the war has an influence upon immigration even from the south. It is not rational that it should be so, but it is a fact, nevertheless.

I have shown the railway situation which confronted this Government when it came into power. I have indicated my views as to the importance of the problem, and to the unwisdom of allowing these railway systems which have continued up to the present time to collapse. I have indicated my faith that the country with its resources and with its people will overcome any difficulties that may be presented in the future. On the whole, as I have stated, my attitude is one of optimism, not of pessimism, in regard to the future of this country, even of the railways of this country—although I say that in my view we have overbuilt. It must be borne in mind, however, having regard to the geographical areas of this country, that it is, in a sense, necessary to overbuild. That is to say, you do not get your settlement until you get your railway; the railway comes first in order of time. I do not desire, as I have said, to enter upon any controversy, but my view is that if the Canadian Northern Railway system and the Grand Trunk could have been put together in 1903-4, this overbuilding situation would have been avoided. The Canadian Northern was taking grain out of the West, but the Canadian Northern

must find return traffic, and the reason why the Canadian Northern embarked upon its railway policy in the East was in order to obtain feeders for its western system. If the Canadian Northern had had the Grand Trunk as a feeder in the East, then the Canadian Northern would not have needed the Canadian Northern Ontario; but by reason of the Grand Trunk promoting the Grand Trunk Pacific the Canadian Northern found itself in a position in which it would be shipping grain out of the West but not taking freights back. Consequently, it embarked on the policy of building the Canadian Northern Ontario. As I have said, there is no use in recriminating. There is not much use in criticising. There is not much use in making reflections upon the wisdom or unwisdom of past policies. The fact is that the railway situation, so important to the people of Canada, is here before us and we have to deal with it, and that is what the Government proposes to do.

Some points have been raised as to the disposition of this money. We are making a loan of $15,000,000 to the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Under the legislation of 1914 and of 1911 the Dominion Government gave guarantees of $45,000,000 and $35,000,000 to the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company. The proceeds of those securities went into the Receiver General's account under the legislation in both cases. I have been trustee for hundreds of millions of dollars in my time, and I can say that no more complete check could be devised than was devised by the Railway Department in authorizing the payment out of those moneys. I say here as Minister of Finance that the proceeds of the $45,000,000 guarantee were paid out absolutely for the purposes for which the guarantee was given, and for no other purpose whatsoever.

Mr. MORPHY: Was that money handled by Mackenzie and Mann?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A guarantee was given for the purpose of paying indebtedness incurred and expenditures made on construction account and for certain other things mentioned in the legislation. The suggestion has been made in the House that in some mysterious way the money is being diverted, but I say there is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Those suggestions came largely from the other side of the House.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They did not come from me. I set out in the statement which I laid on the table of the House every single certificate, and at the end I set out a letter from Major Bell, who is an admirable official, one of the best officials in Ottawa—he is an expert accountant—in which he stated that in all cases before these certificates were issued—I am speaking now of the $45,000,000 guarantee—a careful audit was made either by himself or by members of my staff under my supervision. Every voucher was checked; he had representatives even in Winnipeg.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend is aware that the great bulk of the Canadian Northern railway was built by Mackenzie and Mann as contractors. The certificate might be perfectly right, but if Mackenzie and Mann charged $50,000 for doing $35,000 worth of work, what was the check worth?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was shown in 1914 that nothing of the kind occurred; that they were the agency of the Canadian Northern for making these contracts with sub-contractors. I will say this—after all, the truth is the truth—I do not believe there is a more economically conducted railway in Canada than the Canadian Northern. I have absolute confidence in the accounts that are presented.

Mr. MORPHY: Is there any railroad that has its investments at a cheaper rate?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not know of any. The proceeds of this $15,000,000 loan are paid over on the order of the Governor in Council. It will be audited just as the proceeds of the $35,000,000 of guaranteed securities were audited, and as the proceeds of the $45,000,000 of securities were audited. I have had some experience in trust company work in paying out moneys, and I do not know of any system of any trust company in this country under which the disbursement of moneys are paid out with greater care than the proceeds of Dominion guaranteed securities are paid out at Ottawa. I think that would apply to the late Government as well as to this Government; I believe that the Finance Department has been absolutely honest in its administration of public funds. This loan will be paid over on the order of the Governor in Council after an audit is made to show that it is properly paid out. We are charging 6 per cent, and the loan is a demand loan. I believe that every possible safeguard has been thrown around this transaction from

the standpoint of the Dominion Government. A mortgage is being taken upon the undertaking of the Canadian Northern and its subsidiary and constituent companies which may derive benefit from this loan. Therefore, so far as the transaction itself is concerned, I have no hesitation whatever in supporting and recommending it.

One or two other matters were mentioned, among them the assets of the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The Canadian Northern Railway Company has been built in more recent years than the Canadian Pacific. I do not know what system the Canadian Pacific has in vogue, but if it carries on its business the way other companies carry on their business, I suppose the property values were entered up as of the time that they were acquired. That may also be so in connection with the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and, that being so, the Canadian Northern Railway Company's assets would naturally stand at a much higher figure because they had been acquired in later days. The sums that would be paid for the Canadian Northern Ontario right of way through the province of Ontario would be very large as compared with the cost twenty years previously. If the Canadian Pacific assets were entered up at their present value, I think they would be very much larger than that at which they now appear. I am the first to pay tribute to the Canadian Pacific and the efficiency of its management, but it must not be forgotten that years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was not in as prosperous a condition as it is to-day. Its western lands have become immensely valuable. Its own enterprise, of course, had a great deal to do with making them valuable, but it must not be forgotten that the enterprise of other concerns also tended to make these lands valuable. So that the Canadian Pacific railway is through its land holdings a participant in the prosperity which was brought about, perhaps, in large measure by itself, but also by these other railway companies, that is to say, the Canadian Northern, and in less degree the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And by the enterprise of the people.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: And by the enterprise of the people, and by the assistance which the Government of Canada has given to all these enterprises. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) the other day spoke, lightly I thought, of taking over all the railway systems of Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: Sure; it would only take a minute.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: He stated that it would be only a matter of assuming liabilities. Well, in principle he was correct, subject to this, that there is a large stock-holding in the case of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) showed to-day that $100,000,000 had been put into the Grand Trunk by shareholders who have never received a dollar in dividends. I think that the capitalization of the Grand Trunk Railway Company is about £50,000,000, that is $250,000,000. There is a stock-holding interest there that would have to be reckoned with in taking over the Grand Trunk Railway.

We are confronted with a railway situation which it is our duty to solve, and which we propose to solve by taking the best expert advice that we can get, looking to a permanent settlement of these difficulties which annually confront the Government. My own view is that the solution of that railway problem may involve, and probably will involve, the Government of Canada taking over one or more of the railway systems of Canada. As I stated in my speech when introducing these loans to the House, it is possible that it may lead to the nationalization of the railways of Canada. But I stated at the same time, and I state now, that whether a war is on or not, it is not a light undertaking to take over all the railways of the Dominion of Canada. We should have to consider many things; as, for example, the effect upon our credit of taking them all over at once. The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) seemed to suggest that it was a very easy thing to take them all over. Well, it is not an easy thing to take over all the railways of Canada and assume all the activities now being carried on by them, activities connected with immigration; activities connected with transportation upon the Atlantic and upon the Pacific; the operation of all those roads; the financing of their needs. That would not be a light undertaking at any time, even if we had no war. But I desire, in conclusion, to say that we are in this war; we are confronted with heavier responsibilities by far than have ever fallen to the lot of the people of Canada before; that the end of this war is not in sight; that we are increasing our national debt

at the rate of twenty or twenty-five million dollars a month, some two hundred and fifty or three hundred million dollars a year; that we shall probably be confronted with a debt, at the end of this war, of one thousand million dollars. In time of peace it would not be a light undertaking to bring about the nationalization of all the railways of Canada; it would certainly not be a light undertaking to do so in time of war. But this situation must be faced; there must be an end of this annual coming to the Government of Canada by these two railway companies for relief. The policy which we have adopted has been stated to be no policy. I say it is the true policy in the situation in which we find ourselves. We are not in a position to say what should be the permanent solution of Canada's railway problem. We are in this position, that we do not want these railway companies to collapse. The policy which has been before this committee, and I know it has met with approval in this House, is the true policy at this time, and it is not the less the true policy because it provides temporarily for the situation. It bridges time; it enables these roads to continue—these roads which are so vital, so essential for the welfare of this country—until such time as, upon the best advice that we can get, we shall be able to suggest some permanent solution, which I believe will probably involve the taking over by this Government of one or more of the existing railway systems of Canada, and which, as I stated, may involve later on the nationalization of all the railway systems of Canada.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): With the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), I distinctly voice my objection to the manner in which this legislation has been brought up. Even with the explanation of the Minister of Finance as to the whys and wherefores of bringing it before the House in this way, the fact remains that it should have been introduced by resolution. Further than that, I want to wholly endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett). There are many of us who took a somewhat strong position in 1914 in regard to the legislation granting $45,000,000 to the Canadian Northern railway. It appears to me to be a most vicious practice that practically the largest amount, outside of our civil government, that we grant in this country are to railways, and that invariably—and perhaps one side is not more to blame than the other—the Government waits and waits until the dying days of the session and then such important legislation, with all that attaches to it, is put before this House. I am not going to cavil to any great extent, but we have been here practically for a month waiting for the Government to bring down this railway legislation and it has only just now come down, when everybody is in a mood to finish the session and go home. I am glad to hear the Minister of Finance speak with the optimism he does. We have at the present time rather too many pessimists in this country——

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARDEE: —who are going along with their mouths drawn down and predicting all sorts of evil things for Canada at the end of the war. It is true they all say we are overbuilt in railways. Unquestionably we are; but I would remind this House and the country that for ten years after the Canadian Pacific railway was completed we were also overbuilt. The building of railways in districts where they are most needed, has invariably produced good results. The railways have brought the people, the people have brought prosperity; and to a large extent the great prosperity of the West is due to the building of the Canadian Pacific railway and the immigration which that railway brought into the West, to such an extent that it has enriched this country by millions and millions of dollars. Then if we had not had the existing railway transportation, even although we were overbuilt, with the abnormal crop of last year in the West, Canada would have been in a far worse position than she is in to-day. So, I am not finding fault to any great extent with the building of the railroad. The only thing that does strike me in regard to the Canadian Northern is that, year after year, we come to this House and, year after year, grants are made to the Canadian Northern Railway and, year after year, the same question is put from either one side of the House or the other: Is this the last aid that the Canadian Northern Railway is going to require? And the invariable answer is: Yes, this is all they want; this will see them through. I have been listening to that now for a good many years, and yet, as the sessions roll around, still there come other requests from the Canadian Northern railway: "We are again in deep water; we come to you and ask you to give us aid."

It has become, so far as my observation goes, a question in the country whether or

[Sir Thomas White.]

not the Canadian Northern Railway is being properly managed. We have been told by the Finance Minister that in his opinion—and without any disrespect to him I am sure he will allow me to take his opinion in this matter, for what it is worth, as mine is to be taken—that it is a most economically managed railway, that all the money that comes from this railway goes back into it and that, as a matter of fact, it is properly managed in all respects. That may or may not be true. Speaking for myself, I would like to be convinced by a most thorough independent audit of the Canadian Northern Railway Company's books that all the money that is earned by the Canadian Northern goes back into the Canadian Northern. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) told us this afternoon that $10,000,000 is the estimated profits of the Canadian Northern on its operating account. If that is so, I would like to know, merely as a citizen, if that $10,000,000 goes back into the Canadian Northern. We want to know that, and we can only know that by a better and more independent audit of Canadian Northern affairs than there has been up to the present time. Would it not strike the ordinary man that, having regard to the fact that these requests are coming session after session, and are granted, as this request will be granted, I have no doubt, the Government, not from the point of view of the value of the stock of the Canadian Northern—I care nothing about that for the purposes of my argument—but for the purposes of the management of the Canadian Northern, should take unto itself sufficient stock to give it control, irrespective of the control which it acquired in 1914; that it should appoint upon the Canadian Northern Board men, in whom the people would have confidence, to see that the money which comes from the Canadian Northern goes back into the Canadian Northern, so that the people would know exactly where the money is going, and, therefore, whether these grants are being made properly or not. That is the point I make. So far as the stock goes, I agree with the minister's argument, so far as it goes, but, to my mind, no argument can be successfully put up against the contention that as the people of this country have advanced, in this Parliament and in other Parliaments, enormous amounts of money, they should know that the moneys which come from the Canadian Northern go back into the Canadian Northern and that the road is properly managed. This, it would appear to me, is a proper enough request, and it is something that really ought to be done.

So far as I am concerned,—I am expressing only my own opinion—I am in favour of a receivership for the Canadian Northern. A receivership would not dislocate matters in connection with that system to the slightest degree. The borrowing powers would not be curtailed in any way, and the financing of the road would not be hampered in any way. A receiver could go on and do exactly the same thing to-day as if the road were left, as no doubt it will be left, in the hands of the present owners. But there would be this advantage, I submit, that if a receiver were appointed for the Canadian Northern railway, and he was a man in whom the country had confidence, the people would know that, dollar for dollar, the money that was coming in and going out was being applied and expended in the interests of the road, and therefore, in the interests of the people of Canada. The matter is becoming serious, so serious that when we consider the enormous amount of money that has been put into the Canadian Northern railroad, and that the money has to a very large extent been advanced by the people of Canada, it seems high time that the people of the Dominion had a voice in the running and operating of that road. I have not heard any argument advanced by the Minister of Finance against a receivership. I would like to hear, for my own information, whether, in any way the road would be prejudiced by such an appointment.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I dealt with the matter in my speech before we went into committee. I pointed out that a receivership would mean by reason of the number of subsidiary companies involved, dismemberment of the system, a break-up.

Mr. PARDEE: I would not think that that would be an insuperable difficulty.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There are thirty or forty of them.

Mr. PARDEE: I have yet to be convinced that the hon. minister is right.

Mr. MORPHY: Would the hon. gentleman apply the same principle to the Grand Trunk?

Mr. PARDEE: It might be very reasonable to do the same thing.

Mr. MORPHY: In regard to the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. PARDEE: The Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific are locked together. If, as the Grand Trunk railway tell us to-day, the Grand Trunk railway can no longer carry the Grand Trunk Pacific, and if it is a fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific will have to come for aid in subsequent years, in the same way as the Canadian Northern has come, the sooner we take hold of the Grand Trunk Pacific the better. So far as I am concerned, the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Morphy) can take no comfort from the view that because we had to do with the Grand Trunk Pacific we should argue another way. I say that so far as the Canadian Northern is concerned, the control of the stock ought to be taken, that the people ought to have upon that board representatives able to take care of the receipts and expenditures of the road. If this is not done, and I have no doubt it will not be done, I say a receiver should be appointed in whom the people of the Dominion would have confidence, so that they would know exactly whether or not the money which they had invested in that road would be properly expended.

We are told that a commission is to be appointed, "a commission for inquiry and report upon the railway situation," and for that purpose a sum of $150,000 has been placed in the Supplementary Estimates. Since 1911, when this Government came into power, there has been a superfluity of commissions in this country. Some 85 commissions have been appointed for one reason or another, according to a return recently brought down. Some of these commissions have done something; some of them have done very little, but I do think —and I am not speaking in a partisan way—that, before these sums are voted to the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific, it would be fair for the Government to give this House the names of the commissioners who will inquire into the railway systems of the Dominion. That at least would have the effect that, when these votes go through, the country will know that, even although another vast sum had been granted to the Canadian Northern, men in whom they had absolute confidence were being appointed to inquire into the operations and carryings of these two roads, and that, therefore, they might reasonably hope that before another grant is asked, as no doubt it will be, they would know all the facts connected with these roads.

In conclusion, I just wish to say that I think, and I believe the people of this country think, that before any further large grants are made to the railways of this country, and especially the Canadian Northern railway, the people should be fully informed of all the facts, and if any railway is to be assisted the Dominion Government should be fully protected so far as the outgoings and incomings of that road are concerned.

Mr. OLIVER: I have listened with very great interest to the remarks of my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett), and if I appreciated them correctly their logical conclusion was, or might very well be interpreted to be that Canada had reached the limit of its railway development. When he argued that to-day we have far over-built in railroads, and are in consequence suffering serious financial difficulties, the logical conclusion of his argument must have been that we should not build in the near future. I maintain that so far as the western country is concerned we are not over-built, and not only are we not over-built, but it has been my duty to bring to the attention of the Government from time to time the needs of certain localities for additional railways. I am not alone in that, as other members have been impelled to bring the same aspect of the case to the Government's attention. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that there has been over-building in some directions, there is still a need of further building in other directions. Even if it should be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the country that we have over-built in some districts, that is no reason why we should not have further construction in other places where it is needed. I will not go over the details as to where it is needed, as I have already discussed in the House construction in which my constituency is particularly interested.

First of all, let me say on the general question whether we have over-built or not, that in developing a new country we build in advance of requirements; otherwise there would be no development through railway construction. It is admitted in the present day and generation that if we have a country to develop it is sound policy to invest the public money and credit in the construction of railways that will secure that develop-

ment; and it is not until after the road has been constructed that development takes place, or can take place. When, therefore, it is said that we have over-built and have not the traffic to make our railways profitable, we are simply stating what must necessarily be the case: the railways must be built before the traffic is created. We build the railway in order to create the traffic, and we must await the natural and ordinary development of the traffic before we can expect a railroad to have the earnings which it will ultimately have. Such a condition does not indicate any fall-down or failure of our policy in railway projects. It is true that war conditions at the moment are preventing, and will prevent, so long as they continue, that expected development upon which we rely for carrying the capital charges and expenses of our roads. But that is an abnormal condition that no foresight could have provided against; that is an abnormal condition that lays serious burdens upon us which we never expected. Those conditions have to be met, and it is now for us to say in what manner we shall deal with them. I do not wish to discuss at the moment how we should deal with this question, but I want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the railway condition confronting us is not an abnormal or an unnatural one, but the normal and the natural one, except in so far as it has been made abnormal by abnormal war conditions. As my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee) has said, we were overbuilt when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed. It was many years before the traffic that was created by the building of that road was sufficient to make the Canadian Pacific Railway a profitable enterprise. There was less traffic per railway mile in Canada on the day the last rail of the Canadian Pacific railway was laid than there is to-day, counting every mile of railroad we have in the country. Just as the building of the Canadian Pacific railway produced valuable results to the country, which results, however, had to be waited for, so the building of the Transcontinental and the Canadian Northern railways have produced and are producing results, but we must wait a reasonable period for those results to accrue. In fact, it is still in dispute whether the Transcontinental is completed yet; the Canadian Northern railway is certainly not completed. After the Canadian Pacific railway had been completed across the continent and its branch lines completed to Prince Albert and Edmonton, it was still ten years, so far as the main line was concerned, and five years so far as the branch lines were concerned, before the road was doing the business that is being done to-day by the Canadian Northern Railway and the Transcontinental.

We are to find the solution of our railway difficulties in increased settlement and development? When we realize that of the crop of last year produced in the prairie West, practically half of that available for export still lies in the elevators and in the granaries of that prairie West because there were not transportation facilities to move it to the seaboard during the months that have passed, I ask you, Sir, to prove to me that the country is overbuilt with railroads. I do not think the evidence is that the country is overbuilt with railroads. It may be evidence that the railroads are not well managed; that the business is not well directed; but when such facts are brought before the House as were brought before it the other day by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Cruise) and by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), that men in the prairie West in the month of May, having hauled their grain fifteen or twenty miles to the elevator at the railroad station to sell it, could not sell it because the elevator was full, and that the elevator was full because the railroad had not been able to take away the grain. I say that the evidence has yet to be produced to show that this country is overbuilt with railroads.

While I do not wish to introduce contentious matters, there must be some question as to responsibility in this case, and I maintain that the Government of Canada, being responsible for the railway situation, having assumed absolute responsibility for the operation of the Transcontinental, certainly are the people who either should not have allowed that condition to exist or should be able to say to the House why it exists and how they propose to remedy it. Certainly, for the Government to come to the House and ask for loans amounting to $23,000,000 to pay interest and cost on railroads now existing, on the plea that they are not able to earn interest on their bonds owing to lack of traffic, while the prairie West is choked with its own wealth produced last year, is a situation that I maintain demands explanation.

I agree with my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) when he says that every dollar of this loan should be traced by the Government in order to see that it goes

where it is intended to go, and that there should be no question as to the fact of the money being used to meet the purpose for which it is voted. I supplement that with the criticism that the Government, having had to take this responsibility ever since they have held office having two years ago come before the House and the country with their proposal for a guarantee of $45,000,000 for the Canadian Northern, and having since that time made further advances to both the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific, are not square before the House when they come to us in the face of existing financial conditions of the railroad companies on the one hand and as to the traffic conditions of the country on the other, and give us no word of explanation in the matter and tell us they are going to appoint a commission to inquire into the whole business. I do not agree with what my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett) and other hon. members on both sides of the House have said as to the appointment of a commission in this matter. This is not a time nor an occasion for the appointment of a commission; it is a time and an occasion for the Government of Canada to come before the people of Canada with a definite policy as to what they propose on their responsibility to do in handling the railroad situation of this country. What can, by any possibility, be the result of any inquiry that may be made? I have already criticised the Government for its attitude towards the Grand Trunk Pacific. I may be misunderstood if I criticise the Government for its attitude towards the Canadian Northern; but I ask: How can any business enterprise, looking for money in the markets of the world, expect to get that money on fair and good terms in the face of the deluge of adverse criticism that both these railway enterprises have received in this House from the Government as well as from the Opposition? How can it be expected that a company shall be successful in financing, that is to say in borrowing money on its credit, if those who are its principal creditors, who have absolute control of it in every particular, discredit it as a well thought out enterprise and discredit its management as well? Both enterprises may deserve everything that is said in regard to them; but that having been said, it is futile to say that they can carry on their business by ordinary methods from this time forth. Unless the Government can bring forward some better policy than it has yet brought forth, these enterprises are on the hands of the country; we have no choice in the matter, and to ask us to vote $23,000,000 now to put into broken-backed enterprises, as they are labelled on both sides of the House, is only putting $23,000,000 out of the power of the people of Canada when it should not be put out of their power. If we are to take over these railroads, now is the time to do so. That seems to be the only conclusion at present. I do not wish to be understood as agreeing that that is the best policy; but in view of the conditions into which the Government has permitted the matter to drift, and in view of the fact that they have no definite proposition to offer for a solution of the problem, there is no need of any commission of inquiry to find out what must be the result.

Mr. TURRIFF: Will the Minister of Finance state what the policy of the Government will be after this loan is granted, and as I expect it will be granted, as to the Canadian Northern branching out into new fields altogether such as they propose to do in Ontario and which will add greatly to their liabilities?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am speaking from memory, but I think, under the legislation of 1914, there is some limitation upon the power of extensions unless with the consent of the Governor in Council. It is the financing of the Canadian Northern that gives immediate concern and that makes this loan necessary. I do not think my hon. friend need be very apprehensive about any extensions of the Canadian Northern—did I understand him to say in Ontario?—because any such extensions would have to be financed, and at present my hon. friend knows how difficult it is to finance.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister must be aware of the campaign that went on for two months of this session in the Railway Committee and in this House to get authority to revive charters to build lines in Ontario that would take many, many millions; yet those interested said that they had the money to carry on the work.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not familiar with that situation. I understand the reference is to two electric lines proposed in Ontario. They are part of the Canadian Northern, and if the subsidiary companies concerned are able to finance their enterprises, it will increase the earnings of the

company and will not diminish the security of the Government, but will rather enhance that security. I speak with incomplete knowledge, for, though it may seem strange to my hon. friend, I am not familiar with the Canadian Northern legislation that is before the House. I accept what the hon. gentleman says—that they have the money for the completion of these lines. But there is nothing in that situation that would immediately connect with the proposal now before the committee, as near as I can see.

Mr. OLIVER: The Canadian Northern enterprise seems to be completed except that part from Capreol to Montreal. What is the intention or expectation with regard to that portion of the scheme as the result of the loan proposed? Capreol is north of Sudbury and is the point of junction between the Montreal branch and the Toronto branch. I understand that the section from Ottawa to Capreol is being operated with local trains, but that on the line from Ottawa to Montreal no trains are being run. It is quite plain that the Canadian Northern cannot be a profitable and completed enterprise as a transcontinental line unless and until that connection is finished. Has this aid in view the securing of the completion of that part of the enterprise?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no doubt they will complete it as soon as they have the financial strength to do so. But this money is not for that immediate purpose; it is to assist them in the situation in which they find themselves in regard to existing obligations for construction and for payment of interest upon securities.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it not usual for a financial institution, when dealing with a concern in difficulties, to take into consideration how soon and under what circumstances that concern is going to get into a profitable and earning position? This Canadian Northern, considered as a transcontinental line, is not a completed enterprise. It cannot be made profitable—no one can expect it to be profitable—unless this section of the line is completed and the road put in full operation. Surely, that is a matter for the consideration of the Government when they are giving aid of $15,000,000.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If matters of this kind were to be taken into consideration, as I said the other day, instead of $15,000,000 we should have to give them more. This is the same case as that of the extensions in the West to which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) referred the other day. We could give them a minimum of aid to carry them during the present year, looking as I have said, to a permanent solution of the question through the investigation that is to be held. The Canadian Northern officials are well aware of the necessity of completing their transcontinental line as early as possible, and they will endeavour to finance the completion of it, if what the hon. gentleman states is correct, and I do not question his view of it.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

To provide for inquiry and report upon the railway situation of Canada, $150,000.

Mr. NESBITT: I was not here when the resolution for the Canadian Northern railway was passed, and, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two with regard to it. When these resolutions were first introduced I had made up my mind very distinctly that the only thing to do with the Canadian Northern was to put it into the hands of a receiver. It was necessary, I thought, to find out just what constituted the Canadian Northern in its various branches, and to keep track of the receipts. As to this loan, I have no doubt that the minister will see that the proceeds are devoted to the purpose for which they are intended. In speaking of receipts, I refer more particularly to the general receipts for freight and passenger traffic, etc. I was strongly in favour of the appointment of a receiver for this road, because in that way we could keep close track of what is done with those receipts. The Canadian Northern resolution contains the words "such mortgages to contain such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve." It is possible that under that provision the Minister of Finance may be able to appoint someone to have charge of receipts and disbursements. There is a good deal of feeling in the country, whether rightly or wrongly I am not prepared to say, that the receipts from the railway are not used entirely for the purposes of the railway. I am not as much afraid of the credit of the country being injured by the appointment of a receiver as some people appear to be. However, this is a very serious time so far as finances are concerned, and it is just

possible that the appointment of a receiver for a railway the size of the Canadian Northern might be detrimental to the credit of the country. This being the case, no doubt the difficulty in connection with keeping track of the operation of the railway and knowing exactly its merits and demerits will be overcome by the operations of the commission that the minister proposes to appoint. This will be done, of course, only if the men selected are competent for the position and have an exact knowledge of the conditions affecting the railways throughout this country. As to Government ownership, it is quite possible that through the improvements that may take place in the management of Government railways, we shall be in a position at some time to take over and nationalise the railways, but I do not think that we are in any such position now. The history of the management of Government railways in the past is not such as to encourage us to take on more railways. Last year, according to railway statistics, the proportion of expenses to receipts of privately-owned or corporation-owned railways, including the Canadian Northern, was a little over 72, and of Government railways a little over 102. That would not encourage me by any means to vote for the acquirement and operation of all the railways under Government control. Besides, if the Minister of Finance should have to go to New York or to England or to Europe for money, I do not believe he would get any, because the financiers of this continent, as well as those on the other side of the water, know to a nicety what the cost of the operation of Government railways is in this country, just as they know the cost of the operation of privately-owned or corporation-owned railways. Certainly it would be no inducement to financiers to loan money to Canada in this time of stress if Canada were to pile on top of her present debt, and the debt that has to be incurred during the coming year, the sum of two and a half or three billion dollars for the purchase of these railways. It is possible that time will rectify that condition. When it does, I shall be perfectly willing to see the railways nationalized, but until that time I am not so willing. When I first read these proposals, I was strongly in favour of having the whole of the capital stock of the Canadian Northern assigned to the Government—not handed over to the Government for ownership, but handed over in trust to be handed back when the present operators succeed in paying their liability to the Government. I was in favour of that suggestion in 1914, if I mistake not, but after the minister's explanation this afternoon as to the position of the Government in the matter of taking over the railway in case of default—and they are at present in default—and in view of the fact that this is a demand loan, I am not so much in favour of that proposal now as I was. For the reason which I have given, I am not so strongly urgent upon a receivership, because, as the minister has pointed out, it is possible that to place this road in the hands of a receiver would injure the credit of the country. If, then, we are not going to take the railways over or put them into the hands of a receiver, the next best thing—probably the best thing—is to appoint this commission, provided they are qualified for the work. As the hon. member for Calgary said this afternoon, in a year from now we ought to be in a position to know just exactly what we should do with regard to the railway situation in Canada. It should be discussed, I think, entirely from a non-partisan standpoint; there is no necessity to enter into recriminations or reflections of any kind in dealing with it. The railway situation is here, and we have got to face it. I personally am not at all despondent over the railway situation, and I think that the members of this House, when they have the exact facts before them, will be quite capable of dealing with that situation in the same manner as a Board of Directors would deal with it, without any recriminations or any partisanship, and in a manner that will be in the best interests of the country.

Mr. OLIVER: I should like to know why it is that, when the Government are operating the Transcontinental railway and the Canadian Northern railway are operating their own road, the Transcontinental, instead of operating trains between Winnipeg and Quebec, which is the proper eastern terminus of the Transcontinental, operate their trains from Toronto to Winnipeg in competition with the first-class service of the Canadian Pacific railway and also the Canadian Northern railway. Running trains there, the National Transcontinental must run over 500 miles of line which is either leased or operated under running rights. They operate in competition with the Canadian Northern to the disadvantage of both the National Transcontinental railway and the Canadian Northern.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Acting Minister of Railways the other day made the announcement that on the 1st of June a direct first-class passenger service would be inaugurated between St. John, Halifax and Winnipeg, over the National Transcontinental railway.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has drawn attention more than once to the exports of the past year. Without desiring to prolong the discussion, I wish to bring to his attention some very striking figures to show the extraordinary efforts that have been put forth, and successfully put forth, in connection with the export business of Canada. I looked it up and was surprised to find that Canada during the past year had done so well. For the 11 months ended February, 1915, the grain, wheat and flour exported from Canada amounted to 90,000,000 bushels, whereas for the 11 months ended February, 1916, the export of grain, wheat and flour amounted to 180,000,000 bushels, just twice as much. So that for the 11 months ended February, 1916, twice as much grain, wheat and flour was exported from Canada as for the 11 months ending in 1915. There is another curious feature in connection with our export business for the same period. Whereas, for the 11 months ending February, 1915, 36,000,000 of foreign produce, grain, wheat and flour, were exported from Canada, for the 11 months ended February, 1916, only 11,000,000 were exported. So, while the exports of grain, wheat and flour of Canadian produce were doubled, the amount of American produce of the like kind exported from Canada fell from 36,000,000 bushels to 11,000,000 bushels. Then, dealing with totals, I find that the total exports for the 11 months in question in each of the years mentioned were 127,000,000 bushels of both Canadian and foreign produce of grain, wheat and flour, whereas for the 11 months ended February, 1916, no less than 191,000,000 bushels were exported. So we have the extraordinary fact before us that in this year the exports from Canada are enormously in excess of the exports of any other year. I am not saying that this is not as it should be; I am drawing attention to these very striking figures to show that, notwithstanding the shortage of tonnage upon the Atlantic, Canada had been able to increase her exports to such an extraordinary degree as is shown by these figures.

Mr. OLIVER: The figures are certainly very striking and very satisfactory. As figures they are most interesting; but when you say that you say it all, because the fact remains that at the beginning of this month there was, according to the latest returns, 125,000,000 bushels of surplus export grain west of the lakes, and that because of that surplus of grain being west of the Great Lakes at the beginning of this month the people of the West are not able to increase their acreage this season as they would have done if they had been able to dispose of it. As they are not able to increase their acreage, the country does not offer the same attraction to immigration that it would have offered if the acreage could have been increased. My hon. friends on both sides this afternoon were agreed that the question of securing productive occupation of the prairie was the great problem, and they had various ideas as to how it could be solved. I will give a solution of it. If they will secure for the man who now has produced the grain the prompt sale of that grain and a fair price for it, they will then have an effective immigration policy. But they can print all the beautiful literature they please at whatever expense they like, and say what they please in it, and put as many pictures into it as they choose. So long as a man hauls his grain 15 miles to the elevator in the month of May, after he has harvested, and cannot sell it because the elevator is full, and the elevator is full because the railroad did not take the grain away, and because of the embargo put on the transportation of grain by the railway companies, for one reason or another—you cannot argue against such a state of facts as that, and you cannot get the people to come and settle in this country in the hope of developing it when, on the evidence of their senses, they cannot sell the grain they have produced. This is absolutely pertinent to the question. I do not care how much we have exported. We are being asked to finance these two railroads on the plea that we had overbuilt our railroads and did not have traffic to make them profitable enterprises, while the condition is that we have the traffic and it has not been handled. The answer to that is not given by telling us how much we did, when there is so much that we did not do.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think that my hon. friend is scarcely fair in his statement, because he has overlooked the salient fact that the crop of last year in the West was really two crops in one. Our railway

system was designed to take care of a certain normal situation. Of course that situation was likely to increase. Last year the West was blessed with two crops in one, and I think it is not an extraordinary fact—although nobody would be more desirous than I to see the crop moved out quickly—that the whole of the crop of last year has not yet been taken out. Personally, I would be very much pleased if it had been taken out, but we all know that the railway companies could not take out a double crop with machinery that might have been perfectly capable of taking out a normal crop, or even a crop considerably in excess of the normal. They had to deal this year with a double crop situation in the West, and I thought that my hon. friend would be interested in seeing the figures which I produced for the information of the committee, because they show that the export of our wheat and wheat flour was twice as large during the 11 months ending February of this year as it was for the same period of the previous year. While we have not been able to meet the situation in its entirety, I cannot help thinking that, having regard to the scarcity of tonnage which has prevailed upon the Atlantic, it is a very notable record which I have exhibited to the committee.

Mr. OLIVER: There is no question that it is a very creditable record, but it is not creditable enough. That is not the point. The point I wish to insist upon is that here we are dealing with what is said to be a desperate situation, which exists for lack of traffic, while the fact is that we have the traffic which we have not handled in the time in which it ought to be handled. That is a situation which the Government has not risen to meet. We are told that we have too many railroads, and the evidence is that we have not handled the products which we had on hand, and which ought to be handled in order to make our business a success. The two conditions of fact do not meet at all. There must be mishandling or mismanagement somewhere, for which our friends who are in control of the affairs of the country must accept their full measure of responsibility.

Another point is that in the statement of exports of Canadian grain—I presume my hon. friend has the figures—I think something like 70 or 75 per cent of our exports of last season's crop went by way of the United States, and only the balance went through Canadian ports. The share of the crop that went to Buffalo went by lake transportation. We have three lines of railways running from the prairies to the sea, and every bushel of grain that finds an outlet over the lakes was a bushel of grain taken away from the possible traffic on one or other of these three lines of railway. When we have the condition that we have to-day, our railways bankrupt for lack of traffic, and our traffic going in such an enormous proportion to the United States, instead of to our own ports, I repeat it is for the Government to make the explanation, and the explanation cannot be made on the basis of a capable and competent management of the affairs of this country.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is now half-past eight, and we have just been handed a mass of documents relating to the Quebec and Saguenay proposition, which, we are told, is to be taken up to-night. It is the first information we have had concerning it, and I just want to say, for the benefit of the Minister of Railways, that it is showing scant courtesy to the House. It is impossible for those who asked for this information to digest it in the time allowed; perhaps they were not expected to have time to digest it.

With regard to this other item, it would have been better, to my mind, if the Government had been able to give us the names of the three commissioners, for the simple reason that the experience of us all is, first, that the work of a commission largely depends upon the calibre of the men who compose it. If the Government cannot give us the names of these men, I think it ought to have given us a copy of the instructions which it proposes to place in the hands of the commissioners. We all know that, no matter what the subject may be, or what the calibre of the men forming a commission may be, their work depends on the powers which are given to them. This commission might be composed of the best men that could be secured in the world, and their report might not be worth five cents to the people of Canada. The Government will say: You can trust us to give them full scope. I am not going to say that Parliament cannot trust the Government, but men have different ideas even as to the meaning of language. What those of us who are not of the legal profession might think was a pretty wide latitude, legal gentlemen might regard as no latitude at all, or longitude either. The commissioners are thus tied up in a box, and can only move a few inches each way. I think

it would have been more satisfactory if the Government had been able to give us a copy of the instructions in the identical language in which they propose to confer certain powers upon this commission, so that every member of this House could judge what the commission intended to do, and how far it could go. The value of the report will depend on the wording of these instructions. Presuming the commission is not armed with as wide powers as it ought to have, it is not stretching one's imagination to think that it might go to the offices of one of the railway companies and be refused certain information which Parliament might desire it to have. The commission might be in quest of some practical information, such as the experience of certain other roads or of financiers; and unless they were given the fullest possible powers, and those powers were clearly defined, they might be unable to get that information for us. I make that suggestion to the minister, and I do not think it would be a very difficult one to carry out. If the Government has in mind just what powers they propose to give to this commission, a discussion for an hour or so, in which we would be able to give our ideas, might put the matter in even better shape.

There is another matter to which I wish to call attention, particularly the attention of the Minister of Finance. I submit that this committee has a right to have placed before it an estimate of the cost of operation of the National Transcontinental for the year. I know I shall be told that there is a statute. But that statute was not designed to cover the enlarged operation now proposed. The House should know what money the Government proposes to expend, so that we could discuss the proposition of the Government intelligently. Every year an amount is put in the Estimates for the Intercolonial, and we discuss it thoroughly, perhaps too thoroughly sometimes; but at all events the rights of the members of Parliament are preserved to them when they have the opportunity of discussing expenditures in that way. When the operation was only on a small scale there was perhaps not so much objection to the Government not submitting estimates, but now that the Government has taken over the Transcontinental and proposes to expend millions in operation each year, it is unfair to the House not to submit an estimate. We should be given the opportunity of discussing what is to be done with the money and the question of operation; and then when the report comes in at the end of the year hon. gentlemen would be able to see whether their directions in regard to the expenditure of the money had been properly carried out.

Mr. REID: I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman rose to speak, but I have been told that he stated that the documents relating to the Bill I have on the Order Paper were not given to the House until 8 or 8.30 this evening.

Mr. GRAHAM: I said they came to the House at 8 or 8.30.

Mr. REID: And the hon. gentleman considered that I had treated him with scant courtesy. I think it is hardly fair for him to say that, because he was sitting in the House this afternoon at two o'clock when I handed in the documents that are now before him, and I think he must have heard me say that I was laying them on the Table.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not hear anything of the kind.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman was in the House at the time, and surely he can not censure me for not having heard what I said. As soon as the Orders of the Day were called, I handed in the papers, and I took it for granted that he heard what I said. A few minutes afterwards I thought I saw the hon. member reading them, but that turns out not to be the fact. I do not think I could have done anything more. I was unable to get the papers at an earlier date. The hon. gentleman walked out of the House shortly after I handed in the papers, and I thought he was reading them. Under the circumstances I think it was hardly fair for him to accuse me of discourtesy. With regard to my hon. friend's suggestion that we should give an estimate of the proposed expenditure on the National Transcontinental, it is quite true, as he says, that a certain amount is placed in the Estimates for the Intercolonial every year. But the Intercolonial was built fifty or sixty years ago, and has been in operation for many years. On the other hand, we have only been operating the Transcontinental for eight or ten months, and it is not fair to ask us to put in an estimate of what it will cost until we have been operating the road a little longer. No man living can give an approximate estimate of the cost of operating the Transcontinental during the coming year. Surely

we should be allowed to operate the road for one year in order to get an idea of what it will cost before being asked to submit an estimate to Parliament. At the end of the fiscal year, on March 31st last, when we had been operating the road for only eight months, how could we tell what a year's operation would cost?

Mr. TURRIFF: Add a third of a year's expenses to the amount spent at the end of eight months.

Mr. REID: We want to run the road for a year and see what it will cost, and then next year we shall be able to submit a statement to the House, and there is no doubt that an amount will be put in the Estimates for the Transcontinental, and that the road will be treated in that respect just the same as the Intercolonial and other railways operated by the Government. I submit that it is only fair that we should be allowed to run the Transcontinental for one year before being asked to submit an estimate. There is no other reason than that why an estimate should not be given.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am sorry there is a misunderstanding between the minister and myself. I regret I did not hear what he said this afternoon. I never repeat private conversations, and I am not going to now, but I understood the minister was going to send me the documents at ten minutes to two; I was told so by a gentleman. I stayed in all afternoon waiting for them. They were not discovered until 8.20 in the Clerk's office. What the minister says about the Transcontinental is loud, but not strong, and for this reason: the Government should not segregate itself from Parliament. It is not the Government that is running this railway, but Parliament, and hon. members are just as much interested in it as is the Government, and have a right to know what the Government propose to do, so far as the Government can tell them. The manager can surely give an approximate estimate of what he proposes to do on the Transcontinental this year; that is always done in the case of the Intercolonial. It is true there is never a year but what he comes back for $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 more. It depends on the traffic; if the traffic is heavy expenses are greater, and if the traffic is light the expenses are less. That is to be expected in the case of enterprises where it is impossible to give a very close estimate. I am not charging the minister with any wrong-doing in holding back this estimate, but what I am saying is that as we are taking the Transcontinental over as a business proposition the manager should give an approximate estimate of what amount will be needed for the year. When hon. members go home to their constituencies they will be asked: "What is it going to cost to operate the Transcontinental? I see you are taking it over." and we shall have to tell them that an estimate was never given to the House. The point I am making is that the Government is taking to itself authority which the Parliament never intended it should have, for it was never thought that the Government would operate the Trancontinental permanently. I say the Government should submit an estimate of the cost just as in the case of any other public work. But as the minister has said that he will submit an estimate next year, I will not say anything further on that point. If the road is to be permanently operated by the Government the appropriation ought to be asked for in the usual way.

Mr. TURRIFF: How does the minister propose to get the money for the operation of this road if he does not put an item in the Estimates?

Mr. REID: Under the Act, all the expenses of operation can be taken out of the Consolidated Fund. The desire of the Government is to get that money in the same way as we got the money for the operation of the Intercolonial. We are waiting until we get our organization complete. We have not the train service thoroughly organized on the Transcontinental between Moncton and Winnipeg, but when we get our power and our cars so that we can give the system a fair trial, we shall know what the road will cost. As soon as we are in a position to make a proper estimate of the cost of operation of the Transcontinental, that will be placed in the Estimates in the usual way, but it must be borne in mind that the road was taken over only last July. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) states that we know what it is costing from Toronto to Winnipeg, and if we ask him what it is costing to operate the Transcontinental between Toronto and Winnipeg he can give us the figures. If he wants the figures for the cost of operation between Cochrane and Moncton or any other portion of the Transcontinental up to the present time, I will telegraph and get them

for him, because there is no desire to keep the figures secret. As soon as it is possible for the Railway Department as a whole to get the Transcontinental into the same position as the Intercolonial, so that we can come to Parliament and say: Our estimate for the operation of the Transcontinental is so and so, that will and must be done, no matter who is in charge of the Railway Department.

Mr. ROBB: Will the minister tell us what the Government proposes to do in the way of improving the service between Cochrane and Quebec? The minister must know that since the operation of the road was started that service has been most unsatisfactory and unfair to the people of that district.

Mr. REID: Probably the hon. gentleman was not here the other evening when this matter came up. The operation between Cochrane and Quebec has since it was started been a local service. We had neither the equipment nor the organization complete. I stated here the other evening that there will be a through service from Halifax and St .John to Winnipeg commencing, we expect, about the first of June. Of course, you cross at Quebec. Up to the present time the arrangement has been that we run three days a week and the Canadian Northern run the other three days. It is our intention to have a through passenger train that will go right on from Quebec to Winnipeg.

Mr. ROBB: Daily?

Mr. REID: I do not think it will be a daily service to start with. We will run it in connection with the train from Toronto, the two meeting at Cochrane, and the train will go right through. We will, of course, put on whatever service is necessary.

Mr. TURRIFF: Before this item carries, I want again to impress upon the minister that as soon as possible the Transcontinental should be used as a route for the outlet of the western wheat. There is no doubt that wheat can be carried over that road at the summer rate of lake and rail, show a profit, be a big advantage to the grain producer, and give a large amount of freight to the railway. In that way we would take a great deal more of our grain to our own ports. This last year, about 75 per cent of our crop went to American ports, and with the summer rate that the Government has put in force, there is an opportunity of furnishing freight and work for the Government railroads, cutting down the loss, if there is going to be a loss, in operating them, and of operating the roads to the advantage of all concerned. I trust the minister will give the matter his best attention as soon as he can get sufficient rolling stock.

Mr. REID: I certainly agree with the hon. member that we should operate the Transcontinental as much as possible. What is surprising me at the present time is this. Our rate from Armstrong to Quebec is six cents and I understand that the rate from Winnipeg to Armstrong is six cents. I have not made inquiries of late but I am informed that the lake and rail rate from Montreal to Port Arthur is nine cents. Therefore, wheat shipped from the West all rail through to Quebec should get to Quebec for about three cents less than if shipped via Port Arthur, lake and rail, to Montreal. I do not know whether that is the way it works out or not, but those are the rates in force, and if that is the way it works out, why is not the wheat being shipped all rail to Quebec? I understand there are about 18,000,000 bushels of grain along the Grand Trunk Pacific that has to come east, and I cannot understand why that grain is not sent over the Transcontinental to Quebec, instead of via Port Arthur to Montreal. Perhaps my hon. friends from the West will make inquiries as to the situation and find out where the trouble lies, because our six cent rate from Armstrong which is on the same line as Fort William, is still in force, and wheat shipped via Armstrong goes right down to Quebec instead of going to Montreal.

Mr. ROBB: One explanation may be that perhaps there is not vessel space at Quebec to take away the grain as fast as it will come in, the minister must also not forget that this six cent rate is not in force to Montreal where there is the largest miling capacity in Canada, and a great deal of the wheat going out by vessel from Fort William and Port Arthur to Montreal is perhaps consigned to the large millers in Montreal for export.

Mr. REID: As those vessels take full cargoes of wheat, they can take it just as well at Quebec as at Montreal. At all events some grain should be going to Quebec where we have an elevator capacity of one and a half to one and three-quarter million bushels, and yet there is no wheat going that way. If there is that difference of

three cents in the rate, the wheat should go that way, because the vesels can be got at Quebec just as well as at Montreal.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think this is a question for an energetic Minister of Railways who will attend to business, do some advertising and send two or three men over the Grand Trunk Pacific to point out to the shippers the advantage of shipping to Quebec. The shippers are accustomed to shipping via lake and rail and they may not know of the advantage to be gained by shipping by this route. Therefore, instead of depending upon outsiders, I think the acting minister should take the matter up himself.

Mr. REID: I have advertised this rate pretty well this session and it should be known in the West.

Mr. TURRIFF: The minister is going in the right direction, but it is a good plan not to depend upon others for what you can do yourself.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will any member of the Government condescend to reply to my suggestion as to the powers to be given to the commissioners?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend thought we might have explained the terms of the commission which we purpose to issue. The terms of that commission have not been settled, but I stated in general words what we had in view, namely, that full report should be made upon the
9 p.m. physical and financial condition of the railways of Canada and upon the general railway situation, in order that we might be in a position to adopt a policy which would prevent these recurring visits for temporary aid, and settle the railway situation in permanent fashion. The powers which will be given to the commission will have to receive careful consideration on the part of the Government in order that that end which we have in view will be accomplished. I am not able to present the wording of the commission which will be issued, because its terms have not yet been settled, but it seems to me that it is only a matter of language apt to clothe the commissioners with the powers to obtain for us the information which we desire for the purpose which we have in view. I stated in introducing these loan proposals to the House that we not only desired the information which we thought a commission could furnish us respecting the physical and financial conditions of the railways and railway companies of Canada, but that we hoped to obtain from the commission suggestion and advice as to what distribution or rearrangement or linking up of lines and systems would give the best economic result for the enormous amount of capital which had been expended upon the railways of Canada. We have in mind a commission clothed with wide powers which will bring in a comprehensive report, as a result of which we shall know what policy, at least in our view, should be adopted to settle, as I have said, in permanent fashion this railway situation with which we are confronted. This problem cannot be side-stepped or escaped. This loan proposal is a measure of temporary assistance, and if the action which we propose to take were not taken, in all probability at the next session of the House, and possibly at the next after that, we might be confronted with a similar situation to that which confronts us to-day. There is every reason, therefore, why the Government should seek a permanent solution, and obtain the best advice which it possibly can get from the ablest experts available for the purpose in order that it may solve the problem which is presenting itself at recurring intervals and which demands solution.

The personnel of the commission has not yet been settled by the Government. The suggestion is put forward that the Government should be ready with the names of the members of the commission. I need not say that it is not an easy task to settle upon the names of men of the ability and of the impartial judgment which will be required to investigate the railway situation of Canada. Some hon. gentlemen have said that we should find these men in Canada; others suggest that they should be found in the United States. Undoubtedly there will be a difficulty in finding them in Canada, for the reason—speaking only for myself—that it would not be easy to find competent men in this country not connected with the existing railway situation and who could bring impartial judgment to bear upon the matter. The railways are competitors one with the other. It is possible that one or more of the men may be found in Canada, but whether found in Canada or in the United States, my own view is that they should be men of eminent ability and of such standing that they will command the confidence of the public, men who will deal with the matter without bias, without prejudice, unin-

fluenced by any interest in the existing situation. To the problem of finding those men the Government must address itself. We have not fixed on three as the number. We stated that we would appoint three directors upon the board of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and three directors upon the board of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I may say that it is not the intention of the Government to appoint so-called dummy directors, as has been suggested this afternoon, as representatives of the Government upon the boards of these two railways. We shall endeavour to find outstanding men who have the interests of the Government at heart and who will command the confidence of the people of Canada. The suggestion has been put forward during the progress of this discussion that there should be an audit of the revenues and expenditures of the Canadian Northern. It was not suggested that there should be a similar audit of the revenues and expenditures of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the two lines stand on the same footing and there is just as much reason for the one as for the other. We have provided for that. We have an estimate of $10,000 for the purpose of retaining and paying two firms of auditors for carrying on a continuous audit, beginning May 1, of the revenues and expenditures of the Canadian Northern Railway Company and of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. We feel that by reason of the guarantees and loans which we have made to these two railways we have a very vital interest in the conduct of their business from this time forward, or at all events until they are in such position that they will no longer need Government aid, if such a condition ever arises. It is our intention to appoint firms of auditors of very high standing who will command the confidence of the people. As it has been suggested that the net profits of the Canadian Northern railway system may have been diverted for other than railway purposes, I would call the attention of the committee to this fact,—because I do not believe that any hon. member desires to do any injustice to the Canadian Northern railway management—that the accounts of that company which have been laid before the House are audited by an eminent Winnipeg firm of very high standing, Messrs. Webb, Read and Hegan, chartered accountants. Personally I see no reason to believe that the net earnings of the Canadian Northern Railway Company have been used for any other purpose than the purposes of the railway; in fact, that is borne out by the statement that we have before us. For the fiscal year 1915, which ended on June 30 of last year, there was a net profit of $6,000,000 and for the present year there is an estimated net profit of $9,700,000. The net profits of that road have not been diverted to other than railway purposes. We can see where they have gone. The net profits, that is to say the amount of revenue in excess of operating expenses have gone, generally speaking, to two purposes. They have gone to pay interest upon underlying securities, that is to say, fixed charges; or they have gone to pay indebtedness incurred or expenditure made upon construction, or for the payment of instalments of equipment securities. There is an indebtedness, as I pointed out to the committee, in respect of those items, but the net earnings of the company so far as they went unquestionably were applied to that purpose.

As I stated, you have first the report of the administration of the Canadian Northern itself, and then you have the certificate of a very reputable firm of auditors in Winnipeg. In addition to that, we propose to appoint three directors upon the board of the Canadian Northern and three upon the board of the Grand Trunk Pacific, to keep the Government informed as to the administration of these railways. We propose, also, that there shall be an audit of the expenditures and revenues of each company on behalf of the Government, and it is our intention to name in this connection auditors who will command the confidence of the Canadian public.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister has brought up another point. I thought it had been decided that there were to be three commissioners, but apparently the Government does not know whether there are to be three or more than three.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I never mentioned any limitation of the number of commissioners to be appointed; there may be three or more than three, as the Government shall decide.

Mr. TURRIFF: No chance of having less than three?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: For myself, I think there should be at least three.

Mr. TURRIFF: At the rate the Government are going in appointing directors and

commissioners they will hardly find applicants enough possibly.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, you know we have a population of eight millions.

Mr. TURRIFF: But you must not interfere too much with recruiting, you know.

Mr. GRAHAM: The newspapers announced that there were to be three commissioners and how they were to be appointed; the Government to appoint two, one a financier, and the other a railway man, and these two to appoint a third. I discussed that the other night. But, to come back to the other point: Will this commission be instructed to report and make recommendations, and will the Government feel that it is bound to accept the recommendations they make? Or will they be asked to report, as the lawyers say, the evidence, and not make recommendations?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: They will be asked to advise generally as to the railway situation and to report as to what arrangement, distribution, or linking up of the lines or systems will give the best economic results. We cannot make any commission a dictator; we cannot abdicate the functions of the Government or of Parliament in favour of any commission. But we hope the commission will give us the benefit of expert knowledge to enable us to find a permanent solution of the railway situation. Speaking for myself, I should think it extremely inexpedient that the Government should devolve upon the commission the powers of Parliament. Obtaining expert advice is one thing, but whether the Government and Parliament should accept that advice is another. I do not think we should fetter ourselves in advance.

Mr. TURRIFF: As to conferring upon a commission the powers of Government, the hon. minister has forgotten that, only two or three weeks ago, at the instance of the Government, our function in regard to railway charters were turned over to the Railway Commission. But I leave that aside. The appointment of this commission is of vast importance. It seems to me that it would be better to take whatever amount of money the Government intends to spend in the salaries of these commissioners, and spend it in getting say two men, one man to deal with the physical conditions of the railways, and how they can best be worked for the general advantage of the people, and the other to look into the finances of the road. Or, instead of appointing three men at comparatively large salaries, get the best man you can find in America and give him the salary you would pay to the three. If you were to do this, I believe you would have a report that would be worth ten times as much as one made by three men. If you have three men on a commission, the work is done by the best man of the three—he practically decides the whole business. As to the gathering of information, that is a matter for clerical and other assistance. I should be in favour of a small commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is part of what I had in mind. The minister will notice that the newspapers are giving him advice as to the personnel of this commission. He has been advised not to neglect to have as one member of the commission a man who is in favour of Government ownership. Another portion of the press tell him that the report will be incomplete unless he has a labour representative on the commission. There are two distinct lines of advice that I have particularly noticed. If suggestions and recommendations are to be asked by this commission, in addition to an investigation of facts, it will be all the more necessary to be very, very careful as to the personnel. If it were possible to have all shades of opinion on the commission, it would be very well; but that might easily make the commission top heavy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many does the hon. member suggest as the membership of this commission?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not have more than three at the outside. I have tried commissions, and I have found that the larger the commission the more trouble you have in arriving at a conclusion. As the hon. member for Assiniboia has said, the acquiring of technical information does not need a commission; the commissioners should be able men who can digest the information when they get it. I do not think I will say more on the subject. The Government has my views. I would merely urge that the instructions to be given to the commission should first be drafted and then thought over for several days, and looked at in the light of full and mature consideration. Upon the powers given to the commission will depend the usefulness of their work.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know whether the minister will attach much importance

to my knowledge of railway matters, but I would like to give, not only to the Minister of Railways but to his colleagues, my idea on this subject. I think there is danger in making the mistake of not developing talent in our departments by going all over the country looking for commissioners. I think that the proper policy would be to employ big men in the various departments of the Government—and big men are needed in every department—pay them large salaries if necessary, and place responsibility upon them. That would be very much better than going outside when any big question arises and employing men at high salaries, perhaps to learn the business in hand at the expense of the Government, and then to leave the service of the Government. By having men of ability permanently employed in the departments they would be constantly at hand to give the Government the benefit of their advice and assistance in carrying out the recommendations which they might make, whereas outside commissioners, when employed in this way, are of no further use to the Government after they have made their report. The Government employs a general manager of the Government railways at a salary of $20,000 per annum. He is, I believe, a thoroughly competent man,—if he is not he is not capable of earning this salary,—and the Government will not be able to secure better advice than he should be able to give by the employment of any outside commission. There is the further fact that when a report is made by the outside commissioners, who may be employed, the officers of the department may say: If you had consulted us in the first place we could have given you better advice than you have received; the plan that has been recommended to you is of no use. The practice of employing outside men to do responsible work in the departments is not a good one. We see it constantly in the Justice Department. Not long ago when a little Bill was to be drafted we had lawyers from Halifax, Quebec and Vancouver gathered here to draft it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What Bill does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. McKENZIE: It was a Bill in connection with the war laws. A few days ago a man was added to the Department of Justice, which of course was carrying out the idea I suggest, and I think is the proper course. We should not have lawyers gathering around, like crows around a carcase whenever there is any legislation to be drafted.

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

To provide for a continuous audit on behalf of the Government of Canada, commencing May 1st, 1916, of the revenues and expenditures of the Canadian Northern railway and Grand Trunk Pacific railway systems, $10,000.

Mr. NESBITT: This is apparently carrying out what I was suggesting, having an audit of the receipts and disbursements. I did not know, when I made my remarks, that this item was in the Estimates.

Mr. OLIVER: There are two questions in connection with the Canadian Northern railway which I think might well be considered at this juncture. One is in connection with the Hudson Bay railway. The Government-owned section of the road runs from the Saskatchewan river to Hudson bay, and is connected with the railway system of the Northwest, through the Canadian Northern main line at Prince Albert, by a branch line, 90 miles in length. The sole ownership of that branch lies in the Canadian Northern railway. It would seem desirable that, if the Hudson Bay road is to be operated as a Government proposition, it should ultimately be extended southwesterly as far as Regina or Moosejaw; but for the time being there would be an immediate advantage in the ownership of the branch connection from Hudson Bay Junction to the Pas. I think it wise to go on record now as suggesting that that would be a proper matter to be taken under consideration and dealt with, because it will probably have to be done at some time, and this would seem to be as appropriate a time as any to make the arrangement.

Another suggestion has been made by the Quebec Board of Trade; that is, that access for the Transcontinental into Montreal should be secured over the Canadian Northern railway branch from Montreal to Harvey Junction.

Mr. REID: That is 116 miles.

Mr. OLIVER: It seems that the mileage from Winnipeg to Montreal is something

less by that route than by Cochrane, North Bay and Scotia Junction, while of course the traffic is hauled over the rails of the Transcontinental for a very much longer distance, and the grade is good all the way into Montreal. I do not know whether these points have been suggested to the minister, or have come to his attention, or whether he has any views on the subject. It would seem to me that, in dealing with the Canadian Northern, this would be a suitable time to make arrangements with the Canadian Northern for the future to acquire permanent rights over these two pieces of railroad.

Mr. REID: The suggestions are good. With reference to the Hudson Bay connection, the hon. member knows that it will be a year or so before that road is out of the hands of the contractors. The commission which is to go to work almost at once will no doubt consider the whole railway situation, as it concerns the West, as well as other parts of Canada, and no doubt they will take up that point in their investigation. With regard to the connection between Hervey Junction and Montreal, that matter has come before me. The suggestion is a good one, and is being taken up with the view of making the connection, so far as Montreal is concerned. There is no trouble in making arrangements of that kind. We can arrange it satisfactorily either by consulting together, or through the Board of Railway Commissioners. The advantage would be that we would be able to take the whole trainload over the Transcontinental, with the exception of a stretch of about 106 or 116 miles, and where you are dealing with a six cent rate, by bringing it over the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway and then over the Grand Trunk railway, there is very little left for the Transcontinental. As I have said, the suggestion is a good one and is being considered, and it may be taken advantage of before another year. I am in hopes that the whole railway question will be in such a shape next session that we will all be seized of the facts through having the advice of good men who will look into the matter thoroughly.

Progress reported.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY AND LOTBINIERE AND MEGANTIC RAILWAYS

ACQUISITION OF BRANCH LINES.

Hon. J. D. REID (Acting Minister of Railways) moved the second reading of Bill No. 101, to authorize the acquisition of lines of railway between the city of Quebec and Nairn Falls and between Lyster and St. Jean des Chaillons.

He said: This Bill is for the purpose of acquiring as part of the Government railway system three lines of railway. One is known as the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway, extending from St. Paul street in the city of Quebec to St. Joachim, a distance of about 43 1/5 miles. This road has already been in operation for many years.

Mr. GRAHAM: In what direction does it run?

Mr. REID: From Quebec, east along the St. Lawrence—that is the electric railway—to St. Anne de Beaupré, and further on. To Ste. Anne de Beaupré is a distance of about 20 miles, and the railway runs along the St. Lawrence to the point I have mentioned.

Mr. TURRIFF: On the north shore?

Mr. REID: On the north shore. As I have said, this road has been in operation for many years, and has been a paying proposition for some time.

Mr. TURRIFF: They should not sell it then.

Mr. REID: It is a part of the system. We are also acquiring the Lotbinière and Megantic railway extending from Lyster in the county of Megantic to St. Jean des Chaillons in the county of Lotbinière, a distance of about thirty miles. This road has also been in operation for a number of years and is a paying road. The other road we are acquiring is what is known as the Quebec and Saguenay railway, extending from its junction with the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway at St. Joachim in the county of Montmorency to Nairn Falls in the county of Charlevoix, a distance of about sixty-two and eight-tenths miles. This road is completed. Nairn Falls is about six miles from Murray Bay, and has some pulp and paper mills.

Mr. OLIVER: How far is that from the Saguenay river?

Mr. REID: About thirty or forty miles. This road was originally to go to Baie St. Catherines. The object in purchasing the Quebec and Montmorency is to have the road run right into the city of Quebec. The earnings of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway are as follows:

1910.	
Gross earnings	$217,802 94
Operating expenses	146,559 40
Net earnings	71,243 54
1911.	
Gross earnings	$245,039 04
Operating expenses	166,719 68
Net earnings	78,319 36
1912.	
Gross earnings	$273,395 84
Operating expenses	197,157 02
Net earnings	76,238 82
1913.	
Gross earnings	$293,985 75
Operating expenses	217,497 23
Net earnings	76,488 52
1914.	
Gross earnings	$311,528 17
Operating expenses	228,496 60
Net earnings	83,031 57

The earnings of the Lotbinière and Megantic railway are as follows:

1912.	
Gross earnings	$14,025 26
Operating expenses	8,047 55
Net earnings	5,577 71
1913.	
Gross earnings	$34,870 07
Operating expenses	27,964 97
Net earnings	6,905 10
1914	
Gross earnings	$30,259 47
Operating expenses	28,993 89
Net earnings	1,265 58

The Quebec and Saguenay railway has not been completed and is not in operation, and has therefore no earnings to show. As to the cost of these railways—the Quebec Light, Heat and Power Company, which owns the Quebec and Montmorency railway, gives the following statement of capital expenditures on the Montmorency division to March 31, 1916: The Quebec Light, Heat and Power Company, Limited, to June 30, 1910, $270,390.84; the Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company to March 31, 1916, $251,819.05, or a total of $2,992,209.89. The above cost includes all capital cost but makes no provision for the increased value of the different lands owned by the company, particularly its terminal property in the city of Quebec.

Mr. TURRIFF: Do I understand that this 30 miles cost on an average $91,000 a mile?

Mr. REID: That figure includes the terminals in Quebec, which were very expensive. Then the road is electrified.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the minister any reliable reports on these roads?

Mr. REID: We have had our engineers go over the road, and their reports are included in the papers that have been submitted. The cost of the Lotbinière and Megantic railway, which was purchased only two or three years ago, was $285,075.95, plus cost of surveys of line, legal and trust fees, etc., $64,132.70, or a total of $349,208.85. I am giving the statement of cost as it has been given to me.

The Quebec and Saguenay railway was, I understand, incorporated on May 20, 1905, the incorporators being E. D. Garneau, Hon. Charles Langelier, George Tanguay, M.P.P.; Narcisse Rioux, Hon. Alexander Taschereau, William Price, Mark Workman, McLea Walbank and W. G. Ross. That railway extends from the east end of the Quebec and Montmorency road on to Murray bay, the original intention being to go to St. Catherines bay, and making that a winter port. The charter was amended on the 28th day of February, 1907.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it a provincial charter or a Dominion charter?

Mr. REID: A Quebec charter. Evidently the work did not begin for some time, because my memorandum shows that construction was begun on the 15th of April, 1911, and the work was stopped in September, 1912.

Mr. TURRIFF: Construction on the Quebec and Saguenay railway apparently had to cease as soon as reciprocity was defeated.

Mr. REID: The fact that reciprocity was defeated, even supposing it caused the stoppage of this work, was a good thing for the Dominion of Canada. This railway will be revived again, and I hope it will be as successful as the defeat of reciprocity was. About 87 per cent of this railway is finished. The amount that has been expended upon it up to the present time is as follows: The company issued bonds to the extent of $4,684,400. $2,500,000 worth of those bonds were sold at 84 cents on the dollar, and $2,184,400 were sold at 82 cents on the dollar, realising together $3,822,315.42. They have expended all this money and $1,050,000 more in cash, all of which has been put into the road. Therefore they have put into the road $4,872,315.42 of actual cash, and there is due for small claims, a balance for right of way and other accounts, $461,000, making a total of $5,333,315.42, which the company claim has been paid out for the construction of this road so far as it has gone. They received from the Dominion Government in cash at

one time for subsidies $132,000, which amount was paid to cancel $144,000 worth of the bonds that I have mentioned. Another subsidy, amounting to $116,000, has been deposited with the trust company, and has not yet been paid out to the Quebec and Saguenay railway. Therefore, they have received altogether in subsidies $248,000, but we get back $116,000 of the subsidies so paid, so that the total subsidy that the railway has received is $132,000. I understand that, according to their charter, they were to have received 189,000 acres of land and $3,000 a mile from the Quebec Government, but of that nothing has been given to them up to the present time.

In regard to the condition of the road, at the present time, according to the report of Mr. Beckwith, from Mile 30 to Mile 51 upwards of 95 per cent of the road is finished; from Mile 51 to Mile 56, which is about the heaviest part of the work, 40 per cent is finished; from Mile 56 to Mile 62, 95 per cent of the road is graded; from Mile 62 to Mile 65, there are several unfinished rock cuts, but about 85 per cent of the total work is finished.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does my hon. friend, when he says that the road is finished, mean that the grading is finished, or that the rails have been laid?

Mr. REID: The roadbed has been graded; the ties are there, but the rails are not laid. From Mile 65 to Mile 79 a number of washouts have occurred, but about 85 per cent of the roadbed has been completed, and we have a great many ties to place on this road. From Mile 79 to Mile 81, 6,000 feet of the light work has gone, but otherwise that part is completed; from Mile 81 to Mile 85, 95 per cent of the work has been completed, and from Mile 95 to Nairn falls it is completed. That is the condition of that part of the road from St. Joachim to Nairn falls. There have been several estimates as to what it will cost to finish the road and put it in the condition in which it was when the contractors ceased work. Owing to the road having been left without any work being done on it since 1912, there are a number of washouts, etc., which must, of course, be repaired.

Mr. NESBITT: Will the minister give the estimates of the cost?

Mr. REID: The contractors thought it would cost about $700,000 to complete the road.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. NESBITT: That is to put it in the condition in which it was before?

Mr. REID: To put the road in the condition in which it was before and to lay the rails, making the road all complete and ready for operation.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are different weights of rails along the road—56 and 67 pound rails?

Mr. REID: There are not many rails there, only enough for about eighteen or twenty miles altogether, and those rails are lighter than the ordinary. The reason this railway has cost so much is that it was built to Transcontinental specifications and there was a great deal of hard rock-cut. The cost for reproducing and placing it in condition for operation and completion one contractor estimates at about $700,000. Our engineer who went over the road estimated it at something over $1,000,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: What engineer?

Mr. REID: I think his name is Beckwith. In fact two or three engineers of the Intercolonial went over this road. The road was originally proposed to give a service to the people who are living on the north shore. We all know that the people on the south shore are well served with railways, while those living on the north shore have no railway accommodation.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the minister will give us information as he goes along. I see by the Bill that the road is 62.8 miles long.

Mr. REID: Yes, that is the Quebec and Saguenay.

Mr. McKENZIE: How much is completed and open for traffic, and how much unfinished?

Mr. REID: I gave that information at the beginning. Mile 30 is the end of the Quebec and Montmorency and the commencement of the Quebec and Saguenay. From mile 30 to mile 91 is the distance the hon. gentleman mentioned. I stated that from mile 30 to mile 51 the work was upward of ninety-five per cent completed, and according to the statement I have, the road is eighty-seven per cent completed throughout.

Mr. TURRIFF: According to the figures as I have taken them down, something over $5,000,000 has been expended on 62·8 miles, of which the grading is only 87½ per cent completed, with no rails laid, no sta-

tions built, but, I presume, with the bridges built, although I am not sure as to that. Figure that out, and you will find that this road has cost more than completed railways even in difficult parts of the country. I think it would be advisable for the minister to explain where the money has gone.

Mr. REID: I explained that these are the figures given me by the Quebec and Saguenay Railway.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has there been no audit?

Mr. REID: Not by us; but we only agree to pay what it actually cost, up to a certain amount. Perhaps I had better state now what our proposition is, because that will afford me an opportunity to explain an amendment that I shall propose to this Bill when we get into committee. The cost of the Quebec and Montmorency railway, as I stated, was $2,992,209.89. There are bonds on this railway of $2,500,000. We propose, if it is proven to the satisfaction of the Exchequer Court that this money has actually been spent on the road, to assume the $2,500,000 of bonds for the railroad and the terminals.

10 p.m.

Mr. PUGSLEY: About $70,000 a mile.

Mr. REID: If it cost that. The Exchequer Court must be satisfied that the amount has actually gone into the road.

Mr. GRAHAM: Irrespective of whether it is worth it now or not?

Mr. REID: If it is necessary to have this part of the road in order to have the through road from Quebec to Murray Bay and St. Catherine's bay, if it is extended. By taking this road we can reach Quebec city. That is the reason why we require this piece of road, and, as I have stated, it is a paying road. Now, from St. Joachim to Nairn Falls, according to this statement, they have spent $5,533,315. It is with regard to this that I shall propose an amendment, asked for by Judge Cassels of the Exchequer Court, with a view to making it plainer and providing that he may be able to go thoroughly into the matter. I shall propose to add to the Bill the following words:

Said value to be the actual cost of said railways less depreciation, but not to exceed $4,465,000 exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all $2,500,000.

Mr. NESBIT: That is on the short piece?

Mr. REID: The short piece is the electric road and steam road, which has been earning the amounts I have stated. And even if they can show, as they say they can easily show, that they have expended the amount I have stated, the Judge of the Exchequer Court will not be allowed to exceed $4,465,000, but not that amount unless it is shown that much money has been expended on the Quebec and Saguenay, the Lotbinière and Megantic, and the Quebec and Montmorency.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The amendment seems to rather tie the hands of the Judge of the Exchequer Court, because, while it fixes a low valuation, it makes no provision for a reduction on account of the Dominion subsidy which has been paid. If the minister thinks that the cost ought to be considered instead of the value, ought not the subsidy to be deducted?

Mr. REID: Of that $132,000 has been paid, and $116,000 has not been paid. We propose that they must show that they have actually expended on the three roads $4,465,000 of cash.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will that include interest on the money that they have invested from year to year?

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I meant was that if he had regard only to the amount actually expended, the judge of the Exchequer Court would not be allowed to deduct the $132,000 which has already been paid by the Dominion by way of subsidy.

Mr. REID: I think the subsidy should be deducted; we can take that up in committee. The Quebec and Saguenay state that they have expended $5,333,315 less the subsidy of $116,000, leaving $5,217,315. Hon. gentlemen can see that if we put in the words "actual cost" without limiting the amount, we would have to pay the $5,300,000. Replying to the hon. member for Guysborough, I may say that during the construction of a road interest is always added to the cost of construction until the road is completed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At what rate?

Mr. REID: I do not know what the rate is. I can easily have that information when we are in committee.

Mr. TURRIFF: One of these roads, the Quebec and Saguenay, stopped construction in September, 1911.

Mr. GRAHAM: It synchronized.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, it synchronized with the defeat of reciprocity. According to what my hon. friend says now, he would propose to pay interest from the time the road began construction up to the present moment.

Mr. REID: No, I said during construction, until the road was completed.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend talks about paying the cost of the road. Does he mean that whatever statement the present owners of the road put in as the cost of the road would be accepted, or does he mean that the cost would be based upon what it could have been built for? This road may have been built, for all we know, along the same lines as the Canadian Northern was built. Certain men who owned the road taking the contract and switching it to 25 or 30 per cent of the money they were getting for building the road, thus making private profit.

Mr. REID: Tenders were made and contracts let; the prices must have been reasonable, because some of the contractors failed with the work and other contractors had to take it up and complete it. The amount that is to be paid is the amount that actually went into the road, the right of way, and terminals. The judge of the Exchequer Court is the man to decide whether the statements submitted to him are correct as to the money expended on this railway. No person will put in accounts by which there will be any money made out of this transaction. The information I have is that these lines will serve quite a population in that locality. I am informed that in the county of Charlevoix there are 22,000 people without railway accommodation. This line enters the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay and will be of service to a number of people in that district. The population of that county is some 65,000, as shown by the census. It will serve the county of Montmorency, which has a population of 15,000, and it will be of benefit to the city of Quebec, the population of which is about 90,000. It will also be of benefit to the people in Quebec county, of which the population is 27,000. My view is that this road will be of considerable benefit to the people along the north shore, who should have had railway accommodation before this. Part of this road has been in operation for many years and has been of great benefit to those who have had the advantage of that operation, as is shown by the earnings that I have given. The line from the end of Quebec and Montmorency to Murray Bay, will, I believe, have good earning power. Very many people go down to Murray Bay and along the north shore during the summer. A great many people, many of them farmers, live along that route, and to them this line will be of great benefit. I discussed this matter with our railway management, and they believe that the road will be quite an advantage to our transcontinental system. Having regard to all the conditions, I have no hesitation in recommending that this road be purchased and put in operation at the earliest possible date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What about the railway on the south shore?

Mr. REID: There is a short line, about 30 miles in length.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that a branch of the Intercolonial?

Mr. REID: Yes, it is a branch line of the Intercolonial, it is on the south side.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not a branch line yet.

Mr. REID: It will be when we acquire it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I mean is, does it connect with the Intercolonial?

Mr. REID: Yes. As I have shown, the earnings are not very large, but they are on the right side, and this line will be a feeder to the Intercolonial.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why does not the minister allow that to come under the statute of 1915, which provides for taking over branch lines of the Intercolonial?

Mr. REID: Even if we did take it over under the Branch Lines Act, we would have to come to Parliament and have the transaction confirmed; therefore we might just as well bring it in now and include it in this legislation. We are really bringing it in under the legislation to which my hon. friend refers, and confirming it at the same time. As this line connects with the Intercolonial, we could have brought it in under the branch line legislation, as the hon. member suggests, but we would have to come to Parliament for the other two lines in any case. The Prime Minister assured the House that if any roads were taken over under that Act which were not in connection with the Intercolonial, he would come to Parliament and have the acquiring of them confirmed as we are doing.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The road on the south side of the St. Lawrence does not come within the minister's promise to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, because that would come under the statute of 1915. By this Bill the minister is making an entirely different provision. Under the Act of 1915, an agreement had been come to as to the price; but here he is providing that these two roads shall be picked out, an exception made in their case, and the price to be paid is to be fixed by the Exchequer Court. Whether or not the Government may deem that price to be reasonable, they will be bound to pay. That is the difference, and I think it is very exceptional and favourable treatment that is being afforded to these two roads as compared with the roads enumerated in the statute of 1915.

Mr. REID: Of course we could do as the hon. gentleman says; but this is just as convenient and I cannot see that it is not in the interest of the Government to do it in this way.

Mr McKENZIE: Does the minister not see that he is simply appointing another commission? It is this pernicious practice of appointing commissions; he is making the Exchequer Court a commission. Is it not possible for the minister to bargain for anything?

Mr. REID: It is not fair for the hon. gentleman to make that statement. The Exchequer Court was organized for the purpose of settling any claim that any person might have against the Government, or to adjust matters if the Government is purchasing.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister need not explain to me what the Exchequer Court is; I know that quite well.

Mr. REID: If the hon. member knows, it is not fair to make the statement he has made. I believe that every hon. member in this House will be satisfied that, whatever decision the Exchequer Court makes in connection with these roads or any other matters that may come before the court.

Mr. GRAHAM: But you tie up the Exchequer Court with conditions.

Mr REID: Only in so far as the maximum amount to be paid is concerned; and I think it is right, in the interests of the Government to do so, because we say that the actual cost is not to exceed a certain amount. The statement is made to the Government that there has been a very much larger amount than this expended on the road, and for that reason we say: We will limit the amount to this maximum. If, when the statements are put before the judge of the Exchequer Court, he is of the opinion that there has not been this amount expended on these roads, then he has power to fix a lower price. That is the reason we limit the maximum.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has my hon. friend taken any steps to verify the figures given to him of how much has been put into the road? He says it has been stated that more than this amount has been put into it. I presume that statement has been made by the company, that they have expended more than appears. Has any audit been made, and have these figures been verified?

Mr. REID: No, we have not gone that far because we have the figures showing what has been paid. We feel perfectly satisfied that, as the whole matter has to come before the Exchequer Court, the court will take good care to see that that amount has actually been expended or has gone into the road; and for that reason it would hardly be necessary for us to go that far. We have confidence in the Exchequer Court carrying out the provisions of the Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Exchequer Court, to put it shortly, was established to decide claims of contractors. A contractor does not go to the Exchequer Court and say: I spent so much. The Exchequer Court decides certain disputes under his contract. If the Government were expropriating a building, the Exchequer Court would decide what the building was worth, not what it cost for its construction, although that might be an element in the evidence. What I mean by tying up the Court is that the Government is compelling it to take what was put into the road as a basis, even if one-half of what was put into it has floated away. Suppose the road had been constructed, and a million dollars worth of it had been washed away.

Mr. REID: They have got to reproduce it.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is all right. My hon. friend ties up the Exchequer Court to give a decision based on the amount that was invested. Unless in their judgment value was received for that investment, the basis is no good at all. Suppose the road were extravagantly built, supposing, for reasons that occur sometimes in railway construction, it cost the company one

million dollars and they got value for only one-half a million dollars, there is no provision made for an allowance for that in the Exchequer Court. The judge must take into account what they expended. The basis ought to be the value of the work that is there, no matter what it cost. That, I think, would be the simple way. The Exchequer Court should not be tied up as is here proposed.

Mr. MORPHY: Does the hon. member mean the value based upon the cost at the time of construction, or what, if it were constructed to-day, that same work would be worth?

Mr. GRAHAM: The judge ought to have full liberty to take everything into consideration.

Mr. MORPHY: Then you are opening it up to a dangerous point.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Government is going to pay the value and no more or less, the judge ought to be the one to determine what the value is. If you take the road as a going concern—my hon. friend need not be alarmed—portions of it have a high value. I am pointing out that the minister is tying up the Exchequer Court on a certain basis on which the court will bring in its findings, and that is not a correct basis; it ought to be the value of the property at present, no matter what it cost.

Mr. MORPHY: My idea is that the present value might be a great deal more than its cost when constructed; and if it is opened up in that way, the country may pay a great deal more than the money put in to build the road.

Mr. GRAHAM: I can assure my hon. friend that will not be the case.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to remind hon. members that the question before the House is the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I appreciate the point raised by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). His contention is that no special limit should be placed upon the Exchequer Court in determining the value; that the Exchequer Court should be governed by the same conditions as it is governed by in other matters when values come before it for determination. It is well known that, under the law governing expropriations, the Exchequer Court considers the various elements, all in varying degree, depending on the case that happens to be before it; sums those elements up and reaches a valuation. What these elements are and what the law is, there is no need to dilate upon; it is well known to hon. gentlemen opposite. If in this case no basis were provided for the Exchequer Court, it would be difficult, if not indeed impossible, to arrive at a determination. As the hon. minister has stated, the intimation that a basis of value would be desirable came from the Exchequer Court itself. I can quite understand why such an intimation should come in this case. Ordinarily the basis of allowance by an Exchequer Court, or indeed by any court, on an expropriation, is the damage done to the parties from whom the property is expropriated, and the damage would be the value of the property to that party; the loss he suffers by its severance from him and by its being taken to become the property of the expropriator. It naturally would appear to the judge of the Exchequer Court that in this case it would be very difficult to have any means of arriving at a basis where all these elements would come in. Here is a road for example, the Quebec and Saguenay, 62·8 miles, which runs through a country yet unprovided with railways, which has been built at a very great expense on account of the character of the country through which it runs. That railway if it were completed, would serve a certain population that exists there to-day. I do not know how the value of that railway could be estimated. It is a matter of potentiality. It is a matter of estimating the future, of estimating, not only the conditions that prevail now, while the railway is in embryo, but of estimating what may be the prospects of the road as conditions develop by the operation of the railway itself. It may be that the railway handled by the company in whose hands it is, would be a losing proposition for a time. One man might say that it would be a losing proposition always; another might say differently. There would be nothing of a tangible nature to go upon, because it is a matter, not of existing conditions, but of potentialities that are buried in the nature of the conditions themselves.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that we are not expropriating this railway, but taking over the road for what it may be worth?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not in the nature of an expropriation but of a purchase?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is true in one sense. While I am on the point, I may answer the hon. gentleman in full. The Act of 1915, under which we are empowered to act, gives the minister the power to take over a road, and under a clause in that Act, he may exercise all the powers of expropriation. That power is given in a clause on the second page of the Act, if my hon. friend will turn it up. The minister is not required to exercise the powers of expropriation, but he has the powers of expropriation vested in him by that statute.

Mr. McKENZIE: You are not going to exercise them here?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes; we will have the power to exercise them as soon as this Bill passes, because we take the roads under the provisions "of an Act to amend the Government Railways Act and to authorize the purchase of certain railways." Taking the road under that, we get the powers of that Act, and we would be able to exercise the power of expropriation. But whether we choose to exercise it or not, or whether we choose to make an agreement by way of purchase with the necessary provisions for the protection of the Government, and then refer that agreement, either under the Act of this session, or simply under this Act, the course before the Exchequer Court would be to determine the value of the road, the value of what we get, and under the very peculiar circumstances that prevail here, expropriating a railway, part of which is only a railway in embryo, the ordinary rules would be very difficult, indeed, of application. Consequently, it appeared to the judge of that court that a basis of valuation was essential.

Before I deal with the method of arriving at a basis, I may say that the words I have used so far apply pretty accurately, also, to the first thirty miles of the Montmorency and Charlevoix road. That road also has a certain value now. But it may have a much greater value when the addition is completed, the Quebec and Saguenay railway, which connects it up with Nairn Falls. It may have an added value by virtue of the possibility of the extension of that line to St. Catherines Bay, which is claimed to be a winter port.

Mr. TURRIFF: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said what is claimed to be a winter port; I am not giving a decision, because I have not the evidence of my own judgment on that matter which the hon. member for Assiniboia apparently has.

Mr. TURRIFF: I lived until I was grown up 100 miles east of that point on the St. Lawrence river, where you could not see across the river, and there was no winter port there, but solid ice all the winter through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be a long time since my hon. friend was there.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is a long time, about forty years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Conditions might have changed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Would it not be well to ascertain whether conditions have changed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be before we build the road. We are not holding out the prospect of building it yet. What the hon. member has said only illustrates and emphasizes the point I am making, the very great difference of opinion as to prospects. There would be nothing substantial and tangible upon which the Exchequer Court could proceed in estimating the value of a potentiality like that.

Mr. TURRIFF: You could trust the judge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We do trust the judge? That is what we are asking the House to do, and the judge asks that Parliament fix a basis, and we propose to trust his judgment in making that request.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How is the amount arrived at?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will explain that. In arriving at a basis, in getting at something that would be a basis, we had in mind these considerations: The road has been built by a private company. It was intended to be built for gain. The presumption is that they would build it to the best advantage; consequently, it would be clear that even under ordinary conditions the actual cost of the road, not necessarily the bonded indebtedness, but the actual money that was translated into the road would be a very important consideration to the judge. However, the fact also appeared that this part of the road had been constructed for some time, and there would be depreciation, and we knew by virtue of our own officers' reports that there would be wash-

outs and the like. Consequently, it was essential that depreciation should be taken off. I think it also right that the subsidies should be taken off, and the actual money that went in, and is now buried in the road, less that depreciation and less the subsidies, would be the value.

Mr. NESBITT: The depreciation for wear and tear during the time the road was lying idle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is tear perhaps, but not wear, because the road has not been used. As to the way the amount is fixed, that is the amount they offer the road at, but not having proof, and not wishing to assume the responsibility of saying that that amount of money has gone into the road, and that there is not sufficient depreciation to make it less than that now, we refer that to the Exchequer Court; but we put a limitation because we do not wish the amount to exceed that at which the company are ready now to dispose of it. I think that that answers all the questions which have been raised.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have been looking over the amendment which the Acting Minister of Railways said he would propose, and I would like to know whether it applies to the whole three railroads or to the first two only.

Mr. REID: To the three.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Let me read the amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have seen it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It strikes me as very peculiar. (Reads):

> The said value to be the actual cost of said railways less depreciation, but not to exceed $4,465,000, exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all $2,500,000.

That is, the value of the three railroads should be fixed by the Exchequer Court, but it is not to exceed $6,965,000. That applies to the three railroads?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are they all owned by the same company?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They seem to be separate corporations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not like to get involved in a discussion as to title, because it is very involved, I can assure the hon. gentleman; but the stock, I understand, is pretty much controlled by the same company, and the intention is that the value of the whole three railroads shall be arrived at by that process. The $2,500,000 are long distance bonds at a low rate of interest, which, I understand, there is no object at all in paying off. They will stand against the Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway. The whole valuation will be taken, and the equity in the whole, over and above that $2,500,000, must not exceed $4,465,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have no objection to urge against the Government acquiring these railways, because I have not sufficient knowledge of the country, or of the railways themselves, to enable me to express an opinion. Therefore, I do not wish to be understood as opposing the acquisition of these railways. That is a matter in regard to which, as far as I am concerned, the Government must be answerable to the House. But one thing that seems to me to require explanation is why this mode of taking over the roads has been adopted. It differs very materialy from the provision made by Parliament in the year 1915 for the taking over of branch lines for the Intercolonial. In that Act it is provided that no branch line shall be taken over unless in the opinion of the minister it can "more conveniently and usefully be operated as a part of the Government Railway system, or which might be deemed necessary or desirable for the more efficient operation of the said system." The Government could not take over any branch line of the Intercolonial unless in the minister's opinion it fulfilled either one or the other of these conditions. But in this case Parliament is asked expressly to authorize the minister to acquire these three roads with the approval of the Governor General in Council.

There is another very great distinction. In the Act of 1915 the purchase is to be a matter of bargain between the Government and the railway company. In this case the Government seems to abdicate altogether its function of determining the price which it will pay to these companies, it being provided that the Government shall pay whatever the Judge of the Exchequer Court might deem a proper amount. And this amendment absolutely ties the hands of the Judge of the Exchequer Court by providing that he shall be bound to allow the actual cost of the railways less depreciation.

Mr. REID: Not the actual cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, it says so.

Mr. REID: A maximum amount is fixed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But not exceeding so much. It does not give the judge of the Exchequer Court or the Government any discretion to take the roads over at a price which it would be reasonable for the Government to pay. In that respect it is different from the Act of 1915, which leaves the discretion entirely to the judgment of the Governor in Council. We know very well that there may be many railroads—we have some in New Brunswick—whose owners would be delighted to get one-half the actual amounts which those roads cost. It is perfectly well understood that the Government had no intention of paying what the roads cost, but would insist on getting them at a valuation which would be likely in the not distant future to yield at all events some return, even though it might be small, on the money invested by the Government. For some reason the Government is making a departure from the Act of 1915 and is specifying that so long as the actual cost of these roads, outside of the bonded indebtedness, does not exceed $4,466,000 the judge of the Exchequer Court shall be bound to allow that amount, even though the roads may cost twice as much as might have been reasonably and necessarily expended on the construction, and even the condition of the roads may be such as to require the expenditure of a very large amount of money to put them in a reasonably fit condition for traffic. I think some explanation should be given why the Government is departing from the provisions of the Act of 1915. It does seem to me that if the Government is going to leave this matter to the Exchequer Court it should at all events provide that the amount should not exceed the actual reasonable and necessary cost of the construction of the lines. Those are the words which Parliament has adopted in reference to subsidies. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, Parliament provides that where the cost of a railroad exceeds $15,000 per mile the Government may grant an additional subsidy upon the cost of the road up to $21,000, so as to allow of a subsidy of $6,400 a mile being granted. Parliament does not allow that increased subsidy to be given on the actual cost, but stipulates that it shall only be given on the actual, reasonable and necessary cost of the construction of the line. It does seem to me that if the gentlemen who own these roads are desirous of getting rid of them, or of transferring to the Government the burden of completing and operating them, they ought to be satisfied to take what the Judge of the Exchequer Court would deem to be the actual, reasonable and necessary cost of construction. That I think would be a reasonable proposition to make. My contention, therefore, is that the Government, instead of coming down here with a separate Bill providing in respect of these roads provisions entirely different from those which obtain in the Branch Lines Act of 1915, should have amended that Act of 1915 to make it apply to branch lines of the Transcontinental as well. That would have been a simple proposition. While I am on my feet I desire, with all due respect, and in all kindness, to say to the Minister of Railways that there will be a very strong feeling of disappointment among the people of the province from which I come that, before carrying out the provisions of the Act of 1915, which provides for the taking over of branch lines of the Intercolonial, the Government is bringing down now a provision for the taking over of two new lines which were not contemplated by Parliament at that time, and with respect to the taking over of which no provision was made. I wish my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was in his place. He ought to be as deeply interested in this matter as I am, for his constituents are very deeply interested in this question. As long ago as the year 1911, before the general electins, the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) sent a hurried S.O.S. call from St. John or Sussex to the then leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister, and who was then in Charlottetown, asking in most pressing terms for the views of the right hon. gentleman with regard to the taking over of branch lines of the Intercolonial. It is stated that it was the policy of the Conservative party to take over all those branch lines of the Intercolonial which could be operated to advantage in connection with the Intercolonial. In New Brunswick, there are quite a number of branch lines, the taking over of which has been agitated for a good many years, and the people in the various counties interested were delighted to receive from the then leader of the Opposition that assurance which was published broadcast in the Conservative newspapers and which, no doubt, had a very reassuring effect upon the people. Hon. gentlemen can realize how much it would influence the people of the constituencies interested in

voting in favour of the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) and other Conservative candidates. There is a railroad running from Hampton to St. Martins, only some thirty miles in length. There is a railway in York county known as the York and Carleton railway. There is a railway in Kings county known as the Elgin, Petit Codiac and Havelock railway. There is another railway called the Harvey and Salisbury railway. There is another railway known as the Moncton and Buctouche railway, and another from Kent Junction to Richibucto known as the Northern railway.

Mr. REID: Those are all old timers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is one from Bathurst to Tracadie in the county of Gloucester; and there are also some in Nova Scotia and some in Quebec. The people interested have been looking for years for the taking over of those branch lines. What I complain of is that these pre-election promises should be regarded just as the Kaiser regarded the treaty which it was thought would preserve the neutrality of Belgium, that is, that they should be regarded as mere scraps of paper which the Conservative party could break at will. I am sorry the hon. member for Kings and Albert and also the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are not here, because their constituencies are interested in this question. They felt that before entering upon new engagements, these old, timeworn promises of the Conservative party ought to be carried out. The taking over of all these branch lines that I have mentioned would not cost anything like the amount which it is proposed to expend on these three railroads which are mentioned in the Bill before the House to-night.

Before I take my seat I want to call attention to the extraordinary statement which my hon. friend the Solicitor General has made to-night, that this amendment is made at the suggestion of the judge of the Exchequer Court. Let me ask how it is that the judge of the Exchequer Court would make a suggestion of that kind before such a Bill is passed, before any proceedings are taken or could by any possibility have been taken in the Exchequer Court. How is it that he could make a suggestion as to the amendment to be made in this Bill and that the Government is not acting upon its own judgment, but upon a suggestion made by that judge? Perhaps the Solicitor General will enlighten us on that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps we had better get into committee, as I have already spoken.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would not like my hon. friend to get out of order, because that would be bad. Not many days ago the Minister of Justice told the House that in his opinion it would be quite impossible for Parliament to constitute this Royal Commission presided over by Chief Justice Meredith and Mr. Justice Duff into a court which would enable them to make inquiries and to issue commissions for the purpose of making inquiries. Almost at the very time that the minister was making that statement, there either stood upon the Order Paper, or had been been passed, a Bill which provided that this Exchequer Court, without having any expropriation proceedings before it, might make inquiries as to the value of property which the Government might think of buying or selling. None of us thought at that time of the purpose for which that Bill was introduced. It appears now that it was introduced and that it has been passed for the very purpose of enabling values to be placed upon those railways which the House is being called upon to consider to-night. I have no doubt whatever that the action of the Minister of Justice, in proposing that Bill to the House and having it passed, has been in anticipation of the railroad legislation which we are now being called upon to consider. It may be, of course, that the attention of the judge of the Exchequer Court was called to that Bill when it passed, and possibly that may be the explanation why he has given this information to my hon. friend.

Mr. REID: That was not it at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I can certainly conceive of no other explanation of the judge of the Exchequer Court obtruding his views upon the Government before any question relating to the subject had come before him. There are no expropriation proceedings before him; there is no intimation; there is no proceeding of any kind or description, and there could be no proceedings of any kind or description before the judge of the Exchequer Court which would justify or explain his making any intimation to the Government, and I can only imagine it is done because the previous Act which has been passed by this Parliament at the instance of the hon. Minister of Justice has been brought to his attention and he has been informed that it was intended to act

with regard to these railways. That would be an explanation why this amendment has been suggested. I can think of no other.

Hon. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Postmaster General): As two of these railways run through a country with which I am tolerably familiar, I think it is incumbent upon me to give a few words of explanation to the House. As to the railway which runs from St. Jean des Chaillons on the St. Lawrence to Lyster on the Grand Trunk and further north to the intersection of the Intercolonial, I am not so familiar. It runs through the county of Lotbinière and also through a part of the county of Megantic. For the most part it runs through very good timber land, and I have no doubt that if it is properly managed and operated, it will prove a good feeder for the Intercolonial.

I am more familiar with the topography of the country through which the other two railways run. The old Quebec and Montmorency railway runs from Quebec to St. Joachim, through part of the county of Quebec and through part of the county of Montmorency, my old constituency. This runs through parishes which are prosperous and uniformly populous, through what is known as La Côte Beaupré. There is practically one continuous village from the station at Quebec down to St. Joachim.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is that the electric railway that runs down to Montmorency Falls?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes; that railway passes first through the parish of Beauport which is a very prosperous parish in the county of Quebec.

Mr. TURRIFF: Who operates the road at present?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company, which holds the Quebec street railway also, and which, I believe, is the holding company for this other company, the Lotbinière and Megantic. It then passes through a parish named St. Grégoire below Montmorency falls. It also has a line on the ridge which runs to the upper part of Beauport three or four miles from Quebec, to the Kent House at the Falls. The lower line, after leaving the parish of St. Grégoire, runs through the populous parish of L'Ange Gardien, and through the large parish of Chateau Richer, thence to and through the town of Ste. Anne de Beaupré, where, as hon. members are aware, there is a famous shrine, to which thousands of pilgrims go every year, especially in the summer. It then runs through the parish of St. Joachim which is the terminus of the old Quebec and Montmorency railway. From this the line proceeds to Petite Rivière St. François, through a country that is sparsely populated and most difficult for railway construction, on account of its mountainous character, but coming down to this parish of Petite Rivière St. François, there are two populous parishes on the brow of the hill—St. Tite, which is a mile and a half from the river, and St. Féréol three miles from St. Tite. These must have a population combined of 3,000. There is a considerably wooded country there, and no doubt if the railway is run through the region it will have quite a freight as well as a passenger business. Then, from the parish of Petite Rivière St. François we go on to the populous parish of Baie St. Paul with from 2,500 to 3,000 population, including the parish of St. Urbain. Then, passing along the shore of the St. Lawrence, we come to Les Eboulements and St. Irénée, famous watering places, and then to Murray Bay. This place has been known for many years as a famous watering place and its reputation is increasing every year. I have no doubt that if a railway were run to that point, there would be traffic along the line in lumber and timber; while at Baie St. Paul and also at Murray Bay there would be industries of various kinds.

Mr. NESBITT: What kind of timber is it?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Pulpwood, there are large quantities of it. This country has never been provided with railway communication. A combined railway and steamer route was established some
11 p.m. years ago by which Murray Bay could be reached. At great expense the Government built a spur line from the Intercolonial railway from St. Pacôme to Rivière Ouelle, where communication is maintained with Murray Bay for six months in the year; but for the other six months communication is greatly interrupted by the ice, the winds, and the snow storms on the St. Lawrence. So this population is almost completely deprived of any communication except by stage coach with the city of Quebec. It seems to me that we can profit by the experience gained by the building of the Lake St. John railway. The climate, soil and general characteristics of the country through which this line of railway will run may be compared with that served by the Lake St. John railway. Before the railway was built to Lake St. John there was only 10,000 of a population in that region. There is to-day a population of

almost 100,000, and when I was up there last summer I was surprised at the statistics handed to me showing the exports from that region—cereals, dead meat, cattle, and all kinds of farm products. It is now a rich country, and hon. members will be surprised to find in that northern part of the province so rich a region. There is no reason why the same development should not take place in the region to be served by the railway which it is proposed to purchase if this Bill goes through. A great deal of money has been spent in the construction of the railway from St. Joachim to Murray Bay, and the line has been to a great extent ballasted, and was at one time ready for the rails. Vast sums of money have been expended on this enterprise. When one takes into consideration the fact that this part of the country has always been deprived of railroad communication, why should we not conclude that it is time that the population of the north shore of the St. Lawrence should have the same measure of assistance that other parts of the country have received? There has been a question as to the amendment proposed by the Minister of Railways. It seems to me that the proper time for discussing the meaning of that amendment is when the Bill is in Committee of the Whole. I have no objection, of course, to the very enlightening observations made by hon. gentlemen opposite, especially those of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). But, if I am not mistaken, the suggestion of the amendment came because a case of this kind had been before the Exchequer Court, and it was found necessary to put wording of this kind into the Bill to meet difficulties such as were encountered in that case. I have forgotten at the moment the name of that case. The amount to be paid is to be an amount ascertained after full investigation by the Exchequer Court. This is the security which the Government gives to the country that no fanciful amount will be paid for the railway, but only its real value to the country. The Bill should go to the committee and then we can discuss more completely and with fuller information the wording of the amendment proposed.

Mr. ROBB: I desire to point out one feature of this proposal which strikes me, and that is that the Government seem to have no confidence in their own administration. This evening the Minister of Railways asked for and obtained a vote of $150,000 to provide the expense of a commission to inquire into the railway situation, and the Minister of Finance made a very pressing speech, and gave to the House the impression that the Government were considering the nationalization of all railways in Canada. Scarcely had this $150,000 been voted to inquire into the railway situation in Canada when the Acting Minister of Railways asked for the passage of a Bill to acquire three railways. Is it because he lacked confidence in the commission that is to be appointed? It seems to me that the logical, business way of going about this would be to await the report of the proposed commission so that we should have full information concerning these railways which we propose taking over, as to their earning value, the country through which they are going, and so on, and be in a position to decide whether or not it would be profitable for Canada to take them over and hitch them up with the Government railway system. I submit that for the consideration of the acting minister.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I wish to correct some statistics I gave a moment ago concerning Baie St. Paul. I said that the population aggregated about 3,000. I am told that the aggregate population of the town and parish of Baie St. Paul is now over 5,000.

Mr. OLIVER: We have been discussing the railroad situation in Canada for a couple of days. We have had before us the question of the two transcontinental railways. We have had information to the effect that the resources of Canada are being strained to the limit in the effort to carry these enterprises to completion and over the present difficult financial situation of the country. Every suggestion that has been made as to the lack of satisfactory character in the proposals of the Government with regard to those railroads has been met by the assertion that the country could not afford more money; that the financial resources of the country were being strained to the limit to meet the needs of these great enterprises in which the whole credit of the country and its future welfare was involved. As my hon. friend the member for Huntingdon said a few moments ago, just as soon as these two proposals were adopted, the Acting Minister of Railways comes forward with a proposition which would argue that Canada had money to throw to the birds; that there was no lack of money in Canada for railroad propositions. A proposal is

being submitted to Parliament to-day such as never was submitted before in the history of this country. Nothing was ever submitted that would approach this proposition in its character, and certainly the country never was in such a condition as it is to-day, so ill prepared to deal with a proposal of this kind. We have no money to adjust matters with the Grand Trunk or with the Canadian Northern that would enable the traffic of this country to be carried, but we have $4,500,000 that we can pay out in cash, we will assume $2,500,000 of bonds and we will be prepared to spend anything from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000 in cash in respect of a railroad of the length of 135 miles. That of itself is a very fair order, but when we remember that of the 135 miles of railroad that is proposed to be dealt with, 30 miles has been completed for I do not know how long, is in operation, is serving the purpose for which it was built, has no connection with the other railroad with which it is associated, has no legitimate claim upon this country, we must come to the conclusion that there is no reason in the world why this railroad should be taken over by the country except that at the present time presumably it does not earn interest on its bonds and the owners deem it desirable that the country should assume the responsibility of paying that shortage of interest. The same condition applies to a portion at any rate, if not the whole of the Quebec and Montmorency railroad, a railroad which has been in operation for years, doing a large business, paying its operating expenses with some surplus, but not enough to pay interest on its bonds. This railroad has no claim whatever on the country in any shape, form or manner except the claim that the owners of the property desire this country to pay for them that which they are not able to earn and pay for themselves. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no such proposal was ever brought before the Parliament of Canada as in the cases that I have mentioned, the Lotbinière railway and the Quebec and Montmorency railway. The lines are completed, the country has no responsibility, whatever in respect of them; they are in operation. We are asked, at a time when money is more needed than ever it was before, for more urgent purposes than it ever was required before, to hand out millions for the purpose simply of relieving the proprietors of these two properties of the losses of interest which they are carrying at the present time.

There is also a demand that we shall assume responsibility for completion of 62 miles of uncompleted road of the Quebec and Saguenay line. This road is partially completed; grading is done, I understand, to the extent of 85 per cent. We are to pay for this work that has been done, and by so doing we are assuming the responsibility for completing the enterprise whatever the cost may be. While the Acting Minister of Railways suggested that the road was 85 per cent completed and that $1,000,000 would be necessary to complete the 60 odd miles, it has been suggested to me that $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 would be very much nearer the requirement to secure completion of the line. The Postmaster General has put before the House the claims of the people who are living along the line of these two railroads. He has stated their numbers. He has given, I presume, the most favourable facts with regard to their requirements. We do not need to discuss the railroad situation there. No doubt the people of that locality desire railroad communication. No doubt they need railroad communication; no doubt railroad communication would be vastly to their advantage. But there are throughout this broad Dominion thousands of instances where an equal number of people are needing railroad communication just as much as these people are, and where that railroad communication would not cost a fraction of what it will cost in this case.

Then, let it be remembered that these people who will benefit by the construction of this railroad have, during the whole summer season, the advantage of deep water navigation along the whole line. That is to say, they are not at all in the same position as the people living on the St. John railway line. That country was altogether isolated from communication until the St. John railway was built. These people are living along the shores of the St. Lawrence and they have boat communication all season long. So, while they are under a disadvantage during the winter, they are not at all in the same position as people dwelling in an inland locality who have not the advantage of river navigation. The amount of traffic that is to be carried by this railroad, supposing it is completed, has not been represented by the Postmaster General. It may be large; but I submit that the fact that neither of the two completed railroad sections included in the pro-

position earns interest on its cost of construction, is fair evidence that this extension of one of them would be in exactly the same position, if not in a very much worse position because of the higher cost of construction and the smaller volume of traffic available to support that cost. It seems to me that the Minister of Finance, who is the guardian of the treasury—and no one will say that he is not, under ordinary circumstances, an efficient guardian—should be heard from upon this proposition. He has told us how he has limited the aid to be given by the Government to the two great transcontinental railway enterprises, whose success is of vital importance to every man, woman and child in the Dominion, and while he spoke of having been successful in restricting the amounts they are to receive from the Dominion treasury to the limit before the House, he is a party to the placing before Parliament of a proposal that will, on the face of it, call for more money than the proposal that he brought before this House as regards the Transcontinental railway, and more than half as much as the proposal which he places before this House in regard to the Canadian Northern railway. Where is my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett)? Surely he should be heard from on this occasion. Surely if it is unfair to the country and to the Treasury to make these proposed loans to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern railroad, to serve great national enterprises for great national purposes, it must be a far greater wrong to spend this vast amount of money for the purpose of relieving certain gentlemen, no doubt very creditable gentlemen, no doubt very enterprising gentlemen against whom nothing in the world is to be said. Why should they be relieved of their unfortunate responsibility any more than anybody else? Why should these gentlemen have the preference over every other man and every other enterprise throughout the country that has happened to make miscalculations, or possibly to have fallen on evil days. I think the Minister of Finance and the member for Calgary, and our other friends on the opposite side of the House who have been so insistent on protecting the treasury and the rights and interests of the people of Canada during the past few days, should be heard from very strongly in regard to this proposal, which certainly, I think I am safe in saying, is unique in the history of Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways suggested that we should discuss this matter for an hour. We have now discussed it for almost two hours, and it is half-past eleven. We have received some information, and we have before us certain papers that we have had no opportunity of examining. I would like to look at the map to get some idea of where the roads run. I suggest that we have made as much progress to-night as we can make, and that it would be advisable to adjourn now.

Mr. ROGERS: It is still very early, and we know that this legislation has been practically before the House for some considerable time. It is within the knowledge of the hon. members opposite, and the facts in relation to the location are well known. Surely my hon. friends have all the information they can reasonably require to allow the Bill to go to committee, where we could discuss it in detail.

Mr. TURRIFF: We can discuss it for three hours yet if my hon. friends wish.

Mr. NESBITT: The minister says that we have had it before us and have all the information we can get. The Minister of Railways gave us information that we will be able to see in Hansard and to understand and to grasp more completely than it was possible to do from listening to his remarks. It would be better to adjourn so that we can discuss this more intelligently to-morrow.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would it not be better to get into committee where the information could be given in a more orderly manner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am ready to allow the Bill to take its second reading. Not that I want to commit myself to it at all; I want to reserve my judgment. I may say to my hon. friend opposite that the information we have received is very scanty. First of all, it is not treating the House fairly that, within two or three days of the period when we expect to have the blessing of a prorogation a matter of this importance should be brought before us for consideration. The matter should have been submitted for the consideration of the House days before. When the second reading was moved at eight o'clock to-night, the very voluminous correspondence was brought down.

Mr. REID: I brought it down at two o'clock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No one could see it until eight o'clock to-night.

Mr. REID: I handed it in at two o'clock, and it was then before the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The clerk took it to his office and nobody knew of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The clerk took it, and nobody on this side saw it until eight o'clock.

Mr. REID: I explained that when the House opened at two o'clock I handed it in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Does my hon. friend think that is an explanation at all?

Mr. REID: No, I am not saying it is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Very good; then, do not bring it up. I have here the report of some engineers; but I do not see a word of the correspondence that has passed between the company and the Government. We ought to have that correspondence so that we can see the reasons why the Government have been induced to take up that road. I do not imagine that the Government have come to a decision on a matter of this kind without having some facts placed before them by the company. Then we are told by the minister that he had the matter submitted to his engineers or the officials of this department and that they recommended the purchase of the road; that the officers in their report highly approved of it. There is not a word of these reports in the papers that have been brought down. Then the minister has told us that the road is not yet completed, that there are some 16 miles still to finish. There are no specifications of the work to be done; not a word of specification, and before we commit ourselves to the building of the road we ought to have a specification as to its character, as to stations, tracking, and so on. Then there are rivers along that line—I do not know how many, but there are a few—and there is no statement as to whether bridges have been constructed or not. Before we take up the matter again, I think we have the right to expect that all this information will be brought down.

Mr. ROGERS: I fail to see how the right hon. gentleman can undertake to leave to the impression that information has not been brought down, for I think a very considerable amount of information has been submitted, all, I presume, that the officers of the department thought was necessary. However, as my right hon. friend suggests, the Bill can be read a second time, and I can assure him that all the information in the department will be available to him when we reach the committee stage to-morrow. We are desirous of placing before the House all possible information at our disposal because there is nothing at all to hide.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Government is full of good intentions, but lacking in execution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Before we pass from that matter, I am informed, and I think it is a fact, that no work has been done on the Quebec and Saguenay railway for the last four years.

Mr. REID: Since 1912, I am informed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am informed also that a section of the line has been very much damaged in consequence, and I see no statement as to the damage. We ought to have that also.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think there is a statement of what it would cost to bring it up to what it was before.

Mr. REID: I think there is a lot of information, which the right hon. gentleman said had not been submitted, in the report of Mr. Beckwith, the engineer, who went thoroughly into the whole matter in November, last year. A statement with reference to bridges and other matters will be found in that report.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me that the minister might favourably consider a provision that the judge of the Exchequer Court should deduct from the actual cost the damage which has been done by reason of the road lying idle, and what it would cost to bring it up to what it was before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is in the amendment.

Mr. REID: It says in the amendment "less depreciation."

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the minister think that that would cover it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what is intended.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would ask that the Minister of Railways be prepared to-morrow to give some reason why, after

having had its own engineers go over the road and make valuations, the Government is not dealing with the matter directly, instead of submitting it to the Exchequer Court.

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS FIRE.

Mr. ROGERS: I beg to lay on the table of the House the report of the commission appointed to investigate the Parliament Buildings fire in February, 1916, together with the evidence.

On the motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.31 p.m.

Tuesday, May 16, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Telegraph statistics for the year ended June 30, 1915.—Hon. J. D. Reid.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: I am desired by prominent gentlemen in Nova Scotia who are interested in the question of daylight saving to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether the Government have considered the passing of any legislation in regard to this matter. It is pointed out that Great Britain, Denmark, and Sweden have passed such legislation. As the right hon. gentleman is probably aware, in the city of Halifax and some other municipalities in Nova Scotia this has been put into effect.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Very few representations have come to the Government on this subject, and we have not yet considered it very fully. It seems that the local authorities, in most of the provinces at least, have the power to deal with it themselves, and if that be the case it may be that the matter had better be left to public opinion in the various localities.

Mr. MACDONALD: The difficulty suggested by those interested in the project is in regard to the official closing of public institutions under the control of the Dominion Government, more particularly in connection with railways, which would not be under the control of the local authorities. It therefore might require Dominion legislation.

[Mr. Turriff.]

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not at all sure that legislation will be necessary, because it may be possible for the departments of the Government, if it is thought desirable, to have regard to the local determination of the matter. However, I shall give my hon. friend's suggestion the best consideration I can between now and the next session.

PROHIBITION OF PAPER EXPORTS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the rumour prevailing in Montreal this morning to the effect that the Government intends to pass an Order in Council to prohibit the exportation of paper and pulp to the United States true? I am told that a deputation met the Government yesterday or this morning.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has not been considered, so far as I am aware.

THE DAVIDSON COMMISSION.

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In the absence of my right hon. friend yesterday, I inquired if it was the intention to give the Opposition the privilege of counsel before the Davidson Commission on the charges brought the other day by the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie).

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think it was announced by the Minister of Justice and also by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that if the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria, or my right hon. friend, should desire to be represented by counsel before the Davidson Commission, we would not only suggest, but recommend to Sir Charles Davidson that such counsel be allowed to appear. The position up to the present has been that Mr. John Thompson, K.C., was selected by Sir Charles Davidson to represent the people of Canada before that commission. So far as I am aware, he has discharged his duties with great ability, thoroughness, and impartiality. It may further be observed that he has done so without any remuneration whatever except an ordinary allowance for travelling expenses when he has been absent from the city of Ottawa. He has regarded his work as a patriotic duty. I am informed that Mr. Thompson, in view of the criticism that has been passed upon him in this House, does not feel it consis-

tent with his self respect that he should continue to discharge those duties. It may therefore be necessary for the Government to take some action towards appointing counsel to take his place. So far as counsel to represent the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria is concerned, as I have already said, we shall not only suggest but recommend to Sir Charles Davidson that counsel be allowed to appear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: On the same terms as Mr. Johnston?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As far as remuneration is concerned? We shall not make any undertaking with regard to that at the present time. I think it should be left for future consideration as was the case in connection with the Tarte-Langevin charges. There was no undertaking in advance, on the part of the Government at that time. The hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria undertook at once, in the same motion, to censure the Government and to demand an inquiry. He is at liberty to appear before the commission by his counsel and to proceed as he deems fit. The other question which my right hon. friend raised will be considered afterwards. Possibly some gentleman will be found on the other side who will undertake the duty upon the same terms as those upon which Mr. John Thompson undertook it.

EXTENSION OF TERM OF PARLIAMENT

The Orders of the day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): My right hon. friend made inquiry yesterday during my absence about the joint resolution passed by this House and by the Senate in regard to the extension of Parliament. I have no further information than that which I gave some time ago. The joint resolution of the House and of the Senate went forward from the office of His Royal Highness the Governor General in the ordinary way, very shortly after it was passed. As soon as the revised Hansard was available, containing the debates in both the House of Commons and in the Senate, I despatched them in a letter to Sir George Perley, stating to him that they contained the grounds upon which this House and the Senate had thought it desirable to pass the resolution, and directing him to place that information at the disposal of the Colonial Secretary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Has there been any further communication?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have had no further communication except an acknowledgement from Sir George Perley of my letter, and a statement that the information so afforded would be communicated to the Colonial Secretary. If desired, I shall send a cablegram inquiring as to the present position of the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Certainly I think that should be done. We want to know where we are with regard to this matter.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY AND LOTBINIERE AND MEGANTIC RAILWAYS.

ACQUISITION OF BRANCH LINES.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. REID (Acting Minister of Railways and Canals), the House went into committee on Bill No. 101, to authorize the acquisition of lines of railway between the city of Quebec and Nairn Falls and between Lyster and St. Jean des Chaillons; Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Mr. TURRIFF: In accordance with the arrangement that was made last night, I wish to discuss briefly a matter which is really more connected with the Customs Department than with the Department of Railways.

Mr. REID: The arrangement was that as soon as we got through this Bill the other Estimates would come on, and then we could take up the other matter which has been mentioned.

Mr. TURRIFF: That was not the arrangement, as I understood it. The minister asked if I was ready to go on, and I said I would leave it altogether to the minister whether I would go on last night or this afternoon. It will not take very long to discuss this matter, and I have been waiting now for about two months to do so.

Mr. REID: I wanted to proceed with this Bill last evening and I said that we would get through with the Bill last night and take up the Estimates to-day, and on the Estimates of any department we could take up this matter relating to the Customs Department I never had in mind that we would bring up on a Bill of this kind any matter connected with the Estimates; and I say now that as soon as this Bill is passed we can take up the matter on one of the items in the Estimates still remaining.

Mr. TURRIFF: This Bill may never pass. I do not want the item that I wish to discuss to depend on the passing of this Bill. I have been waiting here, attending closely to the sessions of the House in order to bring the matter up when my hon. friend had his Customs Estimates under consideration; but, unfortunately, although I have been away only two days during this session, I was not here when that item was passed. I have been present here day after day for the last month or so waiting for this item to come up, and I would like it to be taken up now.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I hope my hon. friend will see the impossibility of discussing Estimates on a Bill of this kind. Even if this Bill did not pass, the Estimates must pass, and there are some items remaining upon which my hon. friend will be at full liberty to discuss the subject which he has in mind.

Mr. PUGSLEY: With regard to this Bill, I would hope that the Minister of Railways has considered favourably the suggestion that the judge of the Exchequer Court should allow only the actual, reasonable and necessary cost of the railway, less the cost of putting in order the road which has been in a large measure destroyed by non-usage, which cost the engineer estimates at about $350,000, and also less the Dominion subsidies. I think that if the roads are to be taken over, that would be a fair basis on which the judge of the Exchequer Court could determine the amount to be allowed. I stated yesterday the reasons why I thought that the same action should be taken as is taken under the Act of 1915; but, if some basis of value is to be laid down for the guidance of the judge of the Exchequer Court which is to a large extent to tie his hands, I think he should be limited in the way I have suggested.

This is especially desirable by reason of what appears in the correspondence which has been brought down by the Acting Minister of Railways this morning. That correspondence discloses a somewhat unusual condition of affairs, in that we have here an offer made by the Quebec Light, Heat and Power Company to give a clear title to the railway, free of all liens or liabilities whatsoever, for the sum of $2,500,000. That is dated 20th October, 1915. There is another offer from the same company to sell the Quebec and Saguenay railway in its present condition for the sum of $3,473,000 free of all encumbrances, and to sell the road upon the south side known as the Lotbinière and Megantic railway, free of all liabilities of every kind, for the sum of $330,000. The total of these three amounts upon which the companies offered to give a clear title would be in the vicinity of a million dollars less than what the acting minister proposes.

Mr. REID: No, $622,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well, $622,000 less; that is a very large sum. I observe, too, in the correspondence that there is a letter dated 2nd May from the President of the road, in which he says that some mistake had been made. It seems extraordinary that, when the companies were making a formal offer to the Government for the sale of the road, they should have asked some $620,000 less than they subsequently discovered they ought to have asked for these roads. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will agree that that very circumstance requires some careful consideration, particularly when it is proposed to tie the hands of the Judge of the Exchequer Court and to lay down for him a basis upon which the amount shall be assessed. My hon. friend the Solicitor General pointed out reasons why the Judge of the Exchequer Court should not be required simply to fix the value of the railway, and indicated the difficulties which would confront the judge if he were to determine the amount upon a basis like that. It would be difficult, he pointed out, to determine what the actual value of the road was. Therefore the minister proposes that it should be upon the basis of cost. If it is to be upon the basis of cost, and the Judge of the Exchequer Court should be so limited, it seems to me that it ought to be upon the basis of actual, reasonable, and necessary cost, because in that way he would be able to fix approximately the value, whereas, if he is to be guided by the actual cost of the road, one can very readily see that that cost might go away beyond what would be the fair value, and away beyond what would be the reasonable and necessary expenditure.

With regard to the Quebec and Saguenay road, it certainly seems to me extraordinary that the cost of this uncompleted road, because it is very far from completion, should have reached, as suggested by the figures of the Acting Minister of Railways, the enormous sum of something like $80,000 per mile, That cost is certainly very large, and the figures are somewhat startling, because the road is not there; the report of the engineer

says that the road is in a very bad condition, and would require the expenditure of a considerable sum of money to bring the work which has been done up to what it was before work ceased in 1911 or 1912. I would therefore urge this upon the Minister of Railways, and I do so from no desire in any way to obstruct or delay the passage of the Bill. I know nothing at all as to the merits of these roads, and, as I stated yesterday, I do not desire to interpose any objection to their acquisition; but as to the mode in which the judge of the Exchequer Court shall determine the amount to be paid, I think that if the minister sees an objection to the judge fixing the value in the ordinary way, which would enable him to determine the value of this road upon a just and equitable basis,—if there are difficulties standing in the way of that, I think the judge should be required to fix the amount at what, in his judgment, was the actual, reasonable and necessary cost of the road so far as constructed. If that course is adopted, Parliament will simply be following the principle which it has laid down in the Acts relating to the granting of increased subsidies for railroads in which case the extra amount can only be given upon determination by the minister, from the report of his chief engineer, of what has been the acutal, reasonable and necessary cost of the construction of the road. That would be following the principle which was laid down years ago, and upon which Parliament and the Government have been acting ever since.

Mr. REID: Before answering the hon. member, I wish to correct the impression he has with reference to the Bill which I submitted to the House, and which was passed, relating to the Exchequer Court. The hon. member stated last night that that Bill, having been introduced this session, and late in the session, had the appearance of being introduced by reason of the Government taking over these railways. I may explain for the information of the hon. member why that Bill was introduced this session. The Government was disposing of a small piece of canal property at Sault Ste. Marie.

The price asked by the Government was considered larger than the parties purchasing thought it was worth. They agreed that it should be submitted to Judge Cassels of the Exchequer Court and I secured the passage of an Order in Council. Judge Cassels approached me and stated that this was not an Exchequer Court case, that he would not act as arbitrator, but that if it were within his jurisdiction he would gladly take it up and of course without any cost or remuneration whatever. Acting on his suggestion, and after discussing the matter with the Minister of Justice, I submitted a Bill to extend the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court to take in cases such as the sale of lands by the Government. The Minister of Justice prepared a Bill to cover the matters contained therein. There was no question of this railway at that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The two merely synchronized.

Mr. REID: Synchronized, that is true. However, I am glad the Bill does give the Exchequer Court that jurisdiction because I believe we all have confidence in that court. I have never heard it criticised since I have been a member of this House. With reference to the suggestion of the hon. member, it does seem to me that the amendment which I propose covers about all that the hon. gentleman wishes and safeguards in every way the interests of the Government. As was stated by the Solicitor Gener last evening, the judge of the Exchequer Court, no doubt, after reading this Bill wished to have some basis in order to arrive at a proper valuation, and he, without any suggestion from any member of the Government, or any other person as far as I am aware, for it was never discussed with any one in connection with the Exchequer Court, wrote to the Minister of Justice suggesting that some basis be put in the Bill in order that the court might arrive at a proper valuation. The basis in the amendment I am suggesting is this:

> Said value to be the actual cost of said railways less depreciation—

That covers the point of the hon. member.

> —but not to exceed $4,465,000, exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all $2,500,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that outside of the $4,465,000?

Mr. REID: Yes. As I said last night, we are purchasing three different railways, one on the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix, for $2,500,000. That includes the terminals at Quebec which, I am informed, represent a very large sum of money, which has been placed at $1,000,000 or $2,000,000.

They are located in Quebec city and they are a very valuable asset in connection with this railway. This railway represents $2,500,000 and we assume these bonds. The $4,135,000 is the maximum price that we have to pay the Quebec and Saguenay in case the Exchequer Court comes to the conclusion that that amount has actually been expended.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do the Canadian Pacific get any of these terminals?

Mr. REID: No, they do not.

Mr. GRAHAM: Have they got any?

Mr. REID: I could not say, I am sure. I do not know. Perhaps I could find that out and let the hon. gentleman know. The $4,135,000 will be paid for the Quebec and Saguenay railway and $330,000 for the Lotbiniere and Megantic. The proprietors of the Quebec and Saguenay must show that $4,135,000 have been actually expended on this railway and they must show that that expenditure has been in cash. They tell me that the books of the company have been audited by Messrs. P. S. Ross & Sons, Montreal, and that the audit will show that a much larger amount has been expended on the railway. If the property has been depreciated in any way on account of washouts, or by other causes, it must be put in the condition in which it was at the time this expenditure was made. The Government feel that in taking these roads over in this way, the proprietors must in every case, even in the case of the Quebec and Charlevoix, show that the values are actual and not inflated. For instance, with reference to the Quebec and Charlevoix, they must prove to the satisfaction of the Exchequer Court that they have expended $2,500,000. If they do that we are willing to assume the bonds.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the Government going to take the bonds at par?

Mr. REID: We are going to take the $2,500,000 bonds at par.

Mr. TURRIFF: What are they quoted at to-day?

Mr. REID: I do not know what they are quoted at but these are guaranteed bonds.

Mr. TURRIFF: They have been going up within the last month or so on the prospect of handing over this proposition to the Government, but why should the Government pay more than they were worth three months ago?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. REID: There are a good many things that go up on the prospect of things happening in this country and they may have gone up the same as anything else. The hon. gentleman knows that on the prospect of tariff changes many things go up. Probably the hon. gentleman has benefited in that way in the past.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who gets the tip?

Mr. REID: We cannot help giving a tip when we introduce a Bill of this kind. That is the position as far as the Quebec and Charlevoix railway is concerned. They must show that the amount which I have stated has been actually expended on the Lotbinière and Megantic railway; otherwise the price will be decreased. We have put in the maximum amount. They tell me that instead of $4,135,000 they will be able to show that the actual amount that has been expended on the Quebec and Saguenay is more than $2,500,000 over and above the subsidies. This railway being in this condition, and the people requiring the service that they are entitled to along that shore, we feel that this railway system should be connected up with, and that it will be an acquisition to the Transcontinental railway. There has been considerable profit on the roads that have been in operation. The Quebec and Saguenay will pay its way in the same way as these other roads will. That is the reason why we would like to see this Bill go through and the matter placed in such shape that the people in that part of Canada will have the benefit of a service that they should have had many years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did the companies give to the minister any explanation of the fact that in October last they offered to give clear title to these roads for $620,000 while in May of this year they ask the amount that is proposed to be paid them and which must have been quite a surprise to the minister? Did they give any explanation of such a very large figure.

Mr. REID: The only explanation I got was that, when I was discussing the matter with them, they said that they had made a mistake in figuring out the amount, and that they had put into the roads about $1,000,000 more than they had stated.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Men must be very rich to make a mistake of that kind.

Mr. REID: Mistakes of that kind are sometimes made. We do not want to pay

any more than has gone into the road, and they must show exactly what that amount is.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister intend to pay for promotion expenses? I understand that these three companies have had a stock-jobbing career for some years, and that their promotion expenses are very great.

Mr. REID: I have already stated that we only proposed to pay the amount that has actually been spent on the construction of the road. That will not include any promotion expenses whatever; it will include nothing outside of what has actually gone into the road, and the Judge of the Exchequer Court will decide what amount that is.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why does the minister dispense with the usual requirement that the certificate of the General Manager of the Intercolonial shall be obtained before any branches are taken over?

Mr. REID: It has been the custom to obtain the certificate of the General Manager and his engineers in the case of roads that have been completed and are in operation. But this is a road that has not been completed. If we were to get the General Manager to make a valuation it would probably not be as satisfactory as an independent valuation would be, made by the Judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not what the General Manager was to do. He was to recommend to the Government that the purchase of a certain road would be in the interest of the public and of the road of which it was to become a branch. My opinion is that the General Manager will not do anything of the kind with regard to these particular roads, and he is right. I am not going to waste any time discussing these propositions. They are indefensible from beginning to end, from every point of view, and it is no use going into details. I know, and the Government knows I know, a great deal about these roads, and I make the statement that their purchase in the heyday of prosperity, when we had an overflowing treasury, would be very questionable. But to-day, in the face of our present financial condition, when every man is bearing all he can in the way of taxation, the purchase is nothing short of monstrous to my mind. The road on the south side, exclusive of the line from Quebec to Ste. Anne de Beaupré, is the best of the lot. The line from Quebec to Ste. Anne de Beaupre is run by electricity, and is all right. My judgment is that the line on the south side is a better purchase than either of the other roads that are being purchased on the north side; and yet when I was minister I refused to consider the purchase of this road as a branch line of the Intercolonial. It was owned by a very warm personal friend, but I did not think the purchase could be justified. I am not going to discuss this any further, as I have now made my protest. At this time, when our finances are in such a condition that the Finance Minister has to impose special taxation on the country for war purposes, it seems to me nothing less than an outrage on the business enterprise of Canada and on our taxpayers to take part of the money that the industries of Canada are paying in taxes to put into these schemes. My hon. friend knows that, although only $4,000,000 is mentioned here, he is really committing the country to an expenditure of more than $10,000,000; and that is a small estimate of the amount that will be required to meet the liabilities incurred in the purchase of rolling stock and the completion of these roads, and getting them into running shape. The minister does not expect that the line is going to pay, but I am not going to discuss that side of it, because there are some districts that should be supplied with railway facilities even when we do not expect to make any money out of them; I have always taken that ground, and I do still. But at this particular time, when we do not know what out financial condition will be in the future, and when financial conditions are so strenuous for all the people of Canada, it is unspeakable that the Government should ask this Parliament to commit the country to an expenditure of more than $10,000,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There is one point to which I should like to direct the minister's attention. In this estimate, which is to tie the hands of the judge of the Exchequer Court—there is no getting over that—and which is to convey to him the opinion of this Parliament that he can safely adopt the figures mentioned in the amendment of my hon. friend, the amount that is to be assumed by the Government is put at $2,500,000; that is, to provide for the bonds on the electric road. And yet in this very report which has been brought down to Parliament, the total cost of replacing that electric railway is put at $1,115,200.

Mr. REID: That does not include the terminals.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it does. I do not think my hon. friend can have read the papers. The report, dated November 12, 1915, contains an estimate of reproducing this property; that is the total cost. That estimate necessarily assumed the use in some cases of new material at first cost value, and thus might not be a correct indication of the present value of the physical constituents. The following estimate makes such allowance as appears reasonable for wear and depreciation. Then he gives the figures: 288 acres at $300, $86,400 (this price should cover damages); rights leased from harbour commissioners, including joint right of way with Quebec and Lake St. John railway, $8,700; St. Paul street terminal lot, $41,300; a total of $136,400. Grading, unchanged, $108,300; then bridges and culverts are given in detail, making a grand total of $1,115,200. The engineer gives a summary of the total distributed as follows:

Quebec terminals	$ 68,000
Joint section with Quebec and Lake St. John railway (Canadian Northern)	38,000
Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway	734,000
Steam equipment	175,000
Electric equipment	99,500
Total	$1,115,200

This statement is signed by Mr. Beckwith, engineer of construction. It strikes me as a very important fact that when the engineer estimates the cost of constructing this electric railway at only $1,115,000, the Government proposes to assume an obligation of $2,500,000; in other words, $1,385,000 more than it would cost to reconstruct and replace the entire system. If I am wrong in these figures I shall be glad if the minister will correct me, but I think I am absolutely correct from the report of the engineer.

If these figures are correct they show very clearly that we should not give them over to a Judge of the Exchequer Court, saying in effect: If you do not reach a higher figure than this you will not do more than is right. It seems to me the duty is imposed upon us of declaring either that the Judge of the Exchequer Court shall fix the actual value of the road, or that he shall determine the amount to be allowed on the actual, reasonable and necessary cost of the road. The amount of the bonds upon one of these roads is more than double the amount that the engineer of the department says the road could be completed and equipped for. What does the minister say as to that, without going into the other? Then, take the Quebec and Saguenay. The engineer says he made a hurried inspection, and that his estimate is approximate, yet he puts the value of the property at only $2,813,500. But the minister is asking Parliament to say to the Judge of the Exchequer Court that he will be justified in allowing as much as $4,135,000 for the property. Is it not an unusual and dangerous proceeding to allow the judge, with the authority of Parliament, to fix as the cost of the road at an amount double that which, according to the report of the engineer of the department, the road is worth and for which it could be reconstructed? I cannot think that the minister has given careful attention to the figures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has not quite the correct basis in his mind when he makes his criticism. The duty of the Exchequer Court, under the Act as now before the House, would be, not to assume that the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix road was worth $2,500,000, because these bonds were against it, which we must assume, and then pass on to the other roads and value them. On the contrary, the principle is this: the Exchequer Court will take one road at a time and ascertain the cost of that road, irrespective entirely of what may be against the road.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why not take the value?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will come to that again if the hon. gentleman desires. Having dealt in this way with the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix road, the court would then come to the Quebec and Saguenay and find the actual money which has been invested there—not the money that may have been paid out by the company, but the money that has found its way into the property. The same would be done with respect to the Megantic and Lotbinière road. The three would be added to ascertain the grand total. From this would be deducted the $2,500,000 bonds which must be left against the entire property though in fact it rests only against the first property. Then, if the balance should exceed the figure allowed, the balance would be reduced to that figure. If, on the contrary, the balance should be be-

low the maximum figure, that balance alone is what the country would pay. There is not in the Bill the slightest intimation to the judge of the Exchequer Court that he would be safe in allowing $4,465,000. If the net cost is less than that amount after deducting $2,500,000, that net cost is all that can possibly be charged against the country for the total purchase. It is argued —by one hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver)—that whatever might be the claims of this locality in ordinary times, those claims should not be heard because of the strained financial conditions of the present time. I cannot but recognize that there is some force in that contention, and only unusually great necessities should impel us at this time to the taking over of these properties by the Government. But there is greater necessity than could be pointed out in any other part of the country, by one cardinal consideration to which I am about to refer. As regards two of the roads: the Montmorency and Charlevoix and the Lotbinière and Megantic, I do not think there can be any doubt that, from the point of view of earning power, as a good business purchase, they are very desirable for the country to acquire. Their earning power in the past has been given, and one of them particularly is of value to the Intercolonial. It has been admitted by the hon. member for St. John that the criticism that has been offered could not be applied to these roads, and the same is admitted by the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). While I am on the subject of these two roads, I might state that as to them the basis of valuation that is offered to the Exchequer Court in this Bill is very decidedly to the advantage of the country, because it would seem to me that probably a much higher figure would be allowed on the ordinary legal basis of value upon which the Exchequer Court rests its verdicts. However, the extraordinary feature to which I have referred comes when we consider the Quebec and Saguenay. Here is a road in which a great deal of money was invested. It was subsidized by the Government of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in 1910, and so had the sanction of that Administration. It is a road that was necessary for the service of the district into which it was to extend. As the result of the assistance given by the Government of Quebec, by the former Dominion Government as well as by this Government in 1912, very considerable progress was made and very considerable moneys were expended.

The road was built from Cap Tourmente right on to Murray Bay so far as acquiring the right of way and the building of the actual roadbed was concerned. Dikes were built along the river St. Lawrence to protect the structure from the inroads of the river; indeed, from Murray Bay to Nairn Falls the road was completed and is now in actual operation and carrying traffic. May I mention in passing, for fear I forget it, that the first road mentioned in the Bill, the Montmorency and Charlevoix, carried last year, my information is, no fewer than 1,800,000 passengers. Such, then, is the work that was done in connection with this Quebec and Saguenay line.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the average fare?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just what would apply to a 30 mile trip—most of it for a 20 mile trip, I presume, to St. Anne de Beaupré.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the road in operation to Nairn Falls?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Quebec and Saguenay is in operation from Nairn Falls to Murray Bay.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Not for passengers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know whether for passengers; chiefly, I think, for the carrying of pulp. Passengers are carried on the Montmorency and Charlevoix.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What kind of operation is it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really could not answer that. There are pulp mills at Nairn Falls and it serves them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is the production of those mills?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot give the figures, but they can be given in the course of this discussion in committee.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood that Nairn Falls was the terminus of the Quebec and Saguenay?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: I understood that the Quebec and Saguenay was not completely railed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not, but a portion between Murray Bay and Nairn Falls is railed.

Mr. OLIVER: Then there is no connection between Murray Bay and St. Anne's.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. I think about six or seven miles are railed between Murray Bay and Nairn Falls.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But not for passenger business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps not. The road is laid; much money was spent in laying it down. Bonds were sold against that Quebec and Saguenay road, and it is claimed by those who ought to know that, expended economically and to the best possible advantage, some $5,000,000 have found their way into that road. However, they came, in the words of the president of the Grand Trunk, "to the end of their tether," and were unable to proceed further with actual construction. Consequently the $5,000,000, or whatever the amount may be, that has found its way into that dump has been assailed by the river St. Lawrence, and is being washed away as time goes on. The dikes are by no means in as good condition as they were when the work was completed to the stage that it was completed. With each day and with each month the money that has been invested there and the hopes that have arisen in the minds of the people who were to be served have been dissipated and as time goes on will be dissipated all the more. Consequently the service that was to be rendered and which it was deemed worth while rendering by the late Government as well as by this Government and the Government of the province of Quebec, is being imperilled more and more as days go by and the money which has been invested and which is being lost will some day have to be recouped if there ever is to be a service in that district. I do not pretend to know the district, but I am informed that the Quebec and Saguenay line should serve a population of something over 60,000 people; that a great many of them or rather their forefathers before them have been in the district for some 200 years and have never known a railway service at all. They have practically no means of transportation and are isolated from all the world. Those of us who come from other portions of Canada—may I say particularly we who come from the West and who have had had railway advantages which our country deserves and which the traffic now in the main warrants

[Mr. Meighen.]

—must remember that in the acquiring of these roads we have had the very great advantage of eastern credit. We should not forget that, when we think of people who have resided in this district so long and who have no railway advan-

3 p.m.

tages. We were reminded yesterday by the hon. member for Edmonton that we were granting aid to the Transcontinental and to the Canadian Northern railways, and he justified that aid on the very good assumption that in those great Transcontinental systems every Canadian was interested and all had something to lose by their failure and something to gain by their success. I am sure that the hon. member for Edmonton, if he considered the habitant of Baie St. Paul or of some of the villages along the Quebec and Saguenay, would find it difficult to convince himself that these people had very much to gain by the success of the Transcontinental or even of the Canadian Northern. These people, at the same time, have borne their share of the credit that has been necessary and of the cash that has gone into the building of roads in various parts of Canada, particularly those that have reached into the Prairie West. When they sit by, therefore, and see their hopes being dispelled by the destruction year by year of the money that has already been spent by private enterprise to reach them, it is no wonder, particularly when they are being called upon to pay their share in connection with other railway projects, that they feel that they have a claim to some recognition at this time. What I want to emphasize is this; These people have a claim that differs entirely from other districts, in that millions of money have gone in there and that that money is being gradually sunk, being almost literally washed away by the river St. Lawrence and by the other corroding acts of time. The longer we wait the more we shall have to pay at some time in order that that district may get the service to which it is entitled. If the population is there—and those who ought to know say it is—and if the population is sure to come—and those who ought to know say it will come—then there will be vindication, there will be justification of this measure let us now look upon the matter in the broad way in which we ought to look upon it, even in a time like this.

Mr. OLIVER: The committee is to be congratulated upon having heard from a member of the Government the Govern-

ment's justification for the proposals now under consideration, looked at from a national standpoint. We heard from the Postmaster General yesterday a justification of the proposals from the standpoint of the people of the locality affected. That was natural, right and proper; every one could understand and appreciate the standpoint of the Postmaster General and of those for whom he spoke. But when the Solicitor General undertakes to justify the proposal upon national grounds on identically the same basis as the reasons given by the Postmaster General, I cannot agree that the grounds offered by him furnish any justification whatever for the proposals; rather do I say that those grounds condemn them absolutely. There are 30,000 people, he says, who need railway communication. As I stated yesterday I can find him many places throughout this Dominion of Canada where 30,000 people need railway accommodation just as much as do the people along the route of this railroad. Nay, I can find people who need it ten times, a thousand times more. The people along the route of this road, during half the year at any rate, have the advantage of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, which certainly can take any product that they have to sell or bring to their doors any requirement that they may have to buy, and do it just as cheaply and just as readily as any railroad will. I will admit that it would be desirable that these people should have a railroad, and, no doubt, if the circumstances were favourable, they would have one. No doubt aid in behalf of such a railroad was warranted at the time it was given; but, the conditions being as they are, I am afraid we shall have to suggest that the money has not always been wisely expended. The fact is that the people have not a railroad, and the people of Canada are called upon to give them a railroad. As I have said, equal numbers of people, in tens, or dozens, or hundreds of other localities throughout the country, are in just as great need of a railroad, and could be supplied with railroad facilities for very much less money. How much is this sixty-two miles of railway going to cost the Dominion of Canada? We are buying forty-two miles of the Quebec, Charlevoix and Montmorency railway, and some thirty miles of the Megantic railway. Whether we buy those railroads or not, the people and the interests served by their existence and operation will continue to be served in the same way. The people along those two sections covered by the proposal now before the House are not in the same position as the people along the line of the Quebec and Saguenay railway. The plea made by the Solicitor General, the plea upon which the Government rests its demand upon Parliament for this sum of money, is based upon the requirements of the people living along the sixty odd miles of the Quebec and Saguenay. It cannot be based upon the requirements of the people living along the Quebec, Charlevoix and Montmorency, or upon the claims of the people living along the Megantic railway, because those railways are in existence and in operation. Therefore, taking the Solicitor General's own argument as it has been presented to the House, we are paying out the amount of money that we are called upon to pay for the benefit of the people living along the sixty odd miles of the uncompleted Quebec and Saguenay railway. The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) says that the total amount will be in the neighbourhood of $10,000,000; and, as nearly as I can figure, that $10,000,000, if considered as being the expenditure necessary to afford railway accommodation to the people living along the Quebec and Saguenay railway, comes to about $130,000 a mile that this country is being called upon to pay in order that these 30,000 people who are living along that sixty-one miles of railroad shall have railroad accommodation in addition to the water transportation which they have now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman places the figures at about double what they should be.

Mr. OLIVER: I am saying that it comes to $130,000 a mile if we consider the whole expenditure as being made necessary in order to afford accommodation to the people along this 61 miles.

My hon. friend made a plea as between conditions in the West and in the East. I happen to have knowledge of a locality, not in my own but in the adjoining constituency, where a larger population than that along the line of the Quebec and Saguenay, a population having no river navigation to aid them, are living at a distance, not of 10 miles, 15 miles, 20 miles, or 30 miles, or 40 miles from a railroad, but living at a distance of from 60 to 120 miles from the nearest railroad. I have brought the condition of these people before this Parliament on a previous occasion.

Their position is that the Provincial Government guaranteed aid to a line of railroad to be built for their relief. That line is in an uncompleted condition, just as is the Quebec and Saguenay; but this Government has seen fit to take that piece of road as a part of the property on which it holds security against the Canadian Northern Railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the road uncompleted in the same sense as the Quebec and Saguenay? Is it not completed as far as it goes?

Mr. OLIVER: It is in the same position as the Quebec and Saguenay; it is graded, but there are no rails.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the line?

Mr. OLIVER: It is the St. Paul de Metis branch of the Canadian Northern Railway.

Mr. TURRIFF: The same condition exists in Saskatchewan in two or three cases.

Mr. OLIVER: The population of which I speak are largely French-speaking, just as are the people below the city of Quebec. This railroad is taken by the Government as a part of the property upon which it holds security against the Canadian Northern company for the guarantee given two years ago. In the proposals which the Government have placed before the House for a loan to the Canadian Northern railway, they have included money to pay the interest on the bonds issued by the company, guaranteed by the province, for the construction and completion of that road. When the matter was brought to the attention of the Government, my friend the Solicitor General said that the amount realized from the sale of bonds was not sufficient to complete, and that additional money would be necessary in order to complete. In my judgment it would be business on the part of the country to find the money to complete in order that that railroad should earn the interest on its bonds, instead of the interest being paid out of the Treasury on an uncompleted road. In addition to that, the people would get the benefit of facilities for traffic, and the country would be developed because of those facilities. But the Minister of Finance said that that was not possible—that they had gone as far as they could in appropriating money for the aid of railroads at this session, and that he could not reconsider the Government's position or consider the claims of this particular railroad and of the people whose rights and interests depend upon its completion. There is another railroad in my own constituency, the Peace river branch of the Canadian Northern railway, which is graded for about 100 miles, and on which about 30 miles of track has been laid. The trains are in operation on that portion of 30 miles, and for the balance, of something over 50 miles the grading has been completed, but there are no rails. This grading was completed, I think three years ago, and the condition is absolutely identical with that of the Quebec and Saguenay. The grading, trestles, etc., are being damaged or destroyed by the weather.

I brought that case to the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways and the answer he gave was that he could do nothing, that there was no money available to supplement the aid that it was proposed to give to the Canadian Northern, and that would enable these roads to be completed. I did not ask for it in the interests of the Canadian Northern; I asked for it on the one hand, in the interests of the people whom I represent, and who need facilities for the traffic which these roads would give if they were completed, and on the other in the interests of the country, which to-day is paying interest on bonds on roads which by reason of not being completed are not able to earn interest on these bonds, and which, if completed, would earn interest. Under these circumstances, it strikes me, as it must strike a great many other people, anything but favourably that $130,000 should be taken to supplement what has been done already in the way of giving aid for the completion of this railroad, while these other railroads, and the people who are dependent upon them, receive no consideration whatever.

Mr. MORPHY: Along the road to which the hon. gentleman refers, are there any towns say of 2,000 or 3,000 population, any settled conditions such as there are in the area of the railways under consideration?

Mr. OLIVER: Certainly.

Mr. MORPHY: What towns are they?

Mr. OLIVER: I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I thought he meant settlements. There are no towns such as there are at Murray Bay.

Mr. MORPHY: Then the position is different.

Mr. OLIVER: The position is different and very much worse, because ours is a

rural population producing from the land, who, unless given railway communication, cannot produce, and cannot live there and do any good. It is a question of the progress of the country, of the development which we all talk about, of our immigration policy, and of the necessity of settlement. Instead of spending our money to redeem the conditions as they exist there, we are going to spend $10,000,000 upon a project in regard to which we have no obligations, and which certainly is not going to produce results in proportion to the amount of money expended. In a time like this, we have to consider that.

Mr. MORPHY: I take it from the hon. gentleman's argument that if the times had been propitious he thinks that these roads should be built in both places, in the West and also in this portion of Quebec, to give relief to the people.

Mr. OLIVER: If we had plenty of money, I would not object at all, everything else being proper. But if we are short of money where a great necessity exists, we seem to have abundance of money where the lesser necessity exists, and I cannot recognize that as a sound principle, or one that I can support.

Since my hon. friend has projected a certain idea into this discussion very delicately and very cleverly, that is to say, the suggestion of a divergence of interests between the East and the West, let me say that in the matter of railway transportation there is not only no divergence of interests, but there is an absolute inter-dependence of interests. The development of the West demands railroad facilities in the East just as the development of the West is necessary to make the railroads in the East of advantage. We are proposing to spend $10,000,000 on 61 miles of railway, because that is what it amounts to, so far as national benefit is concerned. I admit the private benefit to the gentlemen who own these enterprises, which while they earn more than will pay the cost of operation, do not earn enough, I understand from the statement of the Acting Minister of Railways, to pay interest on the cost of construction. I believe that is correct, that the Quebec, Charlevoix and Chicoutimi railway while it earns more than enough to pay its operating expenses does not earn enough to pay interest on the capital cost as well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information is that it does.

Mr. OLIVER: If it does, we are not in any way called upon to spend any money upon it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Except that the other road cannot be operated without it; the other road would be isolated. It is for our advantage that we are taking the Quebec and Charlevoix railway. I do not see how my hon. friend can add that to the country's burden.

Mr. OLIVER: That proves exactly what I was saying, that the burden of the country is in respect of the sixty-one miles of the Quebec and Saguenay railway. That is the burden upon the country. If we have $10,000,000 to spend on railway development, and we want to spend it in eastern Canada, I would make a suggestion to the minister—I have had occasion to make it before, and I shall make it again—by which we could spend that money in a way that would produce enormous results to the city of Quebec, and to every interest that depends on the city of Quebec, and that would be of enormous benefit to western Canada as well. When we were discussing this matter before the Acting Minister of Railways intimated, as the Minister of Finance had intimated, that only the limitations of finance prevented his dealing with the problem as I presented it. Quebec is the great Atlantic deep water ocean port of Canada. Quebec is the Atlantic summer terminus of the Transcontinental road. Quebec has advantages as a port which no other city in the Dominion of Canada has. We have built a railroad from Winnipeg to Quebec, at a cost of nearly $200,000,000, for the purpose of handling traffic through the elevators at that city, and we did not handle it there during the past winter. Although we have the traffic, although it needs to find its outlet at Quebec, we are not handling it there, partly because we have not the equipment on the railroad, but, more than anything else, because we have not elevator accommodation at the city of Quebec. The success of the Transcontinental railway enterprise depends upon the establishment at the port of Quebec of adequate elevator accommodation more than upon any other consideration. We have there an elevator carrying 1,500,000 bushels.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has it been filled?

Mr. OLIVER: It has not been filled. Will my hon. friend suggest that it was not

filled because we had not the grain to fill it with?

Mr. REID: They would not ship it there.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend told us that he had not the cars to haul the grain with, and, if he had had the cars and had hauled the grain there he would not have had any place in which to put it, because they have not the elevators. When I asked why he was not providing greater elevator accommodation at Quebec he said it was because the Government could not afford the money, but it can afford the money to relieve our friends in regard to this uncompleted sixty-one miles of Quebec and Saguenay railway. It can do that, but it cannot afford the money to build elevators at the city of Quebec, which would make Quebec the great ocean port of this Dominion during seven months of every year. which it cannot be unless that elevator accommodation is provided there and provided on a scale similar to that which now exists at the head of lake Superior.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that any grain was offered for transcontinental shipment that had to be refused for lack of equipment, or that any grain was offered for the elevator at Quebec for which there was not room?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All the grain offered was shipped on the Transcontinental railway, and there has been room in the elevator at Quebec.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know anything about that, but I do know that in several cases in the Prairie West railway companies refused to take grain from the farmers and from the elevators, I presume, because they did not have the facilities to send it east.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was not through our lack.

Mr. OLIVER: It was not through the lack of hon. gentlemen opposite? They are in control of the affairs of this country at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not of the railways?

Mr. OLIVER: Of the Transcontinental railway and the elevator at Quebec, and if that condition exists my hon. friend may find any reason he pleases for it; but on this Government must rest the responsibility, and when they come and ask this House to pay $10,000,000 for 61 miles of uncompleted railway to accommodate 30,000 people, I ask them how they can expect us to vote that money without a protest, when the money is so urgently needed to establish elevator accommodation at Quebec, so that the $200,000,000 sunk in the Transcontinental railway may earn interest and so that the people of the prairies, upon whose industry and success depend the earnings of the Transcontinental railway and the development of the city of Quebec, shall be able to progress and develop as they must, or else the whole enterprise falls to the ground. They are in control and, instead of them spending the money of this country in establishing at that port these facilities that will enable it to do the trade of the country, they take untold amounts of money, spend them for other purposes, and refuse these facilities to the port of Quebec. My hon. friends do not seem to like Quebec for some reason, because, while they had a road from Quebec to Winnipeg completed, they did not see fit to give a service on that road last winter. They gave a service from Toronto to Winnipeg over roads that did not belong to them for 500 miles, where they competed with the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific—a very good thing for Toronto, but not a very good thing for Quebec, when every reason suggested that they should put on a service between Quebec and Winnipeg.

If they do not like Quebec, if they propose to put it on the side track, if they propose that that great ocean port of Canada shall be ignored in their policy, notwithstanding the fact that $200,000,000 has been spent on the railway to bring the business to that port, we have another port —the port of Montreal. We have a railway which is proposing to establish terminals in the city of Montreal. The Canadian Northern has a line uncompleted from Montreal to Capreol. Unless and until that line is completed to Montreal, with suitable terminals in Montreal, the Canadian Northern railway system cannot be a successful enterprise. No matter who is at the head of the enterprise, no matter what shall happen, unless and until it secures terminals and facilities to enable the trade to reach Montreal over a completed line, it cannot be a success. I mentioned the matter to the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) when the Canadian Northern Bill was up. The answer was that there was not enough money; we could not take that matter into consideration; we

could loan the Canadian Northern $15,000,000, but we could not do anything to see that the money was spent so that the railway would be a completed enterprise, and, to that degree, able to earn interest on its cost. So that, for the ports of Quebec and Montreal, for the vast interests that centre in each of these great cities, for the transportation interests that are involved in the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, and for the great interests that are behind them in the prairie West, dependent on these railways and upon their access to these ocean ports, there is no consideration at the hands of the Government, but 30,000 people along the shores of the St. Lawrence, where they have navigation during seven months in the year, covering a distance of sixty-one miles, are to have the benefit of an expenditure of $10,000,000 by this Government. We are to be saddled with $500,000 a year interest by reason of the proposition that our friends put before the House to-day. But we cannot get elevator accommodation at the port of Quebec, and we cannot assist the Canadian Northern into Montreal more than we have assisted it. We are able to pay interest on the bonds of the branch lines in the prairie West, guaranteed by the provincial governments, in order to hold our securities, but we are not able to complete the lines so that the people there will get the same facilities as we are offering to these people below Quebec at this cost. My hon. friend the Solicitor General, I presume, has made the best plea that he can on behalf of the Government for the expenditure that they propose to make, but it is not a plea that appeals to my mind as being in the national interest.

Mr. NESBITT: Yesterday the hon. acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) gave the capitalization of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway at about $3,000,000 and he gave the earnings for 1914 as being $83,000, for 1913, $76,000 and for the years before that about the same. The Solicitor General says that that pays.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix?

Mr. NESBITT: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: I would much rather have my hon. friend for my law partner than for my business partner if he thinks that that pays on $3,000,000 of capital stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that it paid on the capital stock.

Mr. NESBITT: You said that to my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information was that it paid the interest on the bonds.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend asked that question, and you said that you thought it paid the interest on the capital stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I did not say that. What he asked about were the fixed charges.

Mr. NESBITT: He said the capital stock.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think he will say that himself.

Mr. OLIVER: I think I did, but I am not sure I meant it in the sense in which my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) does.

Mr. NESBITT: I still say that if the Solicitor General says that is a paying road, I would rather he put money into it than that I should. We come next to the Lotbinière and Megantic. Last year they made the enormous profit of $1,255 with a capitalization of $349,000. There is nothing in this return to show how much money was spent on repairs or maintenance. In this return there is an engineer's report showing that improvements and repairs must be made upon the road. I notice in one case that 6,000 feet of filling has to be done. Everybody knows that a railway or any other enterprise depends entirely on how you keep up the property. On maintenance depends whether you make any net profits out of it or not.

If you starve the road for the purpose of showing a net profit, you may get the net profit all right, but very much to the detriment of the road. My hon. friend thinks that as there are 30,000 people in that district, the road might pay. Now it is estimated by the best American railway statisticians that it takes 2,000 people to the mile to make a railway pay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think I made any statement as to whether the road would pay; I do not think I am competent to judge.

Mr. NESBITT: How can a road with only 500 people to the mile pay?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member knows that besides population bringing railroads, railroads bring population.

Mr. NESBITT: It depends on the country. You cannot dig rocks and grow wheat.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have done it.

Mr. NESBITT: You did not make much at it. It would be much better for you to let the farmer dig the rocks and you advise him as to the law. I absolutely agree with my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) that there is no human excuse for taking over these roads nor for building that new piece. The Lotbinière and Megantic railway already has connection with the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk, and can therefore already feed the Intercolonial, if that is what the minister wants. The road could not be better located, so far as connection with other roads is concerned. There is no earthly excuse for taking over these roads or for building that new piece. There is not even the excuse that this road has a Dominion charter, for it got its charter from the Quebec legislature. We have always been opposed to interfering with provincial rights, and now we have the opportunity of putting our theory into practice. If it is necessary that this road should be built, let the province of Quebec build it by all means, but I do not think we should build it, or take over this other little piece of road. It is an imposition on the people of Canada to ask them to do it at this time of financial strain and stress, and I do not believe there is a man in the Government although they are defending this proposition, and putting it through, who really thinks in his own heart that the road should be taken over. For my part, I want to raise my voice in opposition to the Government's spending one dollar on this proposition this year; we cannot afford to do it in any shape, manner, or form. There is no possible way of showing that any of these roads will pay; they never have paid in the past, as their reports show.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that while the Lotbinière and Megantic railway did not pay last year for some reason connected with the management; in previous years it paid a very good return.

Mr. NESBITT: The net earnings in 1913 were $6,905, and in 1912 $5,577, on a capitalization of $349,000. As I said a moment ago, we do not know how the maintenance of the road has suffered through the net earnings. If there is anything to earn in that district the road should have earned it before this time, and I have no doubt it has been in operation for some years. As far as I am concerned, I am absolutely opposed to the Government spending one dollar on these roads this year.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Knowing something about this road and the district through which it runs, perhaps I might say a few words. The Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway runs from St. Paul street, in the city of Quebec, to Cap Tourmente, a distance of about thirty miles. Part of the road is double-tracked, eighty-pound rails being used. There is no better roadbed in the Dominion. Last year this road carried 1,843,000 passengers, but the average fare was about 12½ cents, due to the short haul. A great number of pilgrims come every year to the shrine of Ste. Anne de Beaupré, coming over the American lines, over the Canadian Pacific railway, the Quebec Central, and so on. These roads get the biggest percentage of the fare, and we get about forty cents per passenger. This road runs through a thickly populated district, and the right-of-way is very expensive. The hon. member for St. John said a moment ago that the engineers had estimated the cost of this road at $1,300,000. I do not think that figure took into account the right-of-way and the rolling stock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They are both included.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: I have the statement here. There are 22 stations on this 30 miles of road. The station and other buildings—I am not taking into account the land—cost $134,000, and they could not be replaced for that amount to-day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What are the names of the stations?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Quebec, Limoilou Junction, Maizerets, Park Maufils, de-Salabery, Monument, Beauport, Everell, St. Gregoire, Montmorency Falls, Boischatel, Rivière de Fer, L'Ange Gardien Station, Petit Pre', Lemoine, Laverdière, Chateau Richer, Visitation, Rivière Aux Chiens, Ste. Anne de Beaupré, Beaupré, St. Joachim. The rolling stock and the stations and other buildings are worth $409,000. The terminus at the city of Quebec comprises about 135,000 feet of land and is worth nearer $2,000,000 than $1,500,000. If you put it at $10 a foot, it would be worth $1,350,000. The Government has already taken over about 40 per cent of these terminals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At what cost?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: The Canadian Pacific railway contributed their lands at $12 a foot. The reason why this land had to be taken over in this way was that the Canadian Pacific railway had not sufficient room for the Union station and freight shed, and also our railway stood between their tracks and the St. Lawrence basin, where their Empresses dock. The Canadian Pacific railway, of course, could not expropriate our railway, so the Government took it over and then turned it over to the Canadian Pacific railway. Our road is double tracked part of the way, making the total mileage 43 miles. The cotton company at Montmorency does not benefit this road very much, as the haul is short, and the freight is turned over to the Canadian Northern railway or the Canadian Pacific railway; but when the Government acquires this road the freight will be turned over to the Intercolonial railway. The Saguenay railway was incorporated in 1905 at the request of my Liberal friends of Quebec; I may say that they are nearly all Liberals in Quebec city. The incorporators were: Hon. E. B. Garneau, Hon. Charles Langelier, George Tanguay, M.P.P., Narcisse Rioux, Hon. Alex. Taschereau, William Price, Mark Workman, McLea Walbank, W. G. Ross, They tried to raise the capital in 1907, but did not succeed, owing to the financial crisis. In 1909, being encouraged by the late Government, who gave us the subsidies, and encouraged also by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who said he would do all he could for me, but advised me to see the Prime Minister, now leader of the Opposition, we started work in 1911. Work was stopped in 1912—not 1911, as stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) last night.

Mr. TURRIFF: It was the Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) who said that; I only quoted his words.

Mr. REID: No, I said it commenced in 1911, and that work was suspended in 1912.

Mr. TURRIFF: No, he said the work stopped in September, 1911.

Mr. REID: Hansard will show what I said.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Work was stopped in 1912. About 87 per cent of the road is completed; the ties, fishplates and spikes are all along the road, and part of the rails. There is a population there that has been waiting for railway communication a little longer than some of the western population of which the hon. member for Edmonton spoke—these people having been waiting for 150 years for transportation facilities. They have paid their taxes for the development of the railways of the West. They do not begrudge that; but we think that they now are entitled to means of transportation. From the 10th of November to the 10th of May in each year, the people are absolutely cut off from civilization. There are no roads—nothing that can be properly called roads—through those mountains. There are severe frosts, extending to 45 degrees below zero, and so transportation by road is almost impossible. The late Government in 1904 established a ferry between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay, from the south to the north shore, and built a line nine miles long from Rivière Ouelle junction to the wharf. That service cost last year, as shown by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, $53,240.66. This amount can be saved by the completion of the Saguenay railway. The transportation of mail costs $6,918.69, by railway, boat and team, of which the railway gets $1,500—that is, from Quebec to St. Joachim. The maintenance of the branch from Riviére Ouelle junction to the wharf, according to the Railway Department, cost about $22,000. These sums make a total of $82,159. The earnings of the Montmorency railway are $83,031 above expenses, and of the Lotbinière and Megantic, $3,889. These are all actual figures. The only estimate of earnings is of the Saguenay railway, which is estimated by Mr. E. Evans engineer, of Quebec, at $315,511. These earnings, actual and estimated, together with the savings, make a total of $484,590. Take from this the steamer Champlain's earnings of last year, $7,093.90. The balance would represent about 5 per cent on $9,000,000 of capital. So these roads would not be by any means a "white elephant"—far from it. In my opinion, as soon as the Quebec and Saguenay is completed, the Government should have at least 5 per cent on its investment, which would not be ten millions, nor would it be nine millions, but would be closer to seven millions than eight millions. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said last night that he at one time lived about one hundred miles east of Murray Bay,—I do not know whether on the south shore or on the north shore,—and he could not believe in a winter port on the St. Lawrence. I would advise him to read the report made on the winter port of St. Catherines bay by Ad-

miral Bayfield in 1882, by engineer J. C. Taché in 1904, and by Edward Evans in 1912; also the report of the commission for exploring the Saguenay in 1829; notes on the Saguenay country in 1829 by Andrew Stuart and by Lieut. Baddeley and Commissioner Ollebar in 1860, and also by the former Deputy Minister of Public Works, Mr. Gobeil, who gave a conference in the city of Quebec; and also a report of Judge Langelier. He will learn from these documents that even at low tide you have in St. Catherine's bay 71 feet of water. It is shown in Mr. J. C. Taché's report that you can take a steamer to within 50 feet of the shore of St. Catherine's bay, and you can winter there in open water all winter. I have my summer home at St. Irénée, and I go there in winter when I can. The north shore channel is always free of ice. The prevailing winds in winter are from the north, and the ice piles up on the south shore. That is why the ferry established in 1904 has not given the service to the north shore. Last winter I tried four times to get there, but unsuccessfully. I went from Montreal to Riviére Ouelle, slept two days at the Riviére Ouelle wharf and returned to Montreal, having made a round trip of 592 miles without reaching St. Irénée. The steamer that is now used in this ferry service is quite obsolete. I have here a letter from Mr. Johnston, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in which he says:

> The usefulness of the boat is pretty nearly gone, and if this department is to continue the service, it will be necessary, without delay, to take steps to provide a suitable boat. It is estimated that a suitable boat will cost, at the present time, no less than $175,000.

As to the money spent on the road, the sum may look large, but every cent of it has gone into the road. There were no side-shows, no subcontractors, so far as the company was concerned. The contract was given to two contractors. From Cap Tourmente to Murray Bay was given to M. J. O'Brien, at prices which could not be had to-day, and from Murray Bay to Nairn Falls was given to the Bishop Construction Company, which failed while building the road, and the work was completed by M. J. O'Brien. The road is operated to-day, not for passengers, but for freight. It is paying the expense of maintenance, and something over.

Now, with regard to the Montmorency bonds. These were issued about 18 years ago. I do not know of any of them having changed hands since they were issued. They are in the hands of insurance companies, of such men as F. W. Ross, of Quebec, and of wealthy estates in Quebec that have kept them from the beginning. There is no market; they are not listed. There has been no promotion money expended on the Quebec and Saguenay railway. Not one five cent piece has any director received either as fees, or as salary, or even as expenses, either directly or indirectly. I am not interested in the Quebec and Saguenay, the Lotbiniére and Megantic, or the Charlevoix and Montmorency railways.

So far as that error of $3,473,000 as against $4,465,000 is concerned I am the guilty party. When I came back with the Minister of Railways, he asked me to write a letter on this subject. I was in my office, in Montreal, in communication with the controller in Quebec, and he gave me the figures. So, I wrote the letter. When the matter came before the Government, I went to Quebec to check the figures.

I talked the matter over with him, and the only explanation he gave me was that he was under the impression that we were working under a deed of trust which would give a clear title to the Government if 67 per cent of the bonds of the railway were handed over to the Trust Co. and cancelled.

Every one in the city of Quebec, including the Board of Trade and the city council, have asked for this road and believe that the people are entitled to it. From the 10th of November until the 10th of May the north shore is without service. During the last two years they have asked the Government to go to the rescue by sending the steamer Montcalm there to try to help them.

The population of Charlevoix is 22,000, Chicoutimi and Saguenay 65,000, Montmorency 15,000, city of Quebec 90,000, Quebec county 27,000. The city of Quebec will certainly be a feeder of that railway. There is no means of communication below Quebec, because the boat leaves at 8 o'clock in the morning and summer residents wishing to go down there—clerks, merchants, bankers and so on—cannot leave by that boat. If there was a train the whole district would be populated in a comparatively short time. The cost of these railways was $8,921,476.37, of which amount the cost of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix was $2,992,209.89, and the Lotbinière and Megantic railway, $349,208.85. This railway was bought from the hon. member

for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) and the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) and we were assured that it earned 5 and 6 per cent all the time. If it is not earning that much it is due to the shortage of cars caused by the Grand Trunk being unable to supply cars to go over this Lotbinière and Megantic line. I think it is the only branch line which the Intercolonial has not taken over in the province of Quebec. It runs from Lyster in the county of Megantic to St. Jean des Chaillons in the county of Lotbinière. At Lyster it connects with the Grand Trunk railway, at Villeroy with the Intercolonial railway and at Fortierville with the Quebec, Montreal and Southern railway. Surely these people are entitled to some direct railway communication. The member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortier) told me a few days ago that although he lives only thirty miles from the city of Quebec, it takes him two days to get there and back. The Lotbinière and Megantic railway consists of thirty miles of main line and about two miles of sidings. The county of Megantic has a population of 31,000, and the county of Lotbinière a population of 22,000. The villages along the lines include Lyster, Lourdes, Villeroy, Kingsbury, Fortierville, Parisville and St. Jean des Chaillons.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the engineer's report the total population served by the Lotbinière and Megantic railway is stated to be only a little over 5,000.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: I am taking the census and the statement made by the hon. member for Lotbinière. The census gives the county of Lotbinière a population of 22,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In his report, the engineer mentions the villages referred to by my hon. friend, and gives the total population as 5,220.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: There may be some villages back from the railway which have escaped the engineer's notice. As to the possibilities of the Quebec and Saguenay railway, I may say that it is not very encouraging for people to try to develop industries in the district when they have communication for only six months in the year. The Mount Mur-

4 p.m.

ray Pulp and Paper Mill Company, which is controlled exclusively by the New York World, was established in that district. They have bought, during the last four years, in the county of Charlevoix, timber lands for which they have paid over $600,000. For the last three years they have produced over 150,000 cords of pulpwood each year, but have been unable to get a cord of it out owing to the lack of railway facilities and harbour accommodation. They proceeded to spend their own money in making the necessary improvements, and this year they will be able to get out some. The Baie St. Paul Lumber Company, which is controlled by some Americans from Syracuse, New York, obtained from the seminary of Quebec certain timber rights in that district, for which they paid $280,000. They have spent a large sum of money there, but they have been discouraged because of the lack of transportation facilities. They can get schooners, but they cannot get steamers, because the water is not deep enough in the bay.

Mr. NESBITT: Can they not get ordinary schooners to carry their pulpwood?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: It would take schooners a long time to carry out 60,000 cords of pulpwood. Besides, they do not navigate in winter.

Mr. NESBITT: They can use teams in winter.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: I wish my hon. friend would come down to that district with me in the winter, and see the conditions.

Mr. TURRIFF: All the way along the St. Lawrence there are scores of big ships that carry timber, sawn timber, and deals all the way from Metis to Rivière du Loup. These vessels do not go into the harbours; they anchor a mile or two outside and are loaded by barges.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: You are talking of the south shore, where they have the Intercolonial railway wharves, and all that they want in that line. On the north shore the only wharf at which there is water deep enough to accommodate a steamer is at Murray Bay. There is an iron mine in the county of Charlevoix in which at least $250,000 must have been sunk. I know that some of our Quebec friends are only waiting for the construction of this railway before commencing to exploit that mine.

Mr. NESBITT: I could tell the hon. gentleman about a lot of mines in which

more money than that was sunk, and in which I myself put some money.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: The man in charge of the Quebec and Saguenay construction was the engineer, Arthur Bruce. The estimates were based on reports by Edward Evans and Beresford Fox, of Sir Douglas Fox and partners, of London. Other engineers engaged in the work were J. G. Guay, S. A. Demeules, and E. S. Lovelace. They were absolutely wrong in their estimates, which were just as bad as the estimates of the cost of the Transcontinental. The railway is absolutely level; there are no grades and the roadbed is largely solid rock. I would call the attention of the committee to the terminals which it is necessary for the Transcontinental to have at Quebec. Without terminals you cannot run a railroad, and the same may be said of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix and the Quebec and Saguenay railroads.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How will this railway benefit the population of Chicoutimi and Saguenay?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: It will do that when it is taken down to St. Catherine's bay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: How will this railway benefit the county of Megantic? If the railway is projected through Sherbrooke it will assist the county of Megantic; otherwise it will be of no value to that county.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: I am simply taking the statement of the hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I asked if the bonds would be paid at par by the Government. He said, "Yes." Does he mean the bonds of the Quebec and Montmorency and the bonds of the Quebec and Saguenay?

Mr. REID: Oh, no.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What bonds?

Mr. REID: We take the road clear of all encumbrance, and the $2,500,000 of bonds are the original bonds, as stated by the hon. member from Charlebois.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does that apply to the two sections?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, just the one section.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The object of my question is that I understand that the Quebec and Saguenay has been built; the surveying, the locating of the line and the grading, has been done with money invested by the French people. I understand that this money was obtained on the Paris market to the extent of something over $4,000,000. Is that right?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Oh, yes, more than that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not think that any Canadian money was invested in that section from St. Joachim to Nairn Falls, and surely the people who have invested their money, with whose savings you have built the road, are entitled to reimbursement if the Government are going to absorb it. Personally I am not opposed to the Government taking over that section of the railroad which runs from St. Joachim to Murray Bay. I wish to explain, however, that the Quebec, Lotbinière and Megantic should not be taken over by the Government. This road was built some years ago by some very enterprising lumbermen for the purpose of exploiting their timber limits. In 1902, if I mistake not, it was bought by Messrs. Tobin, McRae and Pennington for $235,000. This included 60,000 acres of timber land. A few years afterwards, when the limits had been practically exhausted, the road was sold to the Quebec Eastern for $285,000. As was stated a moment ago by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), the road is connected with the Intercolonial. It is not a highly paying concern, but still it pays its way. I do not see why, in these days of hard times, when the people of Canada are called upon to pay such heavy taxation as they will this year, they should be asked to saddle themselves with this railway, especially when we are told by the Minister of Railways and by the Minister of Finance that the Transcontinental railway, to which this road is going to be added, is already a dead weight on the Government. I may be told, it is true, that I should be perhaps more provincial; and that as it is a matter which concerns my own province I should keep silent and let the Government acquire this railroad. My answer is that I am elected to the Parliament of Canada not to represent one county or one province, but to represent the people of Canada; and I care not what may be said about the advantage which might accrue to a special locality by the gift of a railway, or rather by the acquiring by the Government of a certain railway. The people of Canada at the present moment are not in a mood

to pay any such amount of money as this. The war will cost this country an enormous amount of money. The national debt is increasing by leaps and bounds. The people will pay it cheerfully because the people understand that the war must be ended and ended victoriously and that all legitimate sacrifice must be made towards securing that end. Therefore, I think the Government might well ponder and pause before deciding to acquire this small bit of a railroad. As regards the other part of this scheme, that is the railway running from Quebec to St. Joachim. I know that section of the country; it is a rich territory; the railroad runs through alluvial lands, and really I think it is a paying concern. But it is a tramway, and the people are well served as there are twenty-two or twenty-five stopping places; not stations exactly but stopping places. It is the continuation of the tramway system of the city of Quebec. It pays its way and I think that if it was disconnected from the other stretch of railway which was added to it, the Quebec and Saguenay, there would be no need of acquiring it. Therefore I say that there is no reason for the Goverment acquiring the Quebec and Lotbinière section of the railway. There is no reason for them to acquire the tramway from Quebec to St. Joachim, which pays its way. But I would say to the Government, as being interested in the welfare of the north shore of the river St. Lawrence, that the Government should help towards the completion of the road from St. Joachim to Nairn Falls. Really I cannot object to that, because there is a large and old settled population in that district, and that population really requires some mode of transportation. In that respect I may say that I have received a letter from the President of the Board of Trade of Quebec, a well known gentleman, Mr. J. G. Scott. I shall read his letter:

Quebec, 9th May, 1916.

Dear Mr. Lemieux,—May I take the liberty of writing you a line with regard to the Quebec and Saguenay railway.

I think the people of Quebec are pretty nearly unanimous in approving the course of the Government in making this railway part of the Transcontinental. I know that in the Board of Trade—of which I am the president, and we have a very influential board of nearly 600 members—there has never been a dissenting voice, when the matter has been discussed as it often has. Our people feel that the people of Montmorency, Charlevoix and Saguenay, a large population, have as good claims as those of the Northwest to railway facilities and that this project will help towards winter navigation, or at least the prolongation of the season, a matter which is very dear to us in Quebec.

Moreover, a great many people in Quebec are interested financially, and the failure of this project would not only cause them to lose their money, but it would injure the city generally and perhaps cause us to pay dearer for gas and electricity—We pay too dear as it is.

Yours truly,

J. G. Scott.

I have not the copy of my answer, but I wrote back to Mr. Scott that I was certainly not opposed to the Government helping towards the completion of the road between St. Joachim and Murray Bay, provided the people who had invested their good, sound money in that enterprise were recouped. I may be treading on dangerous ground, but I wish to say that this part of the Quebec and Saguenay, which runs from St. Joachim, the terminus of a good paying tram line, to Nairn Falls, was financed in France. I do not think that any Canadian money was invested in that section. If I am wrong my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) will correct me.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: About $1,250,000 of Canadian money was invested and $4,600,000 from France.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have the various prospectuses which were issued in France at the time when this enterprise took form, and the people in France were induced to invest their money not only in that enterprise, but in a series of enterprises, which were known as the Quebec merger, and which included the Quebec and Saguenay railway, the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway, the Quebec Public Utilities, that is, Gas, Electricity, and so on, and the Lotbiniere and Megantic railway. As my hon. friend from Charlevoix said, they parted with their money on the strength of the statements made in these prospectuses. We know how people abroad are induced to invest their money. The French people thought that this would be quite a remunerative enterprise, and they paid their good money in the hope that they would get good returns.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Is my hon. friend aware that these good French people got back their good money plus 6 and 8 per cent of interest?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The whole enterprise was guaranteed by the Quebec merger, and the bondholders of the company received their interest, if I am well informed.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: And the money for their bonds.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is the point. I am informed—my hon. friend knows better than I do—that the French bondholders were offered 40 and 50 cents on the dollar for their bonds, and that afraid, as they were, at the failure of the company to proceed with the work, and discouraged, as they were, by the reports of their engineer, they parted with their bonds. It seems to me that in all fairness, and in all justice, these French bondholders, who very cheerfully and very willingly invested their money in that enterprise, should be reimbursed up to the figure which they paid when they subscribed for the bonds of the concern.

Mr. MORPHY: Have they not sold their bonds outright, and lost possession of them?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, that is what I am stating. The French public admittedly—my hon. friend from Charlevoix says so, and he knows better than anybody else—subscribed to the amount of over $4,600,000. They paid that amount in hard cash. The money was spent on the roadbed, on the grading on the small section of the railroad which runs from Murray Bay to Nairn Falls. Nobody will deny that since then French investors have seen their folly. They have been acquainted with the fact that the enterprise was a failure and I say that without any disparagement. It was a serious failure; they were induced to sell their bonds to a committee of purchasers.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: By whom were they induced to sell?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have the information here.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Would my hon. friend say that the French people who invested in Canadian Pacific railway stock at 280 and sold it at 165 should be reimbursed?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not speaking of the Canadian Pacific railway. I believe that the bondholders of the Canadian Pacific railway in France and England, and all the world over, are quite satisfied with their stock even at the low figure to which it has fallen, because it is a gilt-edged security. There is no comparison.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Yes, there is.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the present instance the French people were induced by rosy prospectuses to invest their good money in this enterprise when the name of Canada was very prominent and very popular in the French money market. I have all the various prospectuses here, but I will not read them. Those people invested their money, and now the Government of Canada proposes to acquire these lines of railway. The Government declares that it will buy the bonds at their par value for the section running from Quebec to St. Joachim. Why not pay the French people the par value on their bonds for the section from St. Joachim to Nairn's Falls. That would be dealing out equal justice. It seems to me that the French people should be treated by this Government in a fair way. Why one policy for one section of railway, and another policy in regard to the other section? My hon. friend from Charlevoix asked a moment ago who offered to purchase the bonds.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Who induced them to sell?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have here a copy of L'Office National des Valeurs Mobilières, a financial review published in Paris. I will translate the paragraph into English. It reads as follows:

The Defence Committee—

They appointed a Defence Committee in Paris.

The Defence Committee of the bondholders of the Quebec railway, Saguenay and Eastern, have been offered the total purchase of their bonds in France at the cost of $60, plus payment of all the coupons due.—
—the committee has consented to present that for the bondholders, but as requested, before their doing that, indisputable guarantees are to be given which guarantees have not yet been given by the group.

I do not know what that group is but I answer that my hon. friend induced the French bondholders to accept $60 for their bonds. I do not say that originally they paid $100 for their bonds.

Mr. REID: They paid $82 and some $84.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, certainly, offers were made by a Canadian group through the Committee of Defence of Bondholders in Paris, at $60 for each bond for which they paid, as the minister says, $82.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I wish I could get the same amount for some bonds I have now.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to know where the protection will be for the people

who have built that section of road. How will they be reimbursed? I am not opposed to the Government aiding that section of road but I am opposed to the acquisition of the Lotbinière and Megantic. I say that this last proposition is absolutely indefensible because this road occupies a territory served by the Intercolonial railway for many years past and nobody in that district has made a demand that the Government should acquire that road. As regards the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix, I do not see why the Government acquires that tramway. It is a good tramway and it pays well.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: It is not a tramway; it is a railway with a federal charter, run by steam and electricity, and it has a telegraph office in many stations. There is a tramway to serve local traffic.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it double-tracked?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Double-tracked and both tracks are electrified.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend says that this road is not in need of help. It serves a large population, and the people are not anxious that their railway should be absorbed by the Transcontinental. The people I am caring for particularly are the people on the line from St. Joachim to Murray Bay. Let the Government help to complete the line. I would not object to that, but I say that if they are still determined to acquire that line the least they can do is to recoup those who have built it. The hon. member for Charlevoix himself admits that the French investors have sunk in that railway $4,600,000.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: They got back their money and they got 6 to 8 per cent interest on it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did they get their capital back? Surely my hon. friend does not contend that the French investors have had returned all their capital invested?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: The road must be given free of encumbrance; that is, the lien on that road must be released.

Mr. LEMIEUX: By whom?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: By the Quebec Railway Company.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That comes to exactly what I said a moment ago. The French investors were induced to put their money into the construction of that road, the Canadian company accepted their money, they located the road, they surveyed it, they graded it; to-day the Government will acquire that road free of encumbrance. I am told and my hon. friend says that the Quebec Railway Company will wipe out any encumbranc existing on it. It means, therefore, that the Quebec Railway Company has purchased the bonds from the French investors.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will make the matter clearer I will thank him for it. All I have in mind is to protect the rights of those who have invested their money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman,—

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend will pardon me; I would like my hon. friend from Charlevoix to give me an explanation. Who has disinterested the French bondholders and how much was paid to them?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: They disinterested themselves by getting rid of their bonds.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who purchased the bonds?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: I do not know; they were sold on the Paris Bourse, and I do not know who bought them. A great part of them were exchanged for Canadian bonds at 50. The Canadian bonds are now selling at 70, which gives them a premium of ten francs on their money, plus 6 to 8 per cent interest. That came about because friends of mine in Paris asked, as the value of the rentes stood at the ratio of 94 to 60, if we could give 60 for these Canadian bonds, as it would help to bring the French rate of exchange up to 60. I said that I would do so. We got some of our friends together, and we made that offer, but it has never been taken advantage of.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Even on the statement made by the hon. member for Charlevoix, there is the admission that the French investors, although they invested their money in good faith for the building of a Canadian enterprise, will be deprived of a part of the value of the bonds which they secured. I am not opposed to the completion of that section of the railway. I am in favour of it, but I do not say that the Government should acquire the road. The Government has not the means to acquire any railway,

especially when the Government comes before Parliament with the declaration that before long this country may be obliged to nationalize the three transcontinental railways. But I say: let the Government help substantially the Quebec and Saguenay portion of the line and they will get my unreserved support. If the Government acquire that railway, which is not built, but which is graded, and in which the French people have sunk so many millions of dollars, the least the Government can do is to protect those unfortunate bondholders. My hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. L'Espérance) smiles. Unless I am a simpleton, I do not see how else the Government can conscientiously act. Is it fair—I put it to my hon. friend, as a friend of the Quebec district—that the people in France who have invested their money after having read the alluring prospectuses which were distributed throughout France should be eliminated and that they should only save a part of their investment? Is it fair for the Government to take over the road and return to the French investors only a portion of the money they invested? My hon. friend from Charlevoix has admitted that the bonds of the road were undersold to a Canadian group of financiers.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Were exchanged.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend would only be as frank as he usually is and unravel the whole thing, he would tell us that a group of financiers in Montreal and Quebec, knowing that the bonds would largely increase in value later on, induced the French investors to sell their bonds at a low figure.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: The company has never induced anybody to sell their bonds. The bonds are quoted on the Paris Bourse, and I know that some have been sold on that exchange. This is no more unfair than when I was induced to buy 500,000 francs of the Est Parisien Tramway Company and only got back 5,000 francs. My hon. friend might as well say that the Grand Trunk shareholders and bondholders who invested their money in this country thirty or forty years ago ought to be reimbursed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend may think what he likes about that, but I am loath to believe that the French would induce foreigners to invest their money in an enterprise under false pretenses.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: You know the Est Parisien Company.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not know about that. I know that they are very severe in France on schemers.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Your friend ex-Controller Macdonald of Montreal was manager of it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He is more your friend than mine. I understand that ex-Controller Macdonald was employed by my hon. friend when he was connected with the Montreal Tramways. I think the Government should see that the French are reimbursed for the money they have invested in this enterprise. I should like to ask the Acting Minister of Railways whether interested parties will be able to bring their claims before the Exchequer Court when this matter comes up?

Mr. REID: The Exchequer Court will determine the value of the properties, also any claims, I suppose, against the road. The owners must give us a clear title.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman must acknowledge that whatever money is paid for the Quebec and Saguenay railway must go to those who have first claim on it; that is, the bondholders. Therefore, the bondholders will be paid in full up to the purchase price of the road, and the only way to pay them further, if the purchase price is not sufficient, would be to add to that purchase price, and we do not feel we can do that.

Mr. TURRIFF: I do not think any one will object to the building of a road that is a reasonable proposition, and that the country is well able to afford. In the last few days it has frequently been impressed upon the House by hon. gentlemen on both sides that we have overbuilt in this country, and that the time had come when we should cease to extend our railway mileage. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. R. B. Bennett) pointed out yesterday that there are in this country 2,500 miles of track that should be taken up and laid elsewhere. The Minister of Finance also touched upon this subject yesterday, and his whole argument was that the railway companies should go to the provinces for assistance in completing their lines. The Minister of Finance is not here to-day, and I do not wonder at it.

Mr. REID: He was here a moment ago.

Mr. TURRIFF: He is ashamed to be present and countenance this proceeding.

Mr. REID: That is absurd. He was here only a moment ago.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Minister of Finance said yesterday that if the company wanted assistance for its incomplete line in Alberta it ought to go to the Government of Alberta, and similarly with Saskatchewan, and the Solicitor General took the same ground. He said that if the provinces wanted the roads completed they should assist them, because we were not in a financial position to do it. One point that has not been touched on, I think, is the assistance these roads have received from the province of Quebec.

Mr. REID: I mentioned that last night. The road was granted a subsidy of $3,000 a mile, but nothing was ever paid on it.

Mr. TURRIFF: Was there not a land grant?

Mr. REID: Yes, but nothing was ever given on it.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why?

Mr. REID: I do not know why.

Mr. TURRIFF: Perhaps the hon. member for Charlevoix can tell us.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: This was granted in March, 1912, and the road stopped in August, 1912; so nothing was earned.

Mr. TURRIFF: On account of the railroad falling down in its construction they have not received anything from the province of Quebec. But they have received a subsidy from the Dominion Government.

Mr. REID: They have received $132,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: On a railway that is incomplete; that is the great objection. Why should the Government at this time, and with financial conditions as they are, take over a tramway running out of the city of Quebec? The hon. member for Charlevoix and the Acting Minister of Railways tell us that the proposition is paying its way. But why take over this particular tramway, even though it has a railway track on which cars can be run? Why should we have anything to do with the Lotbinière and Megantic, which road, as I understand, is running? The only part that we ought to deal with is that which is uncompleted, the part from St. Joachim to Nairn Falls, a distance of 62 miles. I understand from the statement of the hon. member for Charlevoix that people in France put in $4,600,000.

Mr. REID: That is the par value of the bonds. They were sold at 82.

Mr. TURRIFF: But the hon. gentleman is proposing to pay the face value of the bonds.

Mr. REID: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: In addition to the $4,600,000 put in by the people of France; $1,500,000, the hon. gentleman says, was put in by the people in Quebec province.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: In Montreal.

Mr. TURRIFF: Well, in the province of Quebec. That money was put in for this sixty-two miles of railway of which only 87 per cent of the grading is done, and a lot of that washed out. That amounts to $98,000 a mile for grading 87 per cent of a railroad. Either the money was practically taken out of it, or else the country is so rough that it should not have a railway. If the grading of 87 per cent of this mileage costs $98,000 a mile, it will cost $125,000 a mile to put the road in running shape. Now, $125,000 a mile may be a paying proposition in such country as the state of Pennsylvania, where they have trains running every five minutes of the twenty-four hours, but in a sparsely settled country a railway cannot get the traffic that would justify the Government in paying so much money for it.

Why not get down to the facts of the matter? This whole proposition, in my judgment, is nothing but a political steal. And the thirty thousand people along this line are not going to get the advantage. Hon. gentlemen opposite are going to get the advantage, for the Government is simply paying for the political support they got the other day—that is what it amounts to. At a time when the Minister of Finance says that we are not in a position to go on and build railroads we are called upon to put in ten millions of dollars, and all we get is sixty-two miles of railroad. We are actually told that we are to pay $98,000 a mile for a road on which not a bridge is built, on which not only the rails are not laid, but the grading is not completed, on which there is not a station house, for which there is no telegraph line—absolutely nothing but 87 per cent of the work of grading done. The Minister of Railways has the nerve to come to this House and ask us to put ten millions into such a scheme as that. Of all the propositions that have ever been

put before this House in connection with railroad building—and I know there have been many bad ones in the past, and I am not going to say that one side is worse than the other—there was never such an outrageous proposition as this. Yesterday we voted $8,000,000 for the Grand Trunk Pacific and $15,000,000 for the Canadian Northern. Are you aware, Mr. Chairman, I opposed these grants? But there is this to be said in connection with the Canadian Northern—that the provinces of Canada and the Dominion of Canada combined have already put in $208,000,000 into that system. So, we were committed to a certain extent. But here is a gigantic piece of folly, simply a political proposition, by which the Government wants to recoup some of its political friends and supporters, and to that end asks Parliament to vote $10,000,000 to add 62 miles to the railways of Canada. I have never heard anything like it; and if this Government persists in such a proposition, especially in these times, it should be driven from power.

See what this proposal means. The Minister of Finance is putting a business impost on the people of Canada by which he proposes to tax every business man coming within the scope of his Bill 25 per cent on what he earns in his business over 7 per cent. By this tax he expects to raise about $25,000,000 a year. And now it is proposed that a sum equal to more than one-third of this special tax for a year is to be paid for a railway 62 miles long serving a country with only 30,000 people.

Let us put it in another way. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the people of Canada, men, women and children, have been busy since this war began paying, working, doing everything that was in their power to maintain the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross Fund and others intended to alleviate the sufferings of our men at the front. And the whole of that amount so contributed in a year, if I remember the figures correctly, would not amount to what this Government here proposes to hand over to a few men. Montreal put up a million or two, Toronto a million or two; the provinces put up large sums of money, and all this money is taken with one hand and thrown into this concern with the other. With this money it is proposed to take over railroads that, at the price suggested, will be a millstone around the neck of the Dominion of Canada as long as the Dominion of Canada lasts. I am not opposed to helping railroads in the province of Quebec. Quebec is my native province. There I was born and brought up and I have always had the kindliest feelings for my old province of Quebec. If this road is in the condition that it is represented to be in, let the Government come forward with a sane, reasonable proposal to put that 62 miles of road on its feet and add it to the mileage of the railways of Canada. No man would support that quicker than I would, because that would be a reasonable proposition. This company got hold of French bonds at 60 cents on the dollar, for which they are now going to get 100 cents on the dollar from my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways. Then, we are going to issue $4,400,000 of securities that can be turned into cash; these we are going to hand over to the present stockholders, a little group of men who have manipulated the French bondholders and every one else. In this political deal they are now going to draw $4,400,000 out of the Treasury for their own purposes. And that is not the end of the trouble. In addition to that, the Acting Minister of Railways has to complete those roads. He has to add to the roads that are now operating and also to complete this 62 miles of road.

I have pointed out on more than one occasion that within five years we shall have a debt of about $2,000,000,000, with an annual interest charge of $100,000,000. My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways now deliberately proposes to add another half million to our yearly interest account. I say again that if this Parliament passes this measure they will have to take the responsibility before the people of Canada, and I venture to say that the people of Canada will not justify that action in any shape or form. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) suggested a much better way to spend this money and at the same time get value for it—by building up transcontinental railway facilities in the city of Quebec. If you do that, and this railway is as advantageous as hon. gentlemen opposite say it is, the province of Quebec will come to the rescue of this railway company and see it through. But the Government and the Legislature of the province of Quebec, who know the circumstances much better than we do, would not justify what has been done in connection with this road, would not justify the expenditure of $98,000 a mile on an uncompleted grade. The thing is too absurd for argument. That is one reason why this

Bill should be defeated—so that members of the House and the people of the country should have an opportunity of getting some information on the subject. We have not been able to get any information worth speaking about from my hon. friend the acting minister or from the Solicitor General. The very fact that the Acting Minister of Railways has to get the Solicitor General at his elbow to wiggle and twist and turn this thing around is enough to make the people suspicious as to the merits of the case. The Solicitor General is very adroit on railway matters and when we see the Solicitor General take his place at the acting minister's elbow, we know that the acting minister is in deep water. Not knowing what to do, he sends out an S.O.S. call and the Solicitor General rushes to his rescue. Well, the Solicitor General may be able to engineer this legislation through, but he will have to take a good deal of responsibility for it.

5 p.m.

The hon. member for Charlevoix spoke about a winter port. I am free to admit that the hon. member ought to know more about that than I do, for it is now over forty years since I left the province of Quebec. But I have seen twenty vessels frozen in the ice in the month of November.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: On the south shore?

Mr. TURRIFF: On the south shore. If my hon. friend is right in saying that Murray Bay can be made an open port—I think it is only 40 miles from Quebec, is it not?

Mr. CASGRAIN: 90 miles.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: From St. Catherine's bay, 130 miles.

Mr. TURRIFF: Of course, the further you get down the easier it is to navigate in winter. Ice-breaking steamers have had a great deal of difficulty at times in navigating the St. Lawrence during the winter months. I do not know of any vessels other than ice-breakers that have navigated to any considerable extent during the winter months, and you cannot have all your freight steamers built as ice-breakers. In my judgment it will be many years before you will have a winter port any place along the St. Lawrence where it is as narrow as it is at St. Catherine's bay. I will not be too sure about that, however, because I am not as well posted as my hon. friend is.

If the Government does intend to carry out this proposed legislation why do they not do it in a businesslike way? What is the reason why the Railway Department should not deal with this matter? I will tell you the reason: it is right there among the papers that have been brought down. Their own engineer gives the value of the property a trifle over half what my hon. friend the Solicitor General and the Acting Minister of Railways are prepared to pay. This is not a matter that ought to go before the Exchequer Court. The Exchequer Court, as I understand the matter, was established in order that any one having a claim against the Government might go there to have that claim settled. Who has a claim against the Government in connection with these three railways? We gave them a subsidy; we do not owe them a dollar. The Intercolonial does not need the roads, nor does the Grand Trunk Pacific need them. We have no liability; we have no responsibility, therefore why go to the Exchequer Court? This Government is losing all the power of government that it ever had—and it never had much. Commissions are appointed for everything, and now, when they want to take over about 70 miles of operating road and 62 miles of grading, they cannot trust their own engineers and they cannot trust themselves. They cannot trust themselves, and so they pass a Bill here in order to have an excuse for handing the matter over to the Exchequer Court to have that court pass on the value of the road. They do not even trust the Judge of the Exchequer Court, because they tie his hands behind his back. If this Government are going to take over this road, why do they not say to the Judge of the Exchequer Court, if they are bound to put it up to him: "Here, go out and value the road, find out what it is worth"? My hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways and the Solicitor General say: No, we must find out how much it cost. When you find that $98,000 per mile was put into 87 per cent of the length of line graded, I do not wonder at the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) not wanting the road to be paid for at its value. I can quite understand how he would prefer to have paid back what the road has cost, or what they claim it has cost. Supposing that, in the locating of that road, as in the case of the locating of a great part of the Canadian Pacific railway when it was first constructed, the worst possible route was chosen, although there were much better routes near at hand, why should this Gov-

ernment, in taking over the road, pay for the mistakes made by those who built the road? Or why should they take it over at more than what it is worth to them? We are buying this for the people of Canada. I ask, is there one man who is sitting on the Government benches to-day who, if he was putting his own money into this road, would take it over on such a plan as this? Would he say: "Well, I will pay you what you put into it with interest on your money"? Or would he say: "I will take the road over at what it is worth to me"? There is the whole position. My hon. friend is putting it to the Judge of the Exchequer Court instead of trusting his own officers. One of his officers has made a report showing the value of the road to be about one-half what the Acting Minister of Railways proposes to pay. But the minister refuses to go by that, because it would not enable him to put in a large sum of money to those supporters who sit behind him, and put it in, not to the advantage of the people of the country, but for political advantage and nothing else. I hope that when this matter comes to be fully considered by the Government we will have this Bill withdrawn, and I would ask my hon. friends on the Government benches to consider well what the effect of this will be. If this road is bought under such circumstances, how are the Government going to get out of taking over the branch lines of the Intercolonial, many of which they have promised to take over? Will the owners of those roads not also demand that they be taken over, not under the Bill that was passed not long ago for the purpose of enabling the Government to take over branch lines, but on the same terms as this road. Do you not see where it leads us? It will be just one thing such as this after another, and that at a time when the Government of the country cannot afford it. We have heard the ministers talking of economy. What economy are they practising? They are bringing forward now, in the dying days of the session, when members cannot post themselves fully on the enormity of what is proposed, legislation of a most important character. I venture to say that we do not know one-half about this matter yet, and they are coming forward with a proposal to add another $10,000,000 to the debt of Canada for an enterprise that, I venture to say, will never pay one cent of interest. It will be just like the Intercolonial; if it pays working expenses it will be doing mighty well. So we shall have added $10,000,000 to our debt, which will involve half a million dollars each year for interest as long as time lasts, unless we pay off the principal.

As I said before, this is the most vicious proposition that has ever come before Parliament, and I ask the Acting Minister to take it into his further consideration and decide if, in the interest of the people of Canada, he should not withdraw the Bill; because I know perfectly well that my hon. friend the acting minister cannot go into his own constituency and, before any audience, justify the handing over of this $10,000,000. He cannot go into any constituency in Canada, except perhaps those that will immediately benefit, and justify this course. I say again I am quite willing that the Government should give the necessary aid to secure the completion of this road; but they should not buy it. I trust that if anything is done it will be done along the line of assisting the road, not of purchasing it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member who has just spoken has made complaint that we have not provided the House with sufficient facts. Of all hon. members of this House, the last who should complain of the absence of provision of facts is the hon. member for Assiniboia. I have never been able to discover that facts are of the slightest value to him; in fact, they seem to impede the progress of his rhetoric rather than to help him. His first task, whenever he gets on his feet, is to divorce himself from anything in the nature of facts and truth, and to substitute the figments of his fancy, and to proceed with a very well-stocked supply of superlatives to denounce the Government from every standpoint. If I could add to his armoury of adjectives, of superlatives in particular, I know that I would be doing him a great deal more service than if I attempted to supply him with facts on any subject at all.

We have got to that stage of the argument where hon. gentlemen opposite recognize the necessity, from the point of view of the interest of the country itself, of in some way, taking care of the situation with respect to the Quebec and Saguenay railway.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The uncompleted portion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The uncompleted portion of it, the Quebec and Saguenay is all uncompleted. For the moment I leave out the other two roads, the Lotbinière and Me-

gantic and the Montmorency and Charlevoix, which are admitted to be paying concerns by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who, of all hon. gentlemen opposite, should know best. The duty of the Government, according to hon. members opposite, is to take care of the situation in respect of the Quebec and Saguenay by reason of the necessity of providing railway service for the inhabitants of that country, numbering not a few thousand but very many, something in the neighbourhood of 100,000, depending on how far back from the line you go.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not 100,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And from the further point of view of saving to the country the tremendous amount of money already invested in that line and avoiding the necessity of repeating that expenditure when the road comes to be completed.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the hon. member suggest that that is the position taken on this side of the House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: I would like to dissociate myself from that position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member is ready to lead his friends all to their fate. He prefers, instead of serving the people along the banks of the St. Lawrence, to build more elevators where those already built are unfilled, and to put a Pullman car service between Quebec and Cochrane. I understand he wants the Government to operate a Pullman service there, although the prospects are that such a service would get about one passenger a month. That is the alternative proposition put forward by him.

Mr. OLIVER: You could get more traffic between Edmonton and Cochrane than between Quebec and Nairn Falls.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I question that myself. I would rather undertake to operate six miles than to operate several hundred.

Of course, we all know the railway policy of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). He was a member of the late Government. We know the railway policy of the late Government. He, of all men, has the right, of course, to talk about a blockade in western Canada. The hon. member for Edmonton should know what a blockade in western Canada is, because every year during which he was a member of that Administration we had a blockade of western wheat.

Every year, during which he was a member of that Administration, the wheat was sent back to the farmers' doors, and they could not get it out for months, yes, sometimes for a year. It was a regular occurrence right up to 1911 and including 1911, and in those days they did not have half the crop that we had last year. The Government, of which my hon. friend was a member, spent millions of dollars on lines that could not be of service for many years to come. What was the railway policy of my hon. friend from Edmonton and of the Government of which he was a member? It was a policy of waste and want. Not a dollar to assist 100,000 people on the banks of the St. Lawrence, but millions for the wilds of the north where no human being could live. A policy of freight without railways in one half of the Dominion, and railways without freight in the other. Wheat rotting in Alberta, rails rusting in Quebec. An annual paralysis in western grain; an annual orgy of eastern contractors. That was the railway policy to which the hon. member for Edmonton for seven years adhered. I do not wonder that we dismiss rather hurriedly any suggestions which he offers at the present time.

However, I will take up the more reasonable proposal which seems to be adhered to very generally by hon. gentlemen on the other side, that, in respect to this Quebec and Saguenay railway, instead of taking the railway by virtue of expropriation at a price not to exceed $4,135,000, or not to exceed the actual cost, we should loan sufficient money to enable the owners to complete the road. Let me take that alternative proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite—and they all seem to agree on this, even the hon. member for Edmonton.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to put my hon. friend right on that matter. There are three railways. The Lotbinière and Megantic railway is on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, and for my part I do not think the Government should acquire that road. There is no need for it. Then there is the Quebec and Montmorency railway, which runs from Quebec city to St. Jean des Chaillons. That railway is completed; it runs well; it is paying, and there is no need for the Government to acquire that road. But, in my judgment, the Government should put an item in the Estimates, or bring down further railway aid towards

the completion of the Quebec and Saguenay railway, which runs from St. Jean des Chaillons to Nairn Falls.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly the alternative I was referring to. Hon. gentlemen opposite want an estimate by way of loan to the Quebec and Saguenay railway for the completion of that line. It would have to be by way of loan, unless we took over the line. Now hon. gentlemen opposite say that this Bill means an investment of $10,000,000 before the road is complete. It means, first of all, an investment —the way we are taking it—of $4,135,000 to get down to details, for the Quebec and Saguenay line, and from that sum comes off $116,000, which is in the trust account, making virtually $4,019,000. There is $330,000 for the Lotbinière and Megantic line, making a total of $4,349,000, to which add $2,500,000 for the Quebec and Charlevoix line, or a total of $6,849,000. That is the total for the three roads at the outside under the present Bill, and it will be less unless it is shown that actually that money or more than that money has gone into the road. Let us suppose that it will reach the maximum of $6,849,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that, before this road is completed, the total will have reached $10,000,000. There is only one road to complete, the Quebec and Saguenay road, consequently they claim that it will take $3,251,000 to complete the Quebec and Saguenay line, and they ask this House to put in the Estimates a sum of $3,251,000 by way of loan to the Quebec and Saguenay railway.

Mr. TURRIFF: I did not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman did not suggest any method, but he wanted aid to be given to complete the Quebec and Saguenay railway, and he said it would take $10,000,000 altogether, or, in other words, that it would require $3,251,000 to complete that line.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why not the usual subsidy?

Mr. MEIGHEN: How are you going to complete it with the usual subsidy, if, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, it will take $3,251,000 to complete it?

Mr. TURRIFF: Let the owners do something.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman said that he would supply a liberal allowance to complete the road, and you cannot complete it unless you supply the money, and that, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, is the amount of money that it will take. There is no other way of getting it. The proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite is to loan them $3,251,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: It is not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then, where would we be? We would have $6,100,000 in bonds against the road according to the figures given; $4,600,000 of French bonds, and $1,500,000 Canadian, making a total of $6,100,000. We would have a total charge against the road, therefore, of $9,351,000, and we would have a second mortgage.

Mr. TURRIFF: I wish to state absolutely and positively that I for one did not say, and I did not hear any one else on this side say, that we ought to put in the Estimates three million and some odd thousand dollars to complete the road. The hon. member is putting words in our mouths that we never uttered, and he knows it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the only contention the hon. member could make unless he was talking absolute nonsense. What is the use of talking about voting $3,000 a mile when he says it will take $10,000,000 to complete the road. Our maximum is $6,849,000, and, according to the contention of my hon. friends, that leaves $3,251,000 as the balance necessary to complete it. You cannot complete it in any other way.

Mr. TURRIFF: Does my hon. friend lay down the proposition that the owners should not do anything?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am laying down no proposition; it is the hon. member's proposition that I am dealing with. I say that there is no way of completing the road except by providing the money, and when they come before Parliament and talk about voting $3,000 a mile, hon. gentlemen opposite are talking nonsense, and transparent nonsense.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I suggest—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman will have time to make any suggestions he pleases, and I will commend him for doing so.

Mr. OLIVER: What the hon. member for Assiniboia said was, as I understood him, that he was willing to aid the road. He did not say that he was willing to build it. I take it that he meant he was willing to

give the ordinary railway subsidy, and it would then be for the owners to find the money and to finish the road. It is their road, not ours.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The ordinary subsidy has been given, and it has failed to complete the road. Nothing else will complete it except the provision of money; the company are at the end of their tether. The position of hon. gentlemen opposite was as I have stated, until they saw that they were caught.

Mr. OLIVER: I beg the hon. member's pardon, he must not assert a position that does not exist.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the hon. member for Edmonton did so; I did not charge him, but the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) advocated that we should provide the money to complete the road.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: I state absolutely that I did not, and that the Solicitor General is deliberately putting words in my mouth that are absolutely false.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement.

Mr. TURRIFF: I will withdraw that statement when the Solicitor General withdraws his, and not before.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that the conduct of debates in this House will be assisted by the hon. member taking up that attitude, and I think the hon. member will be the first to realize it. If there is any point of order to be raised in regard to anything that the Solicitor General said, I will be very happy to deal with it. As I understood him, the Solicitor General was making an argument on a general statement which he assumed had been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I did not understand his remarks in any other way. I must ask the hon. member for Assiniboia to withdraw his remark, as it is clearly out of order.

Mr. TURRIFF: In deference to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and as I do not wish to trespass on the rules of the House, I will withdraw the statement, and I will now ask that the Solicitor General withdraw the statement which he made and which I absolutely deny. I say that there was not one word of truth in the statement which the Solicitor General made. I ask him to withdraw the statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I have in any way mis-stated what the hon. gentleman said, all I have to say is that the way I put it was much more sensible than the way he put it, and the way that does far more credit to his intelligence.

Mr. TURRIFF: I want that statement withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not apprehend that the Solicitor General refused to accept the statement of the hon. member for Assiniboia. Will the hon. member for Assiniboia state what particular remark of the Solicitor General he objects to.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Solicitor General stated, referring to me, that the members on this side of the House proposed to advance to this uncompleted road from St. Joachim to Nairn Falls over $3,000,000. I never made any such statement, and I would like the Solicitor General to acknowledge that.

The CHAIRMAN: As I understand, the Solicitor General never said that the hon. member for Assiniboia did say so. I understood him to say that that was the logical effect of the argument made by the hon. gentleman, and if that is so, I do not see how any complaint can be made.

Mr. TURRIFF: Well, I will let it go at that. We have one sort of ruling for one side of the House and another for the other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the Chairman says I was arguing is exactly what I was arguing, and, unless the hon. gentleman's statement means that, I am afraid it does discredit to his intelligence. In the interval, I have been doing a little figuring to ascertain what the hon. gentleman's contention would really mean. He states to the House—and these are his figures, not mine—that it will take $10,000,000 altogether to these roads complete, and $3,251,000 to complete the Quebec and Saguenay. The $10,000,000 is his own figure. That, I find amounts to about $55,000 a mile. He proposes to get a $55,000-a-mile road completed by a grant of $1,200 a mile. That is the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TURRIFF: The hon. gentleman knows better than that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that I know better, but the hon. gentleman does not.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend knows as well as any member of this House that the subsidy given a railway that costs as much as has already been expended on this is $6,400 a mile.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will help the hon. gentleman out to that extent. That would be $6,400 a mile, which would leave about $49,000 a mile to be provided, and he wants to suggest to this House that we would be taking care of the situation and be providing to complete the road by supplying $6,400 a mile out of $55,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not the hon. gentleman see the almost childish nonsense of such a suggestion?

Mr. TURRIFF: No, I do not; my hon. friend is still mis-stating everything I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's own way of putting it means that we would supply $6,400 more per mile in the vain and delusive hope that we would acquire from some one else the $49,000 or $50,000 a mile still necessary to complete the road.

Mr. OLIVER: This is not our road.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know it is not, but hon. members behind my hon. friend say that it is our duty to see it completed. We could only get it completed by giving the company a loan of money. Every other means have been exhausted. There are against the road to-day some $6,100,000 in bonds; at all events there is about $5,000,000 against it in bonds, and the rest is against it in some form or other. But, take it at $5,000,000: it means that we would be taking a second mortgage for whatever sum we advanced subject to a mortgage of $5,000,000. Now, we are getting the whole road in its present condition for a trifle over $4,000,000 from the owners. I appeal to my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) to say if that is not better business, if it is not better policy, than to advance against the road with a $5,000,000 mortgage ahead of us the sum of $3,251,000. Is that policy not preferable to the one advocated by the hon. member for Rouville?

I believe the hon. member for Rouville wants to be fair. I do not think that he saw when he was arguing that it would take the money that he said it would. What would become of it according to his own argument? As a matter of fact it would not take that money because we do not propose to invest $10,000,000. These are the figures of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, it would never pay this country, and it would never be business, to make a loan on this Quebec and Saguenay railway and have that loan subject to the mortgage indebtedness that is now against it when we have the other alternative of getting the line for $4,019,000. I appeal to the business sense of the members of this House if it is not better to take over this road at a cost to this country of $4,019,000 than to advance money into the hands of these people—the Quebec and Saguenay Railway Company—and take a lien against it subject to a charge of $5,000,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: As we are now in the dying days of the session, I think it might be well that we should try to come to a perfectly solid basis for discussion of this very important question, because a great many of the arguments which have been presented are irrelevant and unfounded in fact. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Meighen) has stated that these three railways which are to be acquired by the Government, and which are to be made part of the Government Railway system, will assist 100,000 people. He is altogether in error as to that. Take first the Lotbinière and Megantic railway. That railway extends from the St. Lawrence up to the Grand Trunk in the county of Megantic. Some hon. gentleman stated, I think the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget), that the county of Megantic would be assisted by this road. The county of Megantic has a population of about 20,000 souls, but this road is of no use at all to that county. The people of Lyster, which is at the extremity of the county, going to Montreal and Quebec, are better served by the Grand Trunk than they will be by this railway. This railway would be useful to part of the population of Lotbinière, a small number; but, as far as that goes, I do not object that it should be made part of the Government system. Now, we come to the other side of the river. The two railways on the north shore, the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix and the Quebec and Saguenay, will serve part of the population of the county of Quebec, perhaps 20,000, and of the county of Charlevoix, perhaps 20,000. The line will be of no assistance whatever to the people of Chicoutimi and Saguenay unless it is extended from Murray Bay to the Saguenay river. Then, of course, it will be of some

use to the people of that district; but otherwise I do not think it will serve anybody. An argument which has been presented here, and which has struck me as having force, is that there are in that part of the country people who are amongst the oldest settlers in the country, and who have no railway communication at all. But the railway will not serve the purpose which I heard mentioned yesterday by the hon. Acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid), who said that it would develop agriculture in that part of the country. It cannot be developed more than it is. The country is mountainous, but it is pretty well settled now. It might develop the lumbering industry somewhat, but I doubt if the lumbering or any other industry would be better served than it is served at the present time by the river. But people, in these modern days, want to have railway communication, and the people here have been for a long time led to believe they would have railway communication. They have been deceived in that expectation.

It is very unfortunate for the people of that locality that the company has found itself unable to complete the enterprise. I do not know the circumstances very well, but it was not for lack of funds, because according to the statement made by the Acting Minister of Railways yesterday, the company had expended upon that part of the railway between Quebec and Saguenay a little over $5,000,000. The distance from St. Joachim to Murray Bay is about 62 miles, and from Murray Bay to Nairn Falls about 6 miles; say 70 miles altogether. Surely $5,000,000 was ample with which to complete a railway of this character. I know the locality very well, and it is not a difficult country to build through, except in one part when you come to Cap Tourmente. The rest of the road is perfectly level, and where that obtains railway construction is always easy. Labour was also at hand and there were no obstacles of any kind. So, in my estimation, the company had ample means with which to complete the road, but they have failed to do so. I do not want to be severe or to pass judgment. I only know that the people of that locality for want of the company extending this railway, are without communication for the greater part of the year. The usefulness of the railway has been recognized by all Governments. The Dominion Government subsidized it in the ordinary way to the extent of $6,400 a mile, and the Quebec Government also gave subsidies to a large amount; I do not know the precise amount, but I understand it was fairly generous. With all this assistance the company should have been able to construct the road and have it in operation to-day. But it has not done so. However, the people must not suffer; I admit that. I am prepared to take a generous view of this business and give the assistance to which the people in that part of the country are entitled. It is true we are living in strenuous times, and that perhaps now is not the most propitious time we could choose; it is true also that we should be as careful as possible about launching into new enterprises. Unfortunately, this is not a new enterprise, and for my part I should like to see it completed.

But I should like to know why the Government are proceeding in this way. Last year they introduced a Bill for the acquisition of branch lines. Why do they not proceed under that Bill to acquire the roads in question? Why are they changing their mode of procedure? The present method is full of difficulties. Let me read what the Bill says:

1. The Governor in Council may authorize and empower the Minister of Railways and Canals to acquire, under the provisions of an Act to amend the Government Railways Act and to authorize the purchase of certain railways, chapter sixteen of the statutes of 1915, and upon such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve, the railways described in the schedule hereto, together with such equipment, appurtenances and properties used in connection with such railways as the Governor in Council may deem necessary for the operation thereof.

2. The consideration to be paid for each of the said railways and for any equipment, appurtenances and properties that may be acquired as aforesaid shall be the value thereof as determined by the Exchequer Court of Canada.

The price is to be determined by the Exchequer Court. It may be $1,000,000, $2,000,000 or $4,000,000, whatever the judge decides. So far, so good. Then the money is to be paid to whom? The price so fixed by the Exchequer Court is to be paid by the Governor in Council to parties who are not even mentioned here. If we pass this Bill everything is uncertain; we are parting absolutely with all control of the money, we do not know what the price will be, to whom it will be paid or how it will be paid. Once this Bill is passed we shall have no say whatever. Now this is a matter of some importance. Let me now read the amendment which has been proposed by the minister:

Said value to be the actual cost of said railways less depreciation, but not to exceed $4,-

465,000 exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all $2,500,000.

We know that on the Quebec and Saguenay road there is outstanding bonded indebtedness to the amount of $4,480,000; that is a fact. We also know that upon the Quebec and Montmorency there are certain bonds outstanding, but just to what amount I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: $2,500,000.

Sir WILFIID LAURIER: That is nearly $7,000,000 altogether. The bonds of the Quebec and Montmorency railway are not listed. As stated by the hon. member for Charlevoix, they are in the hands of wealthy owners in Quebec, who, I am sure, will not part with them for less than 100 cents on the dollar; I think they are worth that too. But not so with regard to the bonds that are outstanding of the Quebec and Saguenay railway. Those to-day are quoted at 70. We are to take the road free of all indebtedness; all the bonds are to be wiped out, and we are to pay to the company who owns the road $4,465,000. That, as I understand it, is the price we are to pay the company. In addition to that, we are to pay the bonded indebtedness, but not to exceed $2,500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The $2,500,000 is intended to lie still against the Montmorency and Charlevoix railway only; the other is to be cleared entirely; and, of course, the money for the purchase price must go to these bondholders.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I quoted that simply to show how unsatisfactory the Bill is. It is "intended" to do this, that and the other thing; whereas if you had proceeded under the Bill of last year the agreement would have been down in black and white, and we should have known exactly where we were. But under this procedure everything is at the discretion of the Governor in Council, and I submit that that is not the way. My hon. friend the Solicitor General had a good deal to say last year on the Bill for the acquisition of branch lines. That Bill provided that the contract should first be made by the Minister of Railways, authorized by the Governor in Council, and then brought to Parliament for ratification.

Why do not you follow this practice this year? Why ask Parliament to vest in the Government so much power as will give them control over the whole matter? The best way to have the question looked into and properly disposed of is under the terms of last year's statute. The Government has come to the conclusion, and I find no serious objection raised to it on the part of anybody, that the situation is such that we must come to the rescue of the people who are served by this railway. But the fairest way, the only way, to dispose of a matter which is already so much complicated, is under the terms of the Bill passed last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not in mind the clause to which the right hon. gentleman refers, under which the contract must come back to the House for ratification. I do not deny that it may be there. But, speaking without very careful thought on that phase of the subject, I would say that, inasmuch as this Bill provides that we may acquire this road under the statute of last year, we are not relieved from any of the obligations imposed upon us by this statute. So, if this statute provides that such a contract must be ratified by Parliament, then we shall be obliged to come to Parliament for that purpose. We do not ask for more authority. We thought—in our innocence—that we were really limiting rather than extending our powers by this Bill. We wished to acquire the road under the statute of 1915, and under whatever obligations and limitations are provided by that statute. Our desire was to still further limit ourselves by providing that we are not permitted to pay any price until it is not only voted by Parliament, but ratified by the Exchequer Court on a fixed basis.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—values fixed by Exchequer Court:

Mr. REID: I wish to move that this clause be amended by adding the following words:

Said value to be the actual cost of said railways less depreciation, but not to exceed $4,465,000 exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all $2,500,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In answer to what has been stated by the hon. Solicitor General, that the money has to be voted by Parliament, I submit to my hon. friend that Parliament would not be free to refuse to vote the money, because this Bill binds Parliament. We refer the matter to the Exchequer Court, but only on the question of price. If Parliament were to go back

upon the price so made, and refuse to pay, that would be a repudiation of a contract.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot see that Parliament's hands would be tied in the slightest, any more than they already are tied by the statute of 1915. Under that Act the agreement is made by the Government with the railway concerned, and the money must subsequently be voted or the agreement falls. The mere fact that on arriving at the price the assistance of the Exchequer Court is asked in no way ties the hands of Parliament or adds to its obligations to vote the money. The obligations are the same—no more and no less.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No. Let me read the statute of the last year:

> Provided further that no contract for the construction of a line of railway exceeding twenty-five miles in length shall be entered into or the purchase price of any such railway or other work be paid until after a sum of money for the purpose has been appropriated by Parliament.

In that case you take your appropriation and then you make your contract; but here you make your contract and then provide for the appropriation. I submit very seriously to my hon. friend that if he would agree that the matter be referred to Parliament, he would remove a good deal of my objection. Let it be provided that this contract shall be subject to ratification of Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am speaking solely for myself and without consultation, but I will say this: If it is in the Act of last year, I am very strongly of the opinion that it is necessary and that it will be done. I do not feel any doubt about it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why not provide to make it clear?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will after eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 102, for the relief of Martha Isabella Kenny.—Mr. Nickle.

Bill No. 103, for the relief of William Thomas Craig.—Mr. Pardee.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS SMALL CLAIMS ACT AMENDMENT.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate to acquaint this House that the Senate doth not insist on its amendment made to Bill No. 91, an Act to amend the Government Railways Small Claims Act, to which the House of Commons hath disagreed.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY AND LOTBINIERE AND MEGANTIC RAILWAYS.

ACQUISITION OF BRANCH LINES.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 101, to authorize the acquisition of lines of railway between the city of Quebec and Nairn Falls and between Lyster and St. Jean des Chaillons; Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

On section 2—values fixed by Exchequer Court:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just before six o'clock I understood the leader of the Opposition to intimate that under chapter 16 of the statutes of 1915, under which, with the additional clauses that are inserted, it is proposed to acquire the railways in question, we would be obligated to come to Parliament later for ratification of the agreement that we might enter into with the owners of these railways for the purchase. He asked whether, if that were the case, we would come back to Parliament later with the agreement that we would make in this case. My reply to him was that, while I did not recollect such a clause being in the Act of 1915, I felt that, as we were proposing to act under the authority of that statute, we would be subject to all its obligations, and that if that were one of those obligations, we would be subject to it. I promised to let the committee know at eight o'clock. I find, however, upon reference to the statute, that, if I understood the right hon. gentleman aright, there is no such clause. The statute of 1915 provides that we may acquire roads by purchase or by expropriation, gives certain powers to and imposes certain obligations upon the minister and makes certain conditions. Among the conditions is this: No purchase shall be complete until the money is voted by Parliament for the purpose. But there is no provision to the effect that the agreement so made, embodying such terms and conditions as it may embody, must afterwards be ratified by any special act or

action of this Parliament. We are in just the same position now. We come to Parliament with this Bill; we propose to acquire by this Bill certain railways, the acquiring to be done under the provisions of the statute of 1915. We shall be obligated by all the provisions of that statute; but there is no provision that we should come back to Parliament with our agreement, whatever the agreement might be. We do, of course, have to come to Parliament for the appropriation, and we shall have to come to Parliament for the appropriation in this case just as in the other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The clause to which I referred is in these words:

> Provided further that no contract for the construction of a line of railway exceeding 25 miles in length shall be entered into or the purchase price of any such railway or other work be paid until after a sum of money for the purpose has been appropriated by Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That applies in this case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am not sure that it applies in this case. You depart from the statute. If you had proceeded under the statute the Minister of Railways should have made an agreement with the company for the purchase of that road, and then you would have to come to Parliament. But here, as I understand the Bill, the contract is complete the moment this Bill becomes law. There are two conditions—the fixing of the price, which is left to the Exchequer Court, and the application of the price so determined. When these two conditions shall have been fulfilled, in my judgment this Paliament will have lost all its control. Of course, the money will not be paid until it has been appropraited by Parliament; but when this Act has been passed, when the court, acting under this legislation, has fixed a price, would it be within the power of this Parliament not to make the appropriation? This would be a contract binding upon Parliament, and that is why I say that we should provide here that in any case the contract which is to be made, the application of the money, and all the conditions of the purchase should be referred to Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The right hon. gentleman said that under our Bill we have two conditions to be fulfilled, and he apprehends that these will be all we need to fulfill. Well, I do not know that I could limit them to two. Certainly one condition is very essential: that the price must be ratified by the Exchequer Court.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Must be fixed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Must be fixed by the Exchequer Court. And necessarily there will be conditions, as to the purchase, because certain matters in respect to power and the possibility of competing lines, etc., have to be taken care of in the interest of the country, and these conditions are especially provided for in this Bill. But, none the less, all the provisions and all the conditions that are in chapter 16 of the statutes of 1915 are binding upon us; there is no doubt about that. The condition as to the precedent of a vote by Parliament is just as binding in respect of this purchase as in respect of any purchase or acquirement under the Act of 1915—just as binding, but not more binding. There is nothing in the statute of 1915 as to when the appropriation shall be made by Parliament; but it must antecede the going into effect of the acquiring contract. The same is true here: the appropriation by Parliament, whatever it may be, must antecede the going into effect of the acquiring contract. We are under all the obligations of the Act of 1915 and the additional obligations of this Act. The obligations of the Act of 1915 apply with exactly the same, and no more, effect to this acquirement as to any other acquirement under that Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Before this Bill passes I want to enter my protest against this measure. I have not hitherto participated in the discussion, chiefly because I was not very well acquainted with the facts. I have been listening to the discussion last night and this afternoon, and have learned something with regard to the proposal, and I think that I would not be doing my duty to my constituents if I did not place myself on record as opposed to it. The condition of our finances in Canada is becoming alarming. Everyone will admit that we are face to face with a very large expenditure. The appropriations already made in connection with the war, and the enormous expenditures in which we shall have to share, that are now being incurred in Europe for war materials and for other purposes in carrying on the war, will probably, at the end of the present year, amount to at least one billion dollars. The interest on

this enormous sum will exhaust more than one half the current revenue of this country; and, in the face of these enormous expenditures that are confronting us, it appears to me to be most reckless for the Government to embark upon an expenditure of this kind. The credit of the country will be affected by the liabilities that we are incurring during the present session. Our credit is not as good now as it was three or four years ago. The little province of Nova Scotia is able to-day to secure money in the United States at a lower rate of interest than the Dominion of Canada. That was not the case five years ago, but it is the case to-day, showing you that the way in which we are embarking on these extravagant liabilities is affecting the credit of this Dominion to a very alarming extent. One would suppose that the liabilities that are being incurred at the present time would have acted as a check upon the Government in regard to incurring further liabilities; but during the present session our proposed capital expenditure amounts, if I remember rightly, to somewhere in the neighbourhood of $50,000,000. That is an enormous amount to add to our liabilities in one year, altogether independently of the war. That strikes me as unjustifiable and as endangering the future credit of the country. In my own constituency, when railroad extension was asked for, the Minister of Railways told me that it was impossible to do anything in that part of Canada at the present time, owing to the fact that the Minister of Finance was unable to provide the funds. He said that if the Finance Minister could provide the funds there would be no question at all about going on with that very necessary expenditure. This was the answer he gave me.

Mr. Sinclair: I understand that the minister says he would build these branch lines this year if the Minister of Finance could furnish the money.

Mr. Reid: I said that while the war was on I would not ask for money for this railway.

I was satisfied with that reason, because the war is on and we are incurring enormous expenditures in connection with it. I intended to explain that to my constituents, and I felt that it was a fair explanation. But what am I to say now? Am I to go back and tell them that since this statement was made to me by the acting Minister of Railways, he has asked this House to vote $15,000,000 for the Canadian Northern railway, $8,000,000 for the Grand Trunk Pacific, and is involving us to-day in a liability which it is estimated will amount in the end to about $10,000,000? The large appropriations to the Canadian Northern railway and to the Grand Trunk Pacific can be justified on national grounds. It may be said that these are great national undertakings and that they must be kept up. I see the force of that argument. But that argument does not apply to the railways that we are proposing to take over under this agreement. I fear that we shall not be able to accept the sincerity of the acting Minister of Railways, who assured me that the only reason why he refused to entertain any further railway extension in the province of Nova Scotia was that there was no money available for that purpose. The minister should explain why he discriminates in this way between one province and another. The statement has been made by the Solicitor General that this railway will accommodate some 30,000 people. The railway that was proposed in eastern Nova Scotia, to which I am referring, would have accommodated more than 30,000 people. It is estimated that it would accommodate about 40,000 people, and it could be built for about one-quarter of the expenditure we are proposing to make in connection with this railway.

The Prime Minister himself gave a promise some few years ago that that railway to which I am referring would be built. I would expect the Prime Minister, before embarking on a wild scheme of this kind, to think of the pledges he had given in my constituency. Those pledges ought to be kept. I fear, Sir, that the true reason is not a public reason. The true reason dates back to the election of 1911. My hon. friend from Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget), as every one knows, was a very prominent supporter of this Government in that election. He came back after September, 1911, to this House with quite a number of scalps in his belt, and now the people of Canada are expected to pay this very large price for his services on that occasion. I have heard that several men have been claiming the leadership of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. At one time we were told it was Mr. Bourassa; another time Mr. Armand Lavergne claimed that honour, and the Secretary of State (Mr. Patenaude) has also been named in connection with it. But I think we may say that the real chief of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec, the one who has stood behind that party and who has brought its members here, is my hon. friend from Charlevoix. $10,000,000 is a very large

price to pay for about 20 Nationalists who support the Government in this House. That is about half a million dollars apiece that the people of Canada are asked to pay for their services. The Prime Minister himself will admit that half a million dollars is a very large price to pay for a Nationalist.

In the other Chamber a discussion took place a few days ago in regard to the war, and an hon. gentleman there, who has been very prominent in connection with this scheme of the Quebec and Saguenay railway, made a speech in which he condemned the Government for spending so much money in connection with recruiting and the war.

He said it would be far better to put the money in the Quebec and Saguenay railway than to spend it in assisting the Empire in this war. I thought that that was a very impertinent proposal when I read it in the Hansard of the other chamber, but it never entered my mind that within two or three weeks the Government would accept the advice of that hon. gentleman and do what he told them to do with the public money. If we were building railways, I could make a great many comparisons showing the necessity for railway extension in other parts of Canada; that is, if we were building railways in the public interest. But, as we are paying political debts with this appropriation, and not building railways at all, it would not be worth while to enter into any discussion as to what might be done with this $10,000,000 in other directions. Comparisons would be useless in face of the fact that we are all aware that this money is not being given in the public interest, but for the purpose of settling an old score with my hon. friend on the other side who is so prominent in this matter. My purpose in rising was to place myself on record against this measure, and to enter my protest against this measure, which I regard as the most unjustifiable proposal that was ever made in the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. GIRARD: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before the Bill carries I wish to give my opinion on the matter now being discussed and reply to my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), who has registered a protest against the measure now before this House.

I want to place on record that I am in favour of the Government proposal regarding the Quebec and Saguenay railway.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

I understand that the subsidizing of that road dates back to a period previous to the advent of this Government. Many years ago subsidies were voted, but conditions became such that the work had to be delayed for a time. It must be said that the enterprise was launched in proper time, but there came a stringency which resulted in the work being suspended.

I am free to state that the hon. member from Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget), who is a man of note in the province of Quebec, a French Canadian who has reached a foremost place in the world of finance, has undoubtedly helped in a great measure the development of the province of Quebec by different schemes, some of which he has himself launched, and others which he has promoted with all the energy for which he is noted. But if this proposal anent the Quebec and Saguenay railway is before this House it cannot be said to be in recognition of political services rendered, because the question had been agitated long before this Government came into power. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Charlevoix had undertaken, in common with people from the city of Quebec, to put through this railway scheme in order to help the people of Charlevoix, who are cut off during winter from the rest of the world on account of their particular situation. Furthermore, the idea was to show that it was possible to secure a winter port on the coast of the province of Quebec as elsewhere in Canada. That is the point I especially want to make. Is the scheme nothing but a dream, or is it feasible? This Government, by their policy incorporated in the Bill now before the House, have solved the question.

That policy was entered into by the late Government, and the present Administration now seeks the means to carry it out. Should this great undertaking materialize it will open up for the province of Quebec immense commercial possibilities.

Some hon. gentlemen, during this debate, have raised doubts as to the possibility of winter navigation on the St. Lawrence. I will not deny any of my fellow-members the right of giving their opinions on that point, but I have the honour to represent a constituency part of which, the Saguenay district, is deeply interested in that road, because that district extends over the whole north shore from Tadoussac to Belle-Isle.

I know that seven years ago the Department of Marine had a special survey made of the ice situation on the St. Lawrence be-

tween Belle-Isle and Murray Bay, on the north shore, and Cape Race and river Quelle, on the south shore, in order to determine the possibility of winter navigation on the St. Lawrence. The survey was continued the next winter, and demonstrated clearly—the report is on file at the Department of Marine—that for 98 per cent of the season the north channel is open, because during winter the prevailing wind blows from the north, and, of course, drives the ice against the south shore. I have not to-night the official reports here, but anyone can see them at the Department of Marine.

For a century previous to the last twenty-five or thirty years the fishermen of the north shore, in small wooden schooners, more or less seaworthy, used to make their way every winter through the ice floes of the St. Lawrence in search of the sea-wolf; they came back with a fair catch and without ever an accident. At that time the price of oil made the venture a paying one. But twenty-five or thirty years ago, I think I said, oil so dropped in price that the fishermen, who could no more make a living out of it, quit that pursuit, which was reputed dangerous. In the last few years the price of oil rose up considerably, and the fishermen put to sea again after the sea-wolf.

This morning I had a letter from one of the leading men of Sept-Iles, stating that the fishermen had just returned to the village, after a three-months' cruise through the St. Lawrence floes, with a catch of 35,000 sea wolves, without having encountered the least danger; the trip means a haul worth about $200,000.

When the poor fishermen—I mean no disparagement—with their meagre means, can encounter in the gulf the dangers of the ice floes the best part of the winter to earn their living and their families' without any loss of life or vessel, is there not sufficient reason for this Government to introduce a Bill with the aim of solving the important problem of winter navigation on the St. Lawrence? True it is these are war times, but the war will not be everlasting, at least so we hope, and when the end comes we have reason to hope that Canadian trade and industry will spring into renewed life; should not, therefore, the Government get ready to meet the new conditions that will arise?

For my part, that is the main motive underlying the Government's policy to-day. They are not paying any debt of gratitude to the hon. member for Charlevoix; his worth is well known, and requires no tribute from me. We are face to face with a problem which concerns the future of the province of Quebec, which is of the utmost importance, and which will be solved by the Government measure now before the House. Therefore I will vote for the measure.

Doubts have been raised as to the possibility of a winter sea port on the St. Lawrence. Let us see. At St. Catherine's bay, the proposed terminus of the Quebec and Saguenay railway, the Government has subsidized for the last twelve years a small wooden steamer, which plies regularly twice a day between Tadoussac and St. Catherine's bay, without the service ever suffering any accidents or delays. This same boat has, moreover, taken successful trips, four to eight per month, from Tadoussac to Fraserville, on the south shore, a distance of thirty miles. At that point, the crossing being further east, is considered more difficult than the crossing between Murray bay and river Ouelle.

Every one knows that the straits of Belle Isle are open all winter. The surveying party I have spoken of have reported that the northwest channel, in the Belle Isle straits, are always open to navigation. Now, if account is taken of the additional protection afforded by the vessels, and different points along the coast being provided with the wireless, thus providing telegraphic communications with the Government line on the north shore, it will be understood that at any time the captains of vessels can always be warned of the presence of ice floes and be given information as to the state of the channel; in that way all possible safety is insured.

As a result of the enactment of this Bill the city of Quebec will become, through the contemplated railway, a winter terminus, which, compared with other Canadian winter ports, will shorten the distance to Europe by several hundred miles, to the general benefit of the country, and especially to the benefit of the city of Quebec, the capital of my province, and a subject of pride to all French Canadians.

Those considerations demonstrate the unfairness of the suggestions made here, and spread throughout the country by party organs that the only object of the Government is to be kind to its political friends and reward the hon. member for Charlevoix for services rendered. The Administration's sole purpose is to do justice by Quebec and

to build new roads, shorter and easier roads, for the large trade that Canada may expect after the war. I must congratulate the Government on the courage it has shown, at the present juncture, in having had the courage to put through this undertaking.

If the Quebec and Saguenay railway were a mere convenience for the people of Quebec and Charlevoix, the scheme might be open to objection, but the terminus at St. Catherine's gives it national importance for Canadian trade. The Government's policy looks to the whole country and is nothing if not national. All those reasons should secure its acceptance without further discussion.

I noticed that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has departed from the position taken by some of his followers, and appears to favour the project. I congratulate him on his stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If I understood the remarks of the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) rightly, he said that he knows that it is the intention of the Government immediately to extend that road to St. Catherines bay on the Saguenay river. If I did not understand him correctly, then I can be corrected; but I certainly understood him to say that.

Mr. REID: I certainly did not understand it in that way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then, do I understand that the Government has no such intention?

Mr. REID: Certainly not; we have no such intention.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am afraid I am in the same box as the acting Minister of Railways, in not being able to follow very closely the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay; but I take it for granted that he was not criticising the railway policy of the late Government.

In those days we remembered his association with that party and his love and fidelity to the Laurier Government. If anybody was to receive consideration with regard to this railway, as has been hinted by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), when considerations were being passed around, I would not be surprised if the hon. member for Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) heard something about it. I understand that in the latter days of the last election he saw a great light, and that all of a sudden the things that were beautiful and strong and good became everything that was dark and dreary and forbidding. Posters and manifestos setting forth his real and true heart up to election day were immediately scored off, and a new proposition was submitted to the people of the county. If the hon. gentleman who is supposed to be leader, and whom my hon. friend from Guysborough referred as the leader, of the Nationalist party, has made any proposition to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, I would ask him to be cautious, to carry out this part of the deal, if deal it be, on the instalment plan, and to be pretty careful about his sinking fund, because this hon. gentleman will not stay bought.

With that preliminary information, I simply wish to put myself on record, like my hon. friend from Guysborough, in regard to this railway. The right hon. the Prime Minister knows better than any other hon. gentleman sitting on that side of the House our attitude towards railway building in eastern Canada, particularly in Nova Scotia. During the years 1908-9-10-11 the then leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister, and the members from eastern Nova Scotia, were pulling on the same oar for the purpose of getting railway extensions in that part of Nova Scotia. We succeeded in 1911 in having an amount of money granted by this Parliament for the purpose of certain railway extensions in that province. Everybody from Nova Scotia was satisfied, and things went along first rate. The moneys were voted for Victoria, the county which I have the honour to represent, the county of Halifax, represented by the then leader of the Opposition, and the counties of Pictou and Guysborough, represented by the hon. gentlemen who represent them to-day. But what a change has taken place in the policy of the right hon. gentleman in regard to the building of railways! I have on several occasions taunted the Prime Minister with having built his own railway and having left us out. I think he should have built the railways in Guysborough, Pictou and Victoria, because we were all pulling together, and I suppose the fact that he was pulling with us helped to get the Government of that day, the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to commit themselves to the policy of building these roads. Without repeating that charge too often, I submit that when one of the roads went on, the road in Halifax county from Dean Settlement to Dartmouth, they

all should have been placed in the same category and dealt with in the same way. However, matters have gone otherwise. In 1912, 1913 and so on, we were told that it was only a matter of a short time when the same policy would be carried out in the other counties. In the county of Victoria, the gentleman who ran against me in 1911, the candidate of my right hon. friend, and those who were supporting him, said: Do not vote for Mackenzie, because it would procure this railway; but defeat Mackenzie and defeat the Government and the road will be built all the same. The Conservatives in Victoria believed that, stood to their guns and voted for that gentleman. But they have discovered since that the promises made to them were not carried out by the Government and party which they supported. I, and other gentlemen, have been told during the last two years that proposals of this kind could not be carried forward because the finances of the country could not stand it on account of war conditions. That is a fair proposition, that is something that we can tell our people and the people can understand. The Government have found it necessary to put extraordinary taxation on the poor people of this country, taxes that they can ill afford to pay. We might very well understand that new enterprises would be allowed to stand until we were better off than we are to-day. But this is a new proposition. There was never a word of this railway during the later years of the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I never heard the Prime Minister, when he was leader of the Opposition, or any of his friends from Quebec, or any other part of Canada, put this forward or mention this road as a scheme that we might look forward to as a part of the railway system of Canada. There was never one word about it.

Now, it is most extraordinary that railways which were expecting to receive consideration years ago, and for which moneys were voted unanimously by both sides of this House, are passed over, forgotten and neglected, and a new proposition altogether is brought forward which is going to involve an expenditure of some $10,000,000. When an expenditure of this kind is proposed, it gives colour to the statements made by my hon. friend from Guysborough. It looks as if some sinster motive, some reason more urgent than the building of an ordinary piece of road, were behind it, when the Prime Minister and his Government break away from a line of policy that they have laid out for themselves in the last two or three years and come in asking for an expenditure of this kind. I can only tell the people of Victoria that the Government of the day and the Prime Minister broke faith with them, that they did not carry out their promise to them, and that other people were stronger in the affections and regard of the Prime Minister than they are, for some reason unexplainable to me except that which was set forth by my hon. friend from Guysborough. Whether it is true or not, I suppose we shall not be able to find out; but there is no other satisfactory reason. This reason having been given, I am content to leave it there until some more satisfactory one is afforded. We have for the past few years been leaving public works in different parts of Nova Scotia idle and dormant, and no progress has been made.

We were not asking for them to be built, because we were told there was no money. I am sure I am within the mark when I say that there are dozens of places in the county I have the honour to represent where an expenditure of public money is more needed, and would be more in the general interests of Canada than the expenditures which the Government are making to-day, not only in connection with railways, but other public works. But we have been silent because we thought the Government did not have the money and were in earnest when they said that nothing could be done, as all our energies and all our finances had to be concentrated on the main purpose, the winning of the war. It looks now as if the poor people were to be taxed not only for the war, but for other purposes that were never mentioned when the war taxes were imposed, and when explanations were given in that connection not only by the Prime Minister, but by the Minister of Finance.

My purpose in rising was to protest against the Government going on with a work of this character when other undertakings of a like character which had the inside track, so to speak, and which were spoken of long before there was ever a word said about this road, were more urgently needed. I submit that when anything of this character is undertaken by the Government the question of going on with all these other branches should be considered at the same time. They should all be dealt with under the same policy, so that all sections of eastern Canada where railway extensions of this kind are neces-

sary should receive the same consideration and at the same time. I am not saying that these people in Quebec should not have this railway; I am not saying anything about that; I assume that they should have it. But not a whit more do they require railway facilities, not as much indeed, as the people in the county of Victoria who live, not thirty or forty, but some places over a hundred and twenty miles away from a railway, and in which county are some of the oldest settlements in America. After I have been pressing hard to get these people a road, and when I had hopes at one time that all the provisions were made and that the road was at hand, you will pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I feel disappointed now that I see we have been passed over, and other places not a bit more deserving receiving the consideration which is given by this Bill and by the vote which it involves.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The right hon. the Prime Minister was not in his seat this afternoon when I was speaking on this Bill. Of course, I understand that he is very busy and cannot be here every moment; but now that he is here I wish to make an appeal to him, for I look on him as a friend of France. I stated very briefly this afternoon that I opposed the Government in acquiring the line from Lyster to St. Jean des Chaillons and the line from Quebec to St. Joachim, but upheld the aid to the line from St. Joachim to Nairn Falls, as I thought it would be better to do something towards the completion of that road. However, the Government has decided to acquire these lines, and the Acting Minister of Railways has stated that the bondholders will be paid at par for their holdings. I asked whether the bondholders in France, who had sold their bonds at below par, would be allowed the difference between the price they sold at and what they had originally paid, and the answer was in the negative. The reason why I insist upon the right hon. gentleman taking a favourable view of this question is this: as I stated this afternoon, and as was confirmed by the hon. member for Charlevoix, nearly all the money for the construction of that section of the line from St. Joachim, in the county of Montmorency, to Nairn Falls, was obtained in the French financial market. The hon. member for Charlevoix stated this afternoon that $1,000,000 odd had been subscribed in Canada, and $4,600,000 in the French market. To be accurate, I must state that the bonds were sold at 82. Later on, when the French bondholders got discouraged at the failure of the company, they were induced to sell their bonds at a low figure; this was not denied. These bonds were bought up by a Canadian group of financiers, and, if I understand the situation correctly, this group will be paid the face value of the bonds which they secured at so low a figure. The reason why the Canadian Government should view with favour the suggestion I make is this—and I direct the attention of the right hon. gentleman particularly to this: first of all, we are the allies of France, and we must play fair in our financial dealings with them; secondly, this money was secured after some very alluring prospectuses had been issued on the French market; nobody will deny that. Among the names that appeared on one prospectus was that of an ex-member of this Government, the late Postmaster General, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier. It is true that after a while his name disappeared from the prospectus because he found it inconsistent with his position as a minister of the Crown to figure in any financial venture in a foreign market. Among the inducements which were held out to French investors, they were told, for instance—and it was quite an inducement—that this line of railway would run not merely to Nairn Falls, or even to St. Catherine's bay, but as far as Cape St. Charles, on the Labrador coast.

This was a great inducement; for they were told that the ocean trip between Europe and Canada would be greatly shortened; that in three days at most the steamers would cross the ocean and would reach the terminus of this railway. All this, stated in the prospectus, no doubt did much to influence French investors to put their money into this enterprise. Another inducement which certainly had its effect in getting money from the French investor is to be found in the statement of the assets and the revenue of the company, which was published broadcast. It was stated that a subsidy of $400,000 would be paid by the Dominion Government, and that the land subsidy from the provincial Government was valued at $840,000. As to the revenues of the road, it was stated that 160,000 passengers would be carried at $1 per passenger, giving an annual revenue of $160,000. It was stated also that the road would command freight traffic to the amount of 420,000 tons, yielding a revenue of $630,000. The expenditure was represented to be only

$528,000, leaving a net profit for the investors of $264,000. Now, I quite understand that this was only a calculation made by the Canadian promotors. But here is where the Government, it seems to me, is morally responsible for the inducements offered to the French investor.

Mr. REID: That is, the Quebec Government?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No.

Mr. REID: Yes, they were granting so many acres and also $3,000 a mile.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the hon. gentleman say that this inducement was given by the Quebec Government?

Mr. REID: I say they were to give 180,000 acres of land and $3,000 a mile.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Quebec land subsidy was valued at $840,000 and the Ottawa subsidy was represented at $400,000.

Mr. REID: And the Quebec Government gave $3,000 a mile besides the land.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No, only a land subsidy.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Both statements are true. The land subsidy was valued at $840,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But it was a land subsidy, not a money subsidy.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: A land subsidy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where the federal Government is perhaps still more responsible is in this, that besides these assets which were advertised broadcast, it was stated that a postal subsidy of $50,000 would be paid by the Dominion Government. So, the French investors were led to believe that there would be a total net revenue of $314,000. I have here a copy of the prospectus; the date of the issue is not given.

Now, bearing these facts in mind, it seems to me that, as the Government has now decided to acquire the railway and to pay the bondholders the face value of the bonds, those who advanced the money to build that section of the road which is being taken over by the Government, those who were discouraged because the enterprise failed and were induced to sell their bonds—

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Induced by whom?

Mr. LEMIEUX: They were induced by the Canadian group.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: No.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How do you explain the fact that a Defence Committee was appointed in Paris in order to protect these bondholders when an offer was made to them of $60 for bonds which, the hon. member for Charlevoix stated, cost them $82 four or five years ago? They sold at a low figure because they were discouraged. They saw that the enterprise had failed, and they thought they might as well take the sum offered them instead of keeping their bonds. I appeal to the right hon. Prime Minister as a friend of France. We are all proud of the fact that last year he was honoured by the French Government, being made Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour. I believe he would not remain silent knowing that the French bondholders would lose, when they were really the people who put the money into the enterprise. My hon. friend from Charlevoix has stated that the French investors put into that road more than $4,000,000. If the Government is going to redeem these bonds at face value, and if the Exchequer Court is going to adjust all these questions of value, it seems to me that the bona fide bondholders should be recouped the difference between what they paid and what they sold for.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: A bond is payable to bearer. Suppose that Mr. Smith had a bond, and sold it, by what means are you going now to find out Mr. Smith? What proof would be required that Mr. Smith held this bond and ought to be recouped for the difference between the price at which he bought and the price at which he sold? Would you take his word?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would not take his word. But there are means of finding out who are the bona fide bondholders. The first French investors were induced to invest by the representations that were made to them. I do not qualify these representations, but I have stated some of them; they were told that this road would reach Cape Charles on the Labrador coast; also that it would have subsidies from both Governments; also—which was not a fact, I am informed—that the Dominion Government would give a mail subsidy of $50,000. On the representations made they invested their good money in a Canadian enterprise which is to-day absorbed by the Government. I say that we should find out who were the real builders of the road by virtue of the money which they invested in it for its construction, and see that they are not made to lose in the enterprise. With two scratches of your pen, Mr. Chairman, you could insert in the Bill such an

amendment as would give a Judge of the Exchequer Court the right to determine who are the real bondholders and what amount should be paid to them for the difference between what they really paid in at the beginning of the enterprise and what they were induced to sell for when they got discouraged. It may not seem business-like—I see that the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) smiles. I can assure him, however, that in my judgment this proposed action is nothing more than honesty. Here are people who, upon the inducements offered, have disbursed $4,600,000 to build a Canadian railroad which will belong to the Canadian people. Let the Canadian Government pay them what they have disbursed; it seems to me that that is only fair.

Mr. MORPHY: These gentlemen were business men, I understand. They sold their bonds on the open market; they parted with their securities. They had the money, invested it, lived on it ever since. It would be ridiculous that they should come back now after some years and ask to be recouped when they dealt with their own money, on their own responsibility and in their own way.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is true that they have parted with their securities, but at a very low figure.

Mr. MORPHY: They were of age; they were business men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They were of age, but can any Government worthy of its name and reputation honestly make the answer made by the hon. gentleman, knowing what representations were made to these French investors? They were told that this little bit of a road from St. Joachim to Nairn Falls was practically another transcontinental railway; that it would run as far as Cape Charles on the Labrador coast. It was on the assumption that this road would be built that they invested their money. I must say that it is not the first time that that has happened. We have heard the history of the Chignecto railway; I do not know whether the member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) has heard of that scheme. I suppose that every year the right hon. gentleman sees a ghost in the person of a certain gentleman who represents the bondholders of the Chignecto Ship railway, who has been waiting very patiently for the last thirty or thirty-five years. The English people of that day were induced to invest their money in that scheme; the scheme fell through and the investors lost their money. In the present instance the amount involved is, perhaps, not so large, yet it represents a considerable sum, and it seems to me, now that the Government is referring the whole matter to the Exchequer Court, that means should be taken to recoup the French investors to the extent of the total sum that they disbursed in this case. It is not fair that their good money should go to the speculators who bought these securities knowing that some day the Government would take over the road.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is hardly necessary to appeal to any one in Canada on the score of the relations between our Empire and France at the present time. We all know that these relations are of the warmest character, and we are giving very good evidence of that in this country through the splendid expeditionary force which is fighting for the liberties of France as well as for those of the Empire in the battle-line at the front at the present time. When my hon. friend suggests that we should enter into some inquiry with a view of making good to all persons who have become interested in the bonds of this railway the amount that they may have originally invested, he asks the Government to embark upon a proposal that would have very far-reaching consequences. On various occasions when I have visited Great Britain during the past ten or twelve years I found people over there who had invested in some enterprise in Canada which had not proved remunerative. Many of these persons would have been glad to get even 10 cents on the dollar in respect of some of the enterprises into which they had put their money. I have no doubt that my hon. friend himself can look back and see in the course of his career some investments made by him in respect of which he would be very glad to get 10 or 25 cents on the dollar to-day. If a paternal Government would come to his assistance and make that good, I have no doubt that he would be very much gratified; but he could hardly expect it. This road runs through an old, long-settled community which is shut out from all communication with the world for five or six months of the year. The late Administration gave this enterprise its sanction and its imprimatur by granting it a subsidy. The Legislature of Quebec did the same thing

under the condition that the enterprise should be somewhat greater than that which we have now under consideration, and should extend to a point farther down the coast. A great deal of money was invested in the construction of the road, and for the last three or four years all the money so invested has lain absolutely idle. More than that, the work which it represents has been deteriorating from year to year. So that the prospect of having the enterprise, as originally proposed, completed for the benefit of those people, has seemed to be getting farther and farther away. The late Administration or this Administration would no doubt have been very glad if those who had invested their money in the enterprise in the first instance, when they realized that there was not enough money to finish it, had undertaken the burden of completing it, taking the chance of saving their money to the fullest extent by making it a success. But there was no disposition of that kind. There has been no attempt on the part of bondholders, so far as I am aware, to raise money for the purpose of completing the road, and it has been in the condition which I have described from year to year. Under the circumstance, it did not seem desirable in the interests either of the district or of the whole country that an enterprise of this kind, designed to serve a very considerable community in a district which had been settled so long, should be almost nine-tenths completed and remain in that condition for a number of years to come. We were not prepared to embark upon the proposal which my hon. friend suggests, which would have involved a great deal more money, perhaps twice as much as we are proposing to expend. My hon. friend observes the reception which our more modest proposal has had from some of his friends on that side of the House We were not prepared to embark upon that plan; but we were prepared to propose to the House that what might be called the reasonable value of the road should be paid, and that the road should be completed and made to serve the purpose for which it was originally designed by the late Administration when it subsidized the road and by the Government of the province of Quebec when it extended aid. The proposal which we make to the House is in effect that the reasonable value of the road, a certain sum of money not exceeding the amount named in the Bill, should be paid for the road, and that in determining that sum the cost of the road and subsequent depreciation should be taken into consideration.

I regret that we could not go to the extent that the hon. member for Rouville suggests. The proposal which the Government has submitted to the House is designed, on the one hand, to do justice, so far as justice can be done, to those who are the holders of the securities, by paying the reasonable value of the road, and, on the other hand, to carry out the proposal as it was first sanctioned by Parliament, involving the completion of this line in order that it may serve the purpose for which it was originally intended. That, in a word, is the proposal of the Government, and it is one, which, it seems to me, ought to command the approval of hon. members. I do not wish the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie), to imagine that the interests of the communities to which they have referred have been overlooked or will be forgotten. This enterprise stands in this position. It had been sanctioned by the late Administration; it had been subsidized, it had been endowed with a subsidy by the Provincial Government, and a very large sum of money had been expended upon it. Yet the road was lying as an uncompleted affair, of absolutely no use to any person in the world in the condition in which it has been during the past three years. More than that, it was deteriorating all the time by the action of the elements, making it worth less and less each year. For these reasons the Government, while it would have greatly preferred that the persons interested in the road should come forward and undertake the additional burden necessary to complete it and make it a success, nevertheless, seeing that that apparently could not be done thought Parliament should interpose in the way now proposed by this Bill and should complete a road which has been lying almost completed for three or four years.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am glad to hear the Prime Minister say that the basis on which the amount to be paid will be fixed will be the reasonable value of the road. I was somewhat misled by hearing members say that the basis was to be the expenditure that had been made, up to a certain amount. But if it is to be the reasonable value of the road, that is a very different matter. I have been puzzled over the enormous amount expended on the road, according to the hon. member for Charlevoix, who informs us that $4,600,000 was received from

the French investors and that Canadian investors put $1,500,000 into the enterprise. That makes $6,100,000.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I think my hon. friend is not taking into consideration the fact that the bonds were not sold at anything like par.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At 82.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend says they realized 82; so that the amount actually available for the road was very much less.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I do not know the amount of the subsidy. The subsidies were not included in the amount put in by Canadian investors, and would probably make up the difference. If that is correct, the enormous amount of $98,000 a mile was expended in the construction of this road. Even if you take off the discount on the bonds, you will find that the expenditure is still $85,000 per mile, which is an extravagant expenditure for the amount of work that seems to have been done. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway cost only about $100,000 a mile at the very outside, with interest to date and everything. There we have a completed road, one of the finest grades in the world, with stations, heavy steel and all the appliances of a completed enterprise. Here we find that almost the same amount per mile has been expended on 62 miles of road; and what have we got? Only seven miles of it have rails, inferior rails at that; the rest of it is a track through the woods, with no bridges, no grades, no rails, no sleepers, no stations. Where did all of this enormous amount go? I think some hon. gentleman opposite should give the committee some explanation in regard to the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: I forgot to point out that I think the sending of this to the Exchequer Court is not a very good way to arrive at the price. We all know that judges are honourable men and desirous of doing the very best they can; but, while a judge may be a good lawyer, he is not a railroad man. As a rule, he knows nothing about the construction of railways, nothing about engineering, and, taking it all in all, it is a fair proposition to say that judges are not railway men. I cannot understand why a railroad, particularly one of this kind that is in a half-finished condition, and one that has been allowed to deteriorate for the last few years, with the embankments wearing away, should be submitted to a judge for valuation. Where the railroad was raised to grade level some years ago, no doubt these grades have washed away; and I am sure I am right when I say that no part of that road is up to grade now. I know something about the grading of a railway, and I am sure that a railroad, particularly on an embankment, that was graded four years ago and since then has been subject to the upheavals of frost and the action of weather, etc., is nothing like up to grade. I venture to say it is in very poor condition. We are going to ask a judge to take into consideration all these things which appertain particularly to the judgment of a railway man. I would suggest that the Railway Department, with any assistance they might wish to obtain, would be far more capable than a judge sitting alone to determine the proper value of this road. I submit further that human nature is human nature. Who are the two sides to this controversy about this road's value? Who are fighting it out? We have the Prime Minister and his colleagues fighting their friends. They have clearly come to the assistance of their friends in this case. They are willing to give them money to help them out.

Are they going to fight them very vigorously when they get before the man who is to name the amount? I have seen these trials before. I have seen judges with the very best intentions trying to arrive at the true value of lands taken for right of way when politicians were concerned in the value of the lands, and when it was impossible for the judge to get evidence because nobody would give it; nobody was anxious to cut down the value of the land. Those representing the Government were anxious that the politicians who owned that land should get big value for it, and no witnesses were put on the stand at all. This House should have the strongest assurance that this action, for action it is, will be properly defined and placed before the judge, and that the issues, in one form or another, will be fought out. We should have the assurance that this matter is to be fought out the same as if the party who is going to get the money were not a friend and supporter of the Government.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: So far as ascertaining the value is concerned, the evidence of experts must, of course, be given. If the Government undertook to fix the value themselves, my hon. friend realizes, and has indeed said, that their estimate would

depend on the valuation of persons who are familiar with such matters. Members of a government could not personally undertake to value such a road. In arriving at the value the Judge of the Exchequer Court will have to depend, I suppose, on testimony of the same kind. The hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria says he would prefer to have the Minister of Railways and Canals fix the value. We thought it would be fairer and more reasonable, under all the circumstances, that a Judge of the Exchequer Court should fix it. That is very frequently done by a government, even in cases where the value is less difficult of determination than in the present case. For example, one of the latest acts of the late Administration was to pass an Order in Council by which certain land in the suburbs of Calgary, belonging to the Northwest Mounted Police, should be transferred to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The Government did not undertake to fix the value themselves; they directed that it should be referred to the Exchequer Court of Canada for valuation. Unfortunately, they had overlooked the fact that the Exchequer Court of Canada had no jurisdiction to do anything of the kind, and so we had to take the matter up at a somewhat later date. The only way in which the matter could be worked out was to appoint one of the Exchequer Court judges as arbitrator for the purpose of estimating the value, and that course was taken. We agreed with our predecessors that it was better that the value should be fixed by a judge of the Exchequer Court as valuator than that the Government should attempt to determine it themselves. There was the question of prospective value and considerations of that character, which it would have been unfortunate, probably, for the Government to determine; and so in this case. I think there are considerations connected with the value of the road and the reasonable price to be paid for it which, under the circumstances, might better be determined by a judicial inquiry than by the Government themselves.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I agree with my hon. friend that the tribunal of the Exchequer Court would be a very good one to determine the value if that question were left to the judge of the Exchequer Court. But it is not. If my right hon. friend will look at the amendment he will see that the judge of the Exchequer Court has not a word to say about the value. He is simply to take the cost, and, so long as the cost does not exceed $6,849,000, he is bound to allow it under the statute. That obligation is imposed on the judge; there is not the slightest discretion left to him to determine the value. To my mind, it is the most extraordinary proceeding which I have ever seen taken. Parliament purports to leave to the Exchequer Court the fixing of the value, and then tells the judge of the Exchequer Court how he is to fix the value—that he is to take the cost, whether it is twice or three times the value of the property, and be governed by that cost provided it does not exceed a certain amount. Section 2, as amended, would read as follows:

> The consideration to be paid for each of the said railways and for any equipment, appurtenances and properties that may be acquired as aforesaid shall be the value thereof as determined by the Exchequer Court of Canada.

That would have been all right if the section had been left there. That would have met the view which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has presented to the committee, as affording a good reason why the judge of the Exchequer Court should be appointed to deal with the matter. But the amendment proposed by the Acting Minister of Railways ties the hands of the judge of the Exchequer Court in this manner:

> The said value to be the actual cost of said railways, less subsidies and less depreciation, but not to exceed $4,349,000 exclusive of outstanding bonded indebtedness, which is to be assumed by the Government, but not to exceed in all $2,500,000.

My right hon. friend will see that if the total cost, less depreciation and less subsidies, does not exceed $6,849,000, the judge of the Exchequer Court must allow this company that amount of money even although, in his own opinion, the value of the road is not one-third of that amount. That is the objection which I see to this amendment. The very first thing to do—no doubt it was the first thing which the Minister of Railways thought of doing when the proposition was made by this company to sell these railroads to the Government—was to refer the matter to the General Manager of Government Railways; and it is a very singular fact that there is no recommendation of the general manager in respect to the taking over of these three roads. But the matter was referred by him, evidently at once, to his chief engineer, and the chief engineer, Mr. Beckwith, made an examination of these three lines of rail-

way. The structural value of what is called the Quebec and Montmorency line, that is the line which is in operation, is put at $1,115,200, and that includes the terminals, equipment, the whole completed railway. That is the value which is fixed by the Government's own engineer. My hon. friend will find it on page 6 of the report made by Mr. Beckwith to Mr. Brown, the Chief Engineer of Government Railways at Moncton. But I understand that that line is bonded for $2,500,000, and, presumably, that is the cost which the company will be able to show to the judge of the Exchequer Court.

Then, if we take the Quebec and Saguenay part, the engineer in his report, which was submitted to the Government by Mr. Brown, the Chief Engineer of Government Railways, puts the total value of that property at $2,813,500.

There we get the valuation of these two principal roads, made by the engineering department of the Government railways at a little over $3,928,000. Then, if you take the small road on the south side of the St. Lawrence, the statement of the engineer is that the fair cost would be $466,000, of which subsidies were received to the extent of $240,000, leaving $220,000 as the money which was put into the road. If you take the total cost of $466,000, you have about $4,300,000 as being the value of these three lines of railway, or as being the amount of money which it would cost to construct them when this report was made in 1915. Yet this amendment requires the judge of the Exchequer Court to allow these companies, not what the engineering department says they are worth, but if it is shown that they have cost that much, the judge is bound to allow them $6,949,000, or $2,600,000 more than the engineering department of the Government railways declares these roads are worth. This is not proper legislation. Surely the judge of the Exchequer Court ought to be allowed to call witnesses before him and the Government ought to be able to submit evidence. The judge of the Exchequer Court ought to be permitted to allow the companies what these three roads are fairly worth. So far from that being the case, his hands are tied, and if these companies show the judge that the cost may have been $6,949,000, the judge is bound to allow that enormous sum when the roads ought to have cost only what the engineer states. In other words, the judge is not limited to the fair or necessary value or cost, but is bound to allow them $6,949,000 even although that amount is $2,600,000 more than the Government's own engineer says is the value of these three railways.

[Mr. Pugsley.]

On the preamble:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Acting Minister of Railways told us a moment ago that it was not the Government's intention to extend this railway farther than Murray Bay. Is it the intention to at once proceed with the completion of the road?

Mr. REID: Yes, certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: There is no appropriation for it in the Estimates.

Mr. REID: We will provide for that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When—this session?

Mr. REID: Yes, this session.

Bill reported.

On the motion of the third reading:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred again to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend it by providing that any contract made by the Government under this Act shall not be valid and binding until submitted to and ratified by Parliament.

Amendment negatived, on division, motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF SHIPBUILDING.

On the motion for Committee of Supply:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, we are getting near the end of the session, and an important matter has been brought to the attention of Parliament in regard to which I think it would be desirable, in the interest of the country, to know whether the Government have any proposals to make or any policy to announce. I refer to the encouragement of the shipbuilding industry in Canada. I need not go into detail or repeat the many arguments that have been advanced in favour of encouragement being given to the shipbuilding industry.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to allow his observations to await the presence of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), who has been giving the subject a good deal of attention.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have no desire to press it to-night.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand the minister proposes to make some statement in regard to it. However, I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have no desire to proceed to-night, but we do not know how much longer Parliament is going to sit, and I shall not detain the House. My reason for speaking on the subject at all is that I notice that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, speaking at Montreal yesterday, referred to the question of aid to shipbuilding in a manner which I think it would be quite desirable to quote. Any one who reflects for a moment must realize that the time has arrived when Canada must begin to prepare for transportation by the sea. We cannot leave it until another year has gone by. The mercantile marine of the nations of the world is gradually being dimished by the events of the war, and the needs of shipping facilities in Canada are becoming more acute. A year's delay will only make the problem very much more difficult of solution than if some action were taken now before the House prorogues. At the present time we have in operation three transcontinental lines of railway. We boast of our tremendous production of natural products, and look forward with hope and confidence to the time when, after the expenditure on war supplies in Canada has ceased, we shall be able to cope with the conditions that will then present themselves, by reason of the great natural and industrial productions which the country will furnish. But if when that time comes we are without means of transportation by the sea, we shall be at a very great disadvantage indeed. The Government of British Columbia where the situation is very acute on account of the inability to get facilities for the transportation of the lumber products of that province, is trying to solve the problem. I read in the Monetary Times of a few days ago:

> The British Columbia government's measure to aid the building of ships in the province and to subsidize them when completed has just been placed before the legislature for its consideration. The Bill constitutes a shipping credit commission with power to loan money for the construction of ships, to subsidize them after the war is over, when charter prices will not be so high, and to guarantee the bonds of shipbuilding concerns to the extent of 6 per cent. The proposed shipping credit board will be organized on the same principle as the agricultural credit commission.

Among other things it also provides that, after the war, freight rates on these particular vessels shall be no greater from British Columbia ports than the rates charged in the state of Washington. There is also a provision to guarantee 55 per cent of the actual cost of construction and repair of ships. The necessity which has been recognized on the Pacific coast is equally great, if not greater, on the eastern seaboard, because naturally the products of this country east of the Rockies, whether agricultural, mineral or industrial, if exported, must find an outlet through our Atlantic ports. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, speaking at the launching of the ice-breaker from the Canadian Vickers yard, Montreal, yesterday, is reported in the Montreal Daily Star as follows:

> Sir Robert made the announcement that the Canadian Government favoured the subsidizing of shipbuilding in Canada. There would come a time, he said, when the Canadian Vickers, Ltd., would surpass the parent from which it was sprung and when Canada would have a shipbuilding industry equally as great as that in Great Britain.
>
> "I am sure that both political parties are thoroughly in sympathy with that development," said Sir Robert, "and I am absolutely satisfied that both political parties will be willing to pledge themselves to give all reasonable assistance to help bring about that end."

There was a time not so long ago when it was stated and reiterated in this House that the idea of Canada engaging in the manufacture of steel ships was absurd. Without raising in any way the old issue, I am quite sure that any one who will reflect on the subject for a moment will realize that suggestions of that kind are absolutely absurd. It has been proved in the last two years, in respect of munitions of war and other manufactures that we have developed since the war began, that the assertion we on this side of the House made some three years ago to the effect that the Canadian manufacturer and artisan could construct anything that was made by the manufacturer and artisan of any other country, was absolutely correct.

There is no profound mystery in the building of steel ships. It is a legitimate industry, based on the iron and steel industry, and it is because Great Britain had many years start on us in the iron and steel industry that they are able to build ships as they are to-day. When we recall that twenty years ago there was no steel industry in this country that was capable of producing steel ingots, we shall at once realize how it is that Great Britain, which had developed the steel industry thirty years before that time, when we were

in our very infancy, is able to build ships as she is to-day, and manufacture everything else arising out of the iron and steel industry. But to-day Canada has reached the stage where our steel institutions are capable of producing everything that is required in the iron and steel trade. Any one who has made inquiries on the subject knows that the rolling of steel plates in any one of the three or four great steel industries in Canada is just as easy for them to do as to produce steel ingots out of which shells are made, or to make steel rods, or anything else in steel. The steel industry has grown to a wonderful extent in Canada, and a tremendous number of artisans are now employed in developments of that industry. Montreal, for instance, launched an ice-breaker yesterday which had been built in the yards there. Ten submarines were turned out there and went across the Atlantic under their own power last summer and are now fighting on the other side. These facts show that we have passed the preliminary stages, and that the time has now arrived when Canada must develop a steel shipbuilding industry in this country.

The suggestion has been made in some parts of Canada that aid should be given to the building of wooden ships, but with that I do not agree. Modern conditions demand the utilization of steel vessels, more particularly as regards the carriage of freight. Steel ships are very much in advance of the old wooden type, and have many advantages which I need not go into now. I do not propose to elaborate at great length on the manifest necessity of action. The hon. member for St. John and other hon. gentlemen on this side of this House have spoken frequently on this matter since this session began, and I have no doubt the subject is engaging the attention of the Government. I am bringing this matter forward, not in any partisan spirit, but because I regard it as one of the greatest problems the country has to grapple with, and it should be grappled with at the earliest possible moment. Any hon. gentleman in this House, no matter on which side he sits, would be lax in his duty who, realizing the condition that will confront us in the days to come, did not urge on the Government the necessity of immediate action in this matter. I feel that before this House prorogues we should have some assurance from the Government not merely that the matter has received their attention, but that this nation is going to go ahead and provide something in the way of transportation on the sea—something which we absolutely lack at the present time, and which is absolutely essential to the future welfare of our country.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: With respect to the ability of Canada to build steel ships, I am not aware that that ability has been denied in the way that the hon. gentleman has suggested. On the occasion to which he has made allusion there was a comparison of the cost at which steel ships could be built in this country and in Great Britain, and also a comparison of the expedition with which they could be constructed. A country that has a great iron and steel industry, as Canada has, could undoubtedly engage, and must at some time eventually engage—and I hope that in our case it will be in the immediate future—in the construction of steel ships. That industry is undoubtedly associated with many others, the steel industry itself as well as a number of subsidiary industries. The question of transportation is a very important one to Canada, and that points to the desirability, and indeed the necessity, that the industry of building steel ships should grow up in this country. My hon. friend, however, seems to me to confuse two ideas. If I understood him correctly, he confuses the future development of the shipbuilding industry in Canada, and the necessities of Canada, in common with the whole Empire and the whole world, for tonnage at the present time. I have not yet discovered any one in Canada who is prepared to construct steel ships of a considerable size within a period which would probably make them available before the end of this war.

Mr. MACDONALD: But unless they start some time, they will never get them built.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand: but there is something else to be said about that. If you begin the construction of steel ships when the cost is at its highest, and are not sure that you will have these ships available at a time when tonnage is mostly needed, there is room for consideration as to whether the enterprise should be entered upon. At least, it has impressed the members of the Government that way, and I am inclined to think it would impress any hon. hon. gentleman in that way who would give to it much reflection. If we are to build ships when they cost at least double what they would under ordinary conditions, and if, after paying double for them, or subsidizing them to the necessary extent, at a time they are not

to be available when tonnage is most needed, of what advantage would a proposal of that kind be? The want of tonnage has been felt by all nations of the world, more or less, during the past eighteen months. On the whole, however, the arrangements by the Allied nations amongst themselves, particularly by the British Admiralty, have helped the situation a great deal, and I think, on the whole, the available supply of tonnage has done all the work that we could expect it to do. During the past winter I have had occasion to refer to the daily reports sent out by the Department of the Naval Service with respect to Halifax and St. John, and I have found eight, ten, sometimes twelve, transports loading at each of these ports—I think hardly ever fewer than half a dozen—except within recent weeks. So that the supply of tonnage, considering all the conditions imposed by the war, has been better than we could have anticipated, although not all that we could have desired.

10 p.m.

If such action could be taken at once as to insure the delivery of ships at the time when tonnage is most wanted, no one would hesitate very much as to the question of the cost, because the importance of transportation is most imperative at this time, notwithstanding all that I have said as to the arrangements made by the Admiralty. But in what form, one might ask, should that action be taken? The Government itself might embark in the project of constructing ships in Canada. But all that could be constructed in Canada at the present moment, with any possibility of making them available before the conclusion of the war, would not amount to very much in proportion to the needs of the country as a whole. On the other hand, the Government might consider the proposals of corporations or syndicates which have come forward with the idea of building ships if subsidies were granted by the Government. Up to the present time we have not received any proposals of that kind which were of so reasonable a character that we could feel ourselves justified in proceeding with them further.

Then the hon. gentleman speaks as if, when the war is over, the demands for tonnage and the lack of tonnage will be very much as they are at present. I do not speak at all with the authority of an expert, but I think that any of us who desire to apply common sense to the anticipation of conditions as they will then exist must reach one conclusion. Two considerations impress me—doubtless other considerations would impress those who speak with more authority on the subject than I can. One of these is the enormous amount of tonnage now diverted from commercial purposes which will be released and will be then available for commercial purposes. That will take place within a very measurable period after the conclusion of the war. In the next place, the world's demand for tonnage will, I suppose, be reduced also by the termination of the war, for the reason that an enormous quantity of stores and enormous numbers of troops must now be transported for the purposes of the war, and such purposes take precedence over all others. With the conclusion of the war there will, for a time, be less work, I should think, for the tonnage of the world to do. So that, looking at it in that way, you will have a much greater amount of tonnage available, and on the other hand, I suppose, you will be confronted with a smaller demand than confronts the nations of the world at present. So it is not absolutely clear that there will be a dearth of tonnage when the war is over—although the considerations that have to be taken into account are so vast, so intricate and complicated in their character that one, speaking with as little authority as I do on the subject, would not venture a very confident prediction. This, in one sense, is beside the really important question the hon. gentleman has raised.

Leaving out other considerations, I agree with the view the hon. gentleman has put forward, that Canada ought to be a country in which the business of building steel ships will be carried on. We have the material for it, and we can soon train our men, I think, to undertake the work. In the past the difficulty has been the cost. Some four or five years ago I met delegations of the shipbuilders of Canada and discussed the subject with them. There has always been the suggestion of a tonnage subsidy. About eight or nine years ago, I think, I asked them frankly to give me a statement as to whether or not they could name any period within which the industry could be made self-sustaining, so that after that we might expect the business of building ships in Canada to be carried on without any tonnage subsidy. I cannot recall that on either of those occasions they were able to give me a definite statement on that point, which I regarded as a somewhat

important one. There is this to be said in that connection: the impression which I got from those with whom I discussed this subject upon the occasion of a visit to several shipyards in Great Britain four years ago next summer—I discussed it with a great many of the leading shipbuilders—was that the cost of building ships in Great Britain and the cost of building them in Canada would yearly tend to approximate. One very experienced man with whom I discussed the subject told me he believed that within twenty years at the outside the cost of building steel ships in Canada would be approximately the same as the cost of building them in Great Britain. If that opinion could be relied upon, it would afford an answer to the question which I put to some of the shipbuilders of Canada on the occasions to which I have alluded. However, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been giving the subject very careful attention, and I am under the impression that he expected to make some statement to Parliament before the conclusion of the present session. He is chairman of the subcommittee of Council, which has been devoting a good deal of attention to the subject, and I hope that on some other occasion before we prorogue he may be able to speak at greater length and in more detail than I have been able to do to-night, as I was not aware that the hon. member for Pictou intended to bring the subject to the attention of the House to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am not sure whether my right hon. friend is aware of the fact that the Minister of Trade and Commerce did make quite an exhaustive statement.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: How long ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY: About a week ago.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It was since then.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I regret to say that while his statement was a very interesting one, it looked forward rather to what might be done in the somewhat distant future than to some measure designed to meet the present necessities. I am very sorry indeed that my right hon. friend has been able to see so many difficulties in the way of encouraging shipbuilding. Apparently he is not able, at the present time at all events, to present to the House any policy which the Government is prepared to adopt. It has been stated, I think by the Minister of Trade and Commerce,that one or two gentlemen have been asked for the figures which they would regard as satisfactory for the building of ships—I think he was referring more particularly to wooden ships. But I think the best procedure would be to determine upon a policy; to determine whether or not they would give bonuses, and then let it be known publicly so that the people would be in a position to take advantage of it. The Prime Minister states that in consequence of the high prices of materials and of the uncertainty as to how long the war will last, it might not be very good policy to do what would be necessary to ensure the building of steel ships at present. Well, Sir, we have heard a good deal as to the probability that the war will last only a short period. The Minister of Finance stated not long ago, to my astonishment, that when the war broke out it was thought that it would not last more than three or four months.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I said that it was thought by some, or by many.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The way the minister made the statement would rather imply that that view was entertained by some in whose judgment he had confidence, because he was putting it forward as a statement of opinion which had been greatly disappointed by the subsequent results. Having regard to the great preparations which had been made by our enemies for many years, one might reasonably expect that the war would last for a considerable period. I think, however, that in the matter of shipbuilding and everything else connected with our part in the war, we ought to proceed upon the theory that the war may last not for one year or for three years, but for five years, and if the war should come to an end at an earlier period, we shall all be thankful. I say that we ought to make preparations ahead and do everything that is necessary to enable Canada to do her part, no matter how long the war may last. My right hon. friend has truly stated that owing to arrangements which had been made by the British Government with this Government, there has been no undue complaint in the matter of transportation, or, rather that the conditions have not been as bad as they might have been. That is very true, although the cost of transportation has increased from 800 to 1,000 per cent beyond what it was when the war broke out. But it must be remembered that ships are getting scarcer every week, every day almost. The submarine menace is a very great menace to shipping, and British ship-

ping is feeling the effect of that menace. Ships are becoming scarcer and the question of transportation is becoming more difficult day by day. Canada should look at the matter in this light; not that the time will come, but that the time may come when in the interests of Canada and in the interests of the Empire there will be absolute need of having greater ocean tonnage than we shall have if Canada does not do her part in the providing of transportation. Suppose we do pay out hundreds of thousands of dollars more than might be necessary if the war should come to an end quickly. Suppose the amount should even run into millions; if in that way Canada is better able to supply the Empire with her needs in the way of foodstuffs, it will be money well expended; nobody will regret it. I do not want to find fault, but we have lost very nearly two years of time upon this important question. It does seem to me—and I say this in all sincerity and all kindness—that when this war broke out the Government ought to have anticipated the very state of affairs which exists to-day. A condition of war between England and her Allies and a strong resourceful enemy such as Germany and her Allies must necessarily exhaust the resources of the Empire. Knowing, as everyone knows, that the submarines would be effective in the destruction of shipping, we ought to have anticipated that the ocean tonnage would become scarcer as the months went by. But let us not criticise too much as to the inaction of the Government in the past. Let the Government, if it is at all possible, take hold of the question now and submit its policy to Parliament and the country. I venture to say that if a broad, liberal policy of assistance is laid down it will be found that the people of Canada are resourceful enough to take advantage of the opportunity afforded them and will engage upon the building not of steel vessels only, but of wooden vessels, which would prove of enormous advantage and would be fairly profitable for a good many years to come. Canada was once one of the greatest shipbuilding and shipowning countries in the world, if not the greatest of these in proportion to her population. Ships built by our own mechanics were found upon every sea, and performed a great part in the carrying trade of the world.

I believe that, were reasonable encouragement given, we would be able, in a comparatively few months, to have in Canada a large number of wooden vessels which would be capable of doing a great deal in the way of transportation. In addition to giving aid by way of reasonable bonuses, the Government should assist the ship builders to provide auxiliary powers for wooden sailing vessels by admitting machinery, the most modern engines for use as auxiliary power, free of duty into Canada. This would prove of great assistance, because the duty which has to be paid on this machinery is very heavy, and proves a serious burden upon the ship builder. I have quite recently received a great many telegrams from gentlemen who believe that wooden ship building ought to be encouraged, and that if it were encouraged it could be made very successful. I have talked with people who are interested in the subject, and I do believe that if the Government would come down with its policy, if it was a reasonable policy so far as giving assistance by way of bonuses and the admission into Canada, free of duty, of machinery of a class not made in Canada, we would very soon see shipyards established upon both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts, upon the Gulf, and upon the Great lakes; and that before many months rolled by we would find a large number of vessels upon the stocks. It would not be many months before Canada would be able to do her part and a very creditable part, in the transportation business of the Empire.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.): I wish to say just a word or two on this matter, and to join my voice with those of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in urging upon the Government the desirability of giving some aid to shipbuilding. It is a very vital matter with us on the Pacific seaboard, particularly since the war; although I may say that the shortage of tonnage was felt on that coast even before the war commenced. As the gentlemen of the House are undoubtedly aware the interests of the province of British Columbia are very vitally bound up with the prosperity of the lumber trade. The great difficulty with the lumber trade there is to get overseas tonnage. There is no doubt that probably the finest stand of timber left in the world is found within the confines of the province of British Columbia. The difficulty we find there is that nearly all the ships that are in the lumber-carrying trade are under charter, and that the charters are controlled by San Francisco interests, which, naturally, send them to their own lumber mills on Puget Sound, with the result that our mills stand idle on

account of the difficulty of getting tonnage for the export trade.

I find that the Government of British Columbia has, within the last few days, brought down a Bill in the Legislature for the very purpose of aiding the shipbuilding business. The contemplation is, I think, largely to build wooden ships out of good British Columbia timber. We have demonstrated beyond question that ocean-going vessels of the very finest kind can be built out of timber on the coast.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. BARNARD: The idea is to get the people interested in the lumber business to contribute timber for the building of the ships, and to take payment for it in stock in the ships. I may say that I received a copy of this Bill only to-day, and I have not yet had an opportunity of perusing it with any great care; but the main idea of it is that a commission is to be appointed which will give loans to persons building ships, to the extent of 55 per cent of the value of the ship, the balance of the loan to be guaranteed on very stringent conditions as to operation, etc. The Bill also provides for a subsidy, or loan, to shipbuilding plants, of 55 per cent of the value of the plant. The total amount the province proposes to set aside for this purpose is some $2,000,000, and with that it is hoped to build up a home-carrying trade. The conditions of the subsidy are that the ships must return to a British Columbia port to re-load. It seems to me that if the Government could see its way to further this policy in some direction it would be of great benefit not only to my friends in the Maritime Provinces, but very much more even to us on the Pacific coast, and for my part I would be very glad, indeed, to see some action taken along these lines.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I have listened with great interest to my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Barnard). I quite agree with him that this industry is of the greatest importance to that province. It will be impossible to develop the lumber industry of British Columbia and the coal-mining industry of that great province without transportation facilities on the sea. My hon. friend, along with his colleagues, form a solid representation from the province of British Columbia supporting this Government. They have been here now for several years. This question has been discussed in this House year after year, yet nothing has been done. If my hon. friend has to go home at the end of the session without the Government having done anything at all in regard to this important question I fear it will be felt in the province of British Columbia that the influence of my hon. friend and his colleagues from that province is not felt as it should be by the present Government.

I take a very special interest in this question, coming, as I do, from a province by the sea, a province that has a great interest in the shipbuilding industry. And I am glad to inform the House that while we are talking here in regard to this matter, and doing nothing more than talking, in the town where I live an enterprising firm is laying a yard, preparing to build a steel steamer, and is starting the industry. That is being done, though under a great handicap, owing to the tariff that we have in this country. That, to my mind, is the great difficulty in regard to steel shipbuilding. There is no special difficulty so far as the work is concerned. Any person who visited Montreal yesterday and saw the splendid shipyard of Vickers, Limited, and the fine ship that was launched there on that occasion, could see that the workmen in this country are well able to do that kind of work.

I was sorry that we did not have Lord Churchill, the late First Lord of the Admiralty, yesterday with us in order that he might see that we already have done in this country what he advised the Prime Minister we could not do in fifty years. The foundations were all right; they appeared quite solid, although we were told that there was not on the coast of Canada any place where the foundation could be found solid enough for a shipyard. The cranes were, I doubt not, able to carry the 50 tons weight, although that gentleman said it would be found impossible to have such cranes in Canada. The way the rivets were driven and the general manner in which the ship was built, was a great credit indeed to the workmen of Canada. All those things that we were told by that English Lord could not be done seemed to have been well done. We saw none of those disheartening things that were read to us a few years ago by the Prime Minister of this country, who was cheered by his supporters at the time. These matters are now settled, and we have at least one good shipyard in Canada that has produced ships that

are now being usefully employed in the navy. A fine fleet of mosquito vessels is also being built in that same yard, and everything looks very prosperous indeed, and it looks as if it might grow into a great industry. As I said, the great handicap is the tariff. It costs more to get steel in Canada than it does in Great Britain. It costs more to get engines; and, if you have to import them from the United States, as we might have now to do, the tariff on these engines would be enormous.

As I understand our present tariff, articles that are not made in Canada are admitted free for the construction of a ship. If the plates are not made in Canada, and they are not, they can be imported free for ship construction, but most of the articles that go into the construction of a ship, and they are numberless, are subject to a very high duty, and in that way the Canadian builder starts with a very heavy handicap. If a ship cost about $20 a ton more than on the Clyde you have to pay a dividend on that additional capital, and she has to compete with the ships that are built under free trade conditions in the yards of England. That might be overcome to a large extent in Canada by a rebate, and it is an amazing thing to me that this Government, and the late Government, have not dealt with this question.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Does the hon. member think that that would be sufficient to establish a ship-building industry in Canada?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I fear it would not be sufficient; at the same time there are ships being built in Canada. On the Great Lakes quite a fleet is being built; ships are also being built in a small way, on the Atlantic coast, and, as I have said, they are being built in Montreal. But they are all subject to that very heavy handicap which should not exist at the present time. It does not exist in regard to other manufactures. The manufacturer of agricultural implements who imports steel from the United States for his reaper or his mower, and exports it to a foreign country goes, to the Custom house and gets back, I think, 99 per cent of the duty he has paid. But the shipbuilder gets nothing; he gets no rebate, and that is a condition of things which should not exist, and which might be rectified by an Order in Council. I trust that the Minister of Finance will see that the very next time the Government meets an Order in Council is passed that will enable shipbuilders in Canada to import their material from abroad and give them a rebate. I see no reason why it should not be done, and I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance sees no reason why it should not be done. It would be some encouragement, and everybody will agree that encouragement ought to be given to the shipbuilding industry in a greater degree than to the industry of which I have spoken, because when a ship is complete she has to compete with the whole world for business. If there is any product that ought to have an even chance it is the ship that carries freight on the ocean. If there is any freight to carry in any part of the world, the ship has to compete for it, and all the other ships in the world are competing for it. The brokers in London, New York and other great centres throughout the world know that there is freight to carry from Australia, for example, to London. They are all trying to get it in normal times, and each one is competing against the other. Consequently when you launch a ship on the sea, she has to compete with the whole world for business, and she ought to be free from those charges which make ships so expensive in Canada.

Mr. REID: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but he knows that articles necessary for shipbuilding are on the free list.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The hon. minister was not in the House when I explained that. I think I understand what the tariff is. There are a large number of articles on which no rebate is given. On articles that are produced in Canada, and that go to the construction of ships, there is no rebate. For example, if you produce marine engines in Canada, you cannot import marine engines from the United States and get a rebate.

Mr. REID: The articles are:

> Masts, iron or steel, or parts thereof, and iron or steel beams, angles, sheets, plates, knees and cable chain, for wooden, iron, steel or composite ships and vessels; and iron steel or brass manufactures which, at the time of their importation are of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada, when imported for use in the construction or equipment of ships or vessels, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is what I said; articles that are not manufactured in Canada. Not only the iron and steel, but the paint, bolts, locks, the articles for finishing the inside of ships, and innumer-

able other things, are all subject to heavy duty under the present tariff. Duty must be paid to the Government by the manufacturer if a Canadian is going to embark in the shipbuilding industry, and that must be evened up in some way if the shipbuilder is to have a chance. I hope the Minister of Finance will look into this question and endeavour to deal with it.

There is one phase of the shipbuilding question which I have brought repeatedly to the attention of the present Government, and why it has not been dealt with passes my comprehension. Sailing ships on the eastern coast of Canada are not allowed at the present time to sail further south than 5 degrees north latitude. The most profitable business for the ships at the present time is in South America. There are good freights for the river Plate and for Rio and other ports on the coast of South America, but the coasting vessels of Canada cannot engage in that trade because we have a silly and absurd clause in the shipping law which does not allow a coasting captain to go further south than 5 degrees north latitude. The captain can go as far north as he likes, he can go to the North Pole if he can get there; he can sail in the most dangerous waters in the world, but when he gets in the waters of the sunny south, where the trade winds are and everything is favourable he must stop at 5 degrees north latitude. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has struggled to justify this several times, but he has not been able to tell the House why the Government maintain that regulation in the shipping law. Each session during the last three years, I have introduced a Bill to correct that condition, and to enable the Canadian coasting vessels to earn money by going as far as the river Plate. In old times they went round the Horn. I remember the time very well when the coasting vessels of Nova Scotia went round to California. A coasting captain never had any trouble in navigating; he could go anywhere on the ocean, but in the Marine Department at Ottawa they have the absurd idea that a coasting captain sails along the coast, sees a lighthouse at one point, watches for the next one, and crawls along in that way until he gets to his destination. When these men were examined in the room upstairs, the Marine Department officials could not understand how it was that a coasting captain could cross the gulf of Mexico because there were no lighthouses to guide him. That is the idea entertained in the Marine Department regarding coasting captains. The people who know anything about the matter are laughing at the notions which they have in the Marine Department in regard to that matter. Why should the coasting captains not be allowed to go where the business is profitable? In the whole history of shipbuilding in this country there was never a case of a coasting captain who did not get to his destination. The Deputy Speaker knows that. None of the captains who sailed for any of the ports in the south ever failed to get there because it was too far away. But that is the idea they have in the Marine Department. I have been trying during the last three or four years to get this amendment passed. The Bill now before this House has passed the second reading stage, and it has passed the Marine and Fisheries Committee, but it is at the foot of the list of Bills, and, of course, being a private member, I cannot proceed further unless it is adopted as a Government Bill. If there are any members on the Government benches who take the slightest interest in shipbuilding, or in transportation by sea, I wish they would look up the amendment and ask why it has not been passed into law. It would take only five minutes to pass it. It would be a great relief to the shipping industry of this country, and would mean hundreds of thousands of dollars during the coming year to the people who own coasting vessels.

We like to have vessels sailing under the Canadian flag. We are proud of the Canadian flag and we are fighting to maintain it. But we are driving the coast shipping of this country away from the Canadian flag. Every year a number of vessels that were formerly registered under the Canadian flag and owned by Canadians, are driven outside and forced to seek a home somewhere else in order that they may carry on their business. Some sixty coasting vessels from Nova Scotia are registered in Barbadoes because they could not remain under Canadian register and carry on their business or go to these southern ports. Some are registered in the United States. When American registry was opened no less than fourteen Canadian vessels were registered in a short time in the United States, but when the war came the British Government passed a regulation, and the Canadian Government a similar regulation, that Canadian vessels could not be sold or registered in a foreign country during the war. Consquently, that was stopped. Otherwise many of these vessels

sailing under the Canadian flag would have gone under the American flag. That is the condition in regard to coastal shipping. If there is any one in this Government who takes an interest in this matter I wish he would look into it and try and rectify it. I wish we could have something done in regard to it because this is the most important question that is before the Canadian people to-day. The question of the Quebec and Saguenay railway is a small question compared with this. I have no doubt that the expenditure would be small and that if you had a bounty for the first few years, it would not amount to very much. The money we voted a few minutes ago to a worthless property in Quebec would keep the shipyards of this country busy as far as construction is concerned for the next five years and produce a large number of Canadian ships. That would be something big for the Canadian Government to do. I do not know whether they are big enough to do it or not, but at all events I think it is time the Government formulated some policy that would be a credit to themselves and that would promote this great industry which is so important for the future of Canada.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) has raised the question as to whether this Government is big enough to do anything to encourage the shipbuilding industry. That implies that the Government of which he was a follower for many years was not big enough to do anything, because nothing was done. My hon. friend suggests that a bounty for the encouragement of the shipbuilding industry should be provided. The very item of the tariff to which my hon. friend has drawn attention was either inserted at the instance of the late Government, or remained through its term of office, because it is not a new item. The item that my hon. friend called attention to provides that the materials used in shipbuilding shall be subject to a duty if made in Canada. The object of that provision of the tariff is quite obvious. It is for the purpose of giving Canadian steel and other manufacturers the business of supplying the material which may be used in connection with the building of ships. My hon. friend has suggested that the duty should be removed. Without passing for the present upon the advisability of such action on the part of the Government, I desire to say to my hon. friend that that would not afford sufficient encouragement for the establishment on a large scale of the shipbuilding industry in Canada. My hon. friend, I think, agrees with me in that, because I understand him to say that that would not be sufficient, but that further steps should be taken. This matter can be looked at from two points of view: In the first place, from the standpoint of the desirability of establishing upon a large and permanent scale the shipbuilding industry in this country; and, secondly, from the standpoint of providing for the transportation needs of Canada in addition to the ocean tonnage available for carrying Canadian produce to foreign markets. In so far as that is concerned, it is a very important question. I have given very careful consideration to the question of how to establish on a large and permanent scale in Canada the shipbuilding industry. We have coal, we have steel and iron manufactures, and what would seem to be a desirable adjunct to these great industries would be the shipbuilding industry on a large scale.

It is to be pointed out that in the establishment of an industry like the iron and steel industry, or an industry such as the shipbuilding industry, the usual mode of encouragement is by bounty in the first instance. But it has been demonstrated that a bounty in itself is not sufficient unless it is supplemented by a protective tariff. The iron and steel industry has been built up in this country by the granting of a bounty in the first instance, and by a protective tariff, and there we have the case of an industry which has been established in a large way. But, in so far as the shipbuilding industry is concerned, it does not seem possible to encourage it by a protective duty, because, as I understand the situation—I am not absolutely clear as to this—I am speaking from memory—there seems to be a difficulty under the Merchant Shipping Act in the way of the Government of Canada giving protection in so far as ships are concerned as it has been able to give protection in so far as manufactured products are concerned.

Great Britain has an enormous advantage over Canada in shipbuilding. There is a labour market that gives her an advantage. I mean to say that labour in normal times is cheaper in the United Kingdom, that capital is cheaper, and, besides, that shipbuilding is an old-established industry. By reason of doing an enormous business, doing the shipbuilding of the world, she is able

to observe economies that would not be possible in a new country embarking upon the shipbuilding industry. The United Kingdom possesses that advantage over Canada in the building of ships. That difficulty might be overcome in whole or in part by the granting of a bounty for the protection and encouragement of shipbuilding. My own view would be that such a bounty would have to be one extending over a long period, much longer than has been the case in connection with industries which it is possible to protect by protective duties. Therefore one way of assisting in the establishment of a shipbuilding industry would be by the granting of bounties to get it established, and to maintain it until such period as it would be able to compete with the shipbuilding industry of Great Britain.

There is another aspect of the matter—and I am only referring to these to show that it is a question that cannot be solved without much patient thought and consideration. In the case of the bounties which were given upon iron and steel, it was provided that they should only apply where the iron and steel was sold for domestic consumption and not to iron and steel exported. The reason is obvious. Foreign Governments would have ground to complain if steel and iron upon which a bounty had been granted in the country of manufacture entered into competition with the same products in the country in which they were sold. A countervailing duty in such a case might be imposed by the Government of the country to which such products were exported. Once a ship is built it may be used for home trade or it may be sold abroad. The result is that the granting of a bounty for the encouragement of shipbuilding, while it might build up a large shipbuilding industry, would not necessarily have the effect of ensuring that the ships so built would be available for the purpose of Canadian trade, for they might be sold to ship-owners of the United States or of some other country.

Mr. SINCLAIR: You would not favour any restrictions in that respect?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is a point for consideration, and personally I shall be glad to have any views that will be helpful in the solution of this question. I do not see how it would be possible under the bounty system so to fetter the disposition of a ship after it had been built that it could be ensured that that ship would be available for the purposes of Canadian trade and would not be sold abroad. I am the first to admit that the building up of a great Canadian shipbuilding industry is in itself a desirable object, provided we can secure that by the giving of a reasonable bounty, for it does not seem possible to impose protective duties upon ships trading to Canada.

I have been speaking about the desirability of establishing a shipbuilding industry in normal times. As to the present situation, I have talked with many men who are competent to give advice, and whose opinion is worth having upon this question, and it seems perfectly clear that any ship built at the present time will command a price which will give a handsome profit on the cost of construction. Having regard to the freights that can now be obtained it also seems clear that it would be profitable for any shipbuilder to build a ship at the present time, supposing that the war lasts another year, because the freights that he would earn would largely liquidate the cost of the vessel. But, while what I have stated is correct, it must be borne in mind that at the present time the cost of material is twice or three times as much as normally and there is also a scarcity of labour. For these two reasons shipbuilding is exceedingly expensive. My own view is that if at the present time the shipbuilder is not attracted by the high prices which he could obtain for the ship when built, or by the high freights he could obtain when using the ship, he is not likely to be encouraged to build ships by reason of a bounty only. The bounty would have relation to the establishing of a shipbuilding industry looking to the future. So far as the present is concerned the shipbuilder will be largely governed by his view as to the length of the war. These are two aspects of this exceedingly important question.

I much regret that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in the House to-night, but he was not aware that this subject would be brought up. I think, however, that the Prime Minister has explained that the matter is under consideration by a subcommittee of the Council, and we hope to go into it thoroughly with a view to considering what policy would best encourage the shipbuilding industry in Canada, and tend to increase the tonnage available for the movement of Canadian produce. It seems clear, as the Prime Minister has said, that the two questions are separable. The building of ships is in itself a great national industry. As to the tonnage available for the moving of Canadian products, one does not like to offer a conjecture as to the

length of the war, but unless the war lasts for a much longer period than most expect, it seems hardly probable that any large ships built at the present time would have any appreciable effect in increasing the ocean-going tonnage.

I have offered these observations rather at random. The problem is one which appeals to every member of the House and will undoubtedly engage the best attention of the Government, with a view to the solution of both questions to which I have adverted. As to the question of controlling ships built in Canada, for the purpose of Canadian trade, I was struck by the remarks of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) just now, to the effect that the Government of British Columbia had brought down legislation under which it would make loans up to a certain percentage of the cost of the vessel, and I understood him to say that there were conditions attached to the loan which would ensure that the ship would be available for the carrying of the products of British Columbia. No doubt that legislation had in view the point I touched upon earlier in my remarks, that is, the desirability of coupling the aid with a condition which would make ships subserve the purpose of Canada's export business. I have offered these observations without having given this matter consideration in the expectation that the debate would be brought on to-night; but I can assure the House that the Government is entirely agreed as to the desirability of the establishment of a shipbuilding industry in Canada, and of adding to the fleet which must carry Canadian products to Europe and other countries.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: There is just one observation made by the Minister of Finance which I think should not pass unchallenged. It is difficult for him to make any observations without a political fling; he seems to think that nothing has the proper zest unless it has the leaven of partyism thrown in. He could not say anything about this great national question without a fling at the Liberal party, alleging that they did nothing when they were in power along the line of encouraging the shipping industry. In that I must take issue with the Minister of Finance in the sharpest possible way, and point out to him that the policy of the Liberal Administration was to establish shipbuilding plants in this country of the very best class and on the very largest scale. It is true that the intention of the Liberal party was to encourage and commence the building of warships in this country; but if we were capable of building warships, which are of the highest class of vessels afloat, we certainly should be able to build commercial vessels. Once we had the shipyards and plant in this country it would follow as the night the day that when they were not engaged in the building of war vessels they would give their attention to the building of ships of other classes. In that way the policy of the Liberal Government, if carried out, would of necessity have established first class shipbuilding plants in this country, and not only shipbuilding plants, but drydocks as well. The drydock policy of the former Administration was a well matured policy and would have been carried out in connection with the other. Every prophecy put forward with regard to that policy, and every excuse offered by the present Administration for refusing to carry it out has fallen through. As the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said, it was suggested, for one thing that we had a vacuum under the ground, and so did not know what weight we could safely place upon the land at Montreal, Halifax, St. John or Sydney—that Providence had not propped up the earth enough in Canada to support a shipbuilding plant—I am surprised that the Minister of Finance seems to have been willing to father these excuses.

As to the part of the Dominion from which I come, there was every prospect of a first class shipbuilding plant being built in Sydney, and nothing took it away except the policy of this Government. Had the policy of the Liberal Administration been carried on, there is not a question but that a shipbuilding plant would have been erected in Sydney. We have in this country an enormous shipping of our own. On the coast of Nova Scotia we have a great coal carrying business from Sydney to Montreal. But we cannot keep the Norwegian ships out of the business until we have ships of our own. We have legislation enough on the Statute books to prevent foreign ships from carrying on our coasting trade, but the Government has seen fit to suspend its provisions from time to time by Order in Council because we have not ships to carry on the business. This is not because we have not the men or the material, if they were properly handled. We have in Nova Scotia the finest sailors in the world, and

I assume that on the Pacific coast our men are almost as good as on the Atlantic coast. But we must have something more than a mere wish to see the business carried on. It is quite unnecessary to point out what has been done by wooden ships. The age of wooden ships has not altogether passed away. Since the war broke out wooden ships have been built in Nova Scotia and I think it would be worth while to encourage the building of those ships there unless we are able to carry on the building of a larger class of vessels. Had the policy of the former Government been supported, as it should have been, it would have resulted in a vastly different state of affairs from what we have to-day. There is just one observation of a party character and relating to the Minister of Finance which I wish to make. I am glad we have the hon. gentleman with us this evening. But I presume he was very much occupied during this afternoon, last night and yesterday afternoon when the extraordinary financial proposition was before the House from the consideration of which we have just passed. That was an important measure from the point of view of the country's finances, and I am sure we should have been glad to have heard from the minister upon it. When propositions of that kind are before the House he should be on deck.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Is the hon. gentleman making the statement that I have not been present during the discussion of the Quebec and Saguenay matter?

Mr. McKENZIE: We have not heard the hon. gentleman's voice upon that subject.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Because the Bill was in charge of the Minister of Railways. I was in the House yesterday afternoon, and have been here three or four times to-day. The hon. gentleman is making an absolute mis-statement, and he knows it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know whether it is worth while to take notice of that or not. If the Minister of Finance thinks that that is big enough for him, it is big enough for me. If he thinks that he can stand in his place in this House and say that I am making a false statement and know it, I can only leave it for the Canadian people, who know us both, to say how large we are.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. gentleman made the statement that I was absent from the House last evening and to-day. That statement is incorrect, and I ask him to withdraw it.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. McKENZIE: I have nothing to withdraw. I say the Minister of Finance should have taken part in the discussion of this financial question in connection with a railway. By all means he should have told us where the country was going to get the money, and also how it was going to get value for what it was to give. If he had any knowledge about it, the House was entitled to that knowledge. He did not express an opinion upon the matter, and if he was here it was but for a short time. If he thinks it worth while—

11 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Speaker cannot see what connection there is between the remarks of the hon. member for North Cape Breton and of the Minister of Finance and the subject under discussion. I think it would be better for the hon. gentleman to come back to the consideration of the shipping industry.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am talking of the shipbuilding industry, and also on the motion that Your Honour leave the Chair. I do not know that there is anything else before the Chair, and I think that on that motion I can talk about anything. I like to talk of the Minister of Finance; he makes a good subject, perhaps the best on that side. Although we do not always see eye to eye, yet generally we get along all right. I am so constituted that when I can get a fling at a good, big man, I am tempted to take it.

I say again to the minister that we had a policy which would establish shipbuilding in this country beyond peradventure, and that hon. gentlemen opposite got hold of that policy and tore it to tatters, not having the courage to carry it forward. Hence we have no policy in regard to shipbuilding to-day.

Mr. WILLIAM THOBURN (North Lanark): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion that has taken place with reference to shipbuilding. I must say that if there is any hon. member of this House who should try to dissociate himself from politics when he rises to speak, it is the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) for I have seldom heard him address this House without dealing in pretty bitter partisanship.

In reference to shipbuilding, if I were to make the bold statement that hon. members from the Maritime Provinces do not deserve to have ships built, I think I should be only saying what has been borne out by their own speeches in this House. When

this question was under discussion a few weeks ago hon. gentlemen opposite disagreed among themselves as to the policy under which shipbuilding should take place. One wing of the party opposite wanted ships built under a free trade policy and another wing of the party wanted ships built under a protective policy. What Government under the sun could build ships to suit some hon. gentlemen opposite? As to free trade, of course, all hon. gentlemen opposite are not of the same opinion. The catechism of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. J. G. Turriff), for instance, is one which is based on free-trade wheat, although he knows well that there is no such thing and can be no such thing so far as Canada is concerned as granting free-trade wheat. Then, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) wants ships built under a free-trade policy. The Minister of Customs has told the member for Guysborough that most of the articles of iron and steel that enter into the building of ships are admitted free of duty. In the interests of the great iron and steel industries of Nova Scotia, why should such steel as is manufactured in Nova Scotia be admitted into this country free so long as we have a general policy of protection? Why should we discriminate against that great industry in Nova Scotia, which it has cost the Governments of this country a considerable sum of money to put in its present shape? I ask some hon. gentlemen opposite: What encouragement do they give to Canadian manufacturers to launch out upon new industries? What encouragement was given to Canadian manufacturers when they started to manufacture shells for the protection of our own country? They were derided by hon. gentlemen opposite from one end of the Dominion to the other. How many hon. gentlemen from the lower provinces have engaged in the manufacture of shells or in the manufacture of anything else, for that matter? If they want ships; if they think that the building of ships would be such a great improvement to their own part of the country, why do they not build some? Why do they come to this Government begging them to build ships for them? If it is a profitable industry, why do they not engage in it themselves? The great trouble with many hon. gentlemen opposite is that they preach too much free trade to encourage any men to launch into new enterprises. Nobody feels like investing in a new industry when there is such a strong feeling on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to free trade. Let them drop those ideas and join in with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in devising some scheme to encourage shipbuilding in this country. As the Minister of Finance has said to-night, you could not start to do this in a more unfavourable time than the present on account of the enormous cost of the raw material that enters into the manufacture of ships. I think it is time that some hon. gentlemen on the other side should look at these questions from a different standpoint from that of finding fault with everything the Government does. One hon. gentleman made the statement that if the Government were to come down with a policy designed to encourage the building of ships, their proposals would meet with the hearty approval of hon. gentlemen opposite. I doubt, however, if the Government could frame a policy to build ships or to do anything else, for that matter, that would meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who take a keen interest in the matter of shipbuilding. I am glad to see the subject before the House again, and I hope that the discussion to-night will bear some good fruit. I am sorry to hear the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. William Thoburn) say that members from the Maritime Provinces do not deserve to get shipbuilding down there because in some few details in the matter of shipbuilding we do not agree. Some of us, he says, want ships built under free trade, while others want them built under protection. For my part, I do not care under what system, whether protection or free trade, ships are built; what I say is that this Government should do something to encourage shipbuilding in Canada at the present time. The hon. member for North Lanark says also that we on this side of the House are asking the Government to build ships. We are not asking the Government to build ships; we are asking the Government to do something to encourage the people to take up the business of shipbuilding. This Government and every Government in the past have done something towards encouraging industry in Canada. They encourarge industry by building up a tariff to protect certain manufactures—woollens and that kind of thing.

I suppose the hon. member for North Lanark finds no fault with that.

The time has come when the Government should do something to encourage shipbuilding. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House say that any encouragement which might now be given to shipbuilding would not be well advised as to time, because ships which might be built in the near future could not be used to make up for the lack of shipping resulting from the present scarcity of ships. Let us look for a moment at that phase of the question. There is going to be a great change in this country after the war. In the first place, all those who are at present engaged in the manufacture of munitions will have lost their means of earning a living. Two things will be affected by that. First, labour will be affected; the people who are at present engaged in the manufacture of munitions will have to look elsewhere for work in order to support themselves and their families. Secondly, thousands of returned soldiers will come back to this country, many of whom will be able to take their part in the industrial activities of the country. They will be looking for something to do, and they will have to be placed. Another aspect of the case is that a great deal of our iron and steel is being used in the manufacture of shells. All that will be taken away and our steel makers will have to look elsewhere for a market in Canada. Railway construction will not be carried on in the future on such a large scale as it has been in the past, and there will be no other chance for our steel companies to get a market for their steel.

Taking all these things into consideration, is the time not opportune for this Government to do something, to formulate some plan whereby shipbuilding, steel or wood, would be encouraged? I think it is.

The Minister of Finance has said that, if bounties on shipbuilding were given, they would have to continue for a long period of time. There were people in this country, who, 12 or 14 years ago, thought that the steel industry of this country could not be built up within the space of a quarter of a century, that it would have to be bonussed for that length of time before it could get a standing, first to supply the home market, and then to compete with other countries in the foreign market. That is not correct. The steel industry of this country began to come into boyhood between 1900 and 1902. It had reached such a state in 1910 or 1911 that the Government of this country thought the time was ripe to remove the bounty, and they so acted. The bounties were removed, but the steel industry still flourished to a great extent, except in times of stress.

Sir THOMAS WHITE. At the time the bounties were discontinued there was a protective duty upon steel and iron.

Mr. MACDONALD: Very moderate.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The point I made was that bounties on shipbuilding would have to be continued for an extended period by reason of the fact that it would not be possible to protect the shipbuilding industry by a tariff as in the case of the iron and steel industry.

Mr. CARROLL: When my hon. friend says there was a protective duty on iron and steel in 1910 and 1911, I rather disagree There was a duty, but I do not think he will say it was a protective duty. This Government did undertake to increase that tariff to a considerable extent a few years ago. I venture to say that we have not yet what would be called a protective duty on iron and steel in this country. But, be that as it may, there is no doubt that had it not been for the bounty which the late Government gave on the manufacture of steel in this country, these great industries which has been developed in Ontario and in Nova Scotia in steel-making would not have been as successful as they have shown themselves to be. There were people in those days in my own province who said it would be an impossibility for us to manufacture steel and compete with the great corporations of the United States. Time, and may I say the bounties which were given to these industries in their infancy, have shown that these men were mistaken. I am glad to hear the Minister of Finance say that the Government is giving this question some consideration. I hope that their consideration will have such a result that in a very short time they will have formulated some plan to encourage this industry, which must be a great industry in this country if other industries are to flourish.

Another argument made against encouraging shipbuilding in this country was that in Great Britain shipbuilding was more advantageously carried on than in Canada, I presume from the standpoint of cost. If we pursued that argument we would not be building anything at all in this country;

we would not be building locomotive engines, we would not be manufacturing woollen goods, because I believe there is not one article manufactured in this country to-day that could not be and is not being more advantageously manufactured in Great Britain. I fail to see the strength of the argument that because shipbuilding can be more advantageously performed in Great Britain we should not undertake it in this country. The same argument extends to the manufacture of any other article we can mention. Everybody knows that if we could possibly build ships in Canada to-day it would be a most profitable industry. But let us lay the foundation for shipbuilding in this country, notwithstanding that we are not in normal times. We should lay plans now, if we are to compete in the markets of the world after the war is over; and if we are to take our correct place in commercial business, we must have ships to carry on that business. There are only two ways by which we can get those ships: we must either buy them abroad or build them in this country. Is there a man who calls himself a Canadian who will say that, in the long run, even if he could buy a ship and pay a thousand dollars less than it could be built for in Canada, it would be more profitable to Canada to buy than to lay the foundation of a great shipbuilding industry in this country? I say that, notwithstanding the fact that you can buy them cheaper in England, it is for us here, representing the people of this country, to lay the foundation, to do everything we can to encourage shipbuilding in this country, so that when the war is over, and even before the war is over, we will have something to lay before the capitalists of this country which will encourage them to put their capital, their time, their ability into shipbuilding within the borders of Canada.

I do not discuss this matter from the standpoint of there being a steel and iron industry in my constituency. I do not care, so far as shipbuilding is concerned, whether steel is allowed to come in free or not. I say that, in whatever way we get the steel, it will not affect the question in my mind. I believe that there are some parts used in the manufacture of ships that, notwithstanding the statement made by the Minister of Customs, bear heavy duties. It might be well for the minister to look into that more deeply, and I am sure he will find that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is quite correct in saying that a reduction or abolition of duties on certain materials used in shipbuilding might tend to encourage that business. To my humble way of thinking, there is no better plan for building up this industry, or encouraging our moneyed men in this country to take up this work, than by the method of bounties. I do not think it would hurt the faith of our high protectionist friends, because, after all, bounties are the most logical kind of protection, according to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), who is always right in matters of trade policy. Therefore, I do not think that my hon. friends opposite will be, after all, running away from their policy of high protection if they give a substantial bounty to encourage shipbuilding in this country.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do the Government regard this question of assisting the shipbuilding industry as coming within the purview of the War Measures Act, or as one on which they could take action by reason of the $250,000,000 vote that is given for certain purposes?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Very wide powers are given to the Government under the War Measures Act, sufficiently wide, I think, to enable them to deal with a part of the question, if it should be thought expedient to do so. My hon. friend has asked whether any portion of the war vote would be available. I think it would, provided that the action of the Government was connected with the war or deemed to be a measure taken by reason of the state of hostilities now continuing. But, so far as the matter of granting a bounty is concerned, it would be possible to do it by legislation or by announcement subject to legislation being obtained later. As I stated to my hon. friend, and I think the Prime Minister stated likewise, the matter is under the consideration of the committee of the council, which is charged with the duty of considering the question in all its bearings, that is to say, the bearing it has on the matter of the establishment of a shipbuilding industry, and upon the question of increasing the tonnage available for the carriage of Canadian products.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the chair.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery —to appoint Frederick Cook Assistant King's Printer and Controller of Stationery, at $4,000 per annum, from July 1, 1915, $3,000.

Mr. MACNUTT: The matter to which I wish to refer concerns the collection of duties, and particularly the valuation of the duties as applied. A farmer in my district named Mr. D. J. Lowe, purchased a traction outfit from the Rumely Products Company, a large American manufacturing company, with a branch office in Winnipeg. He had occasion to send for repairs, and he received them with this invoice:

Winnipeg, October 27, 1915.

D. J. Lowe,
Harrowby, Man.

2 Crank pins bushing, at $10 .. .. .. $20 00
6 Cap screws at .10 60
Making a total $20.60.

To that was added $6.18 duty, making a final total of $26.38. It is a small matter, but there is a principle behind it. That figure works out exactly at 30 per cent on the retail price, that is, $6.18 is 30 per cent of $20.60. Mr. Lowe thought there was something wrong, and he wrote to the collector at Winnipeg, and received the following letter in reply:

Winnipeg, November 2, 1915.

D. J. Lowe, Esq.,
Harrowby, Manitoba.

Sir:

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, referring to the duty charged you on babbit bushings, brought in for you by the Rumely Products Company, Winnipeg.

In reply I wish to state it is not the custom of this department to give information regarding transactions between buyer and seller.

I would state however, for your information that the rate of duty on babbit bushings as mentioned, is 15 per cent with 7½ per cent war tax, making a total of 22½ per cent ad valorem.

In the invoice it is 30 per cent. I have received a memorandum, however, from the department as follows:

If these babbit bushings were repairs for a portable engine or a traction engine for farm purposes they would be subject to duty under the general tariff at 20 per cent ad valorem under item 447A and in addition 7½ ad valorem war tax.

That would make 27½ per cent, but that differs from the statement of the collector at Winnipeg. It does not matter whether it is 22½ per cent or 27½ per cent; it is not 30 per cent. Mr. Lowe did not want to have any trouble with the firm in regard to the invoice, but either the duty charged the company was greater than was authorized by this House, or the Rumely Products Company were trying to get money under false pretences. I can hardly see why they should take that course to increase their profits, because they could easily do so by adding to their regular invoice price. On the face of it, it looks as if they had been charged 30 per cent on the retail price of those articles when the outside duty is 27½ per cent, and we would presume that it should be on the factory price. This is a very large company which does a large business. They must get their repairs by the carload, and one would think that the duty would be applied to the factory price. I do not think the Rumely people would lower themselves by charging more than they had to pay, but that is what Mr. Lowe desired to find out, and what I would like to find out from the minister, as evidently the collector would not give any information regarding the matter. I would like to know if the amount of duty stated in the invoice is correct, also upon what basis the valuation is made, and whether it is the habit of officials to apply duties greater than are authorized by this House. I have seen a number of other invoices exactly similar to this, in which the duty was 30 per cent of the retail price. I think the people have enough to pay by way of taxation, and should not be compelled to pay more than is authorized.

Mr. REID: This matter was brought to my attention some time ago, but I did not have the full information to enable me to trace the matter up and get at the facts of the case. Of course, babbit bushings are made from lead, and under item 339 manufactures of lead, not otherwise provided for, the duty is 30 per cent, while under item 447A, the parts for portable engines, boilers and so on, it is 20 per cent with 7½ per cent added as war tax. If these articles were imported as repairs for portable engines or traction engines for farm purposes, they would come under the 20 per cent duty.

Mr. MACNUTT: That is what they were.

Mr. REID: But if they were imported under the other class, that is under the manufactures of lead, the duty would be 30 per cent. The collector of customs at Winnipeg, evidently made a mistake in the reply which he sent. Of course, in the interpretation of the various items, mistakes often do occur, in which case they are remedied. As I understand it, the Rumely Company added 30 per cent to the invoice. The goods were imported by the Rumley Company, and they paid the duty to

the Customs and then invoiced the repairs to Mr. D. J. Lowe, Harrowby, Manitoba. Rumley Bros. are the ones that have put on the invoice the amount of duty they paid. I would suggest that in a case of this kind Mr. Lowe, without reflecting at all upon the Rumleys, could write to the department, or if the hon. member will let me have the invoice on which the 30 per cent was charged, our officials will trace that very entry for the repairs imported by Rumley Bros. and see if the 30 per cent was actually paid. If the Messrs. Rumley paid 30 per cent on these repairs for portable engines, they are entitled to a refund but they may have imported babbit or bushing for some other purpose and paid the 30 per cent. With the invoice, I think our officials will be able to trace this entry and get full information. We will take this matter up at once in the regular way and have it traced up. If a mistake has been made the duty will be refunded. If there is no mistake we will be able to give a full explanation so that Mr. Lowe will be thoroughly satisfied as to the way in which the matter was dealt with. But we will send the information to the hon. member and he can forward it to Mr. Lowe so that he will see that he has given his attention to it.

Mr. MACNUTT: The most important feature is the valuation upon which the duty is applied, that is the retail price at which the article is sold to the customer, whereas it cannot be possible that the department apply the duty, no matter what the article may be, upon the retail price. It must be upon the wholesale price.

Mr. REID: The regulation as to value is this: The duty is paid on the value for home consumption as shown by the invoice at the time the goods are imported into this country. If I understand it, Rumley Bros. went across the line and purchased these things and the price at which he purchased them will be the value for duty even though it may be the retail price. The duty must be paid on the price that is paid for the goods on the American side at the time the goods are purchased and exported into this country. If Rumley Bros. brought in a carload of parts of engines, or any other goods, whatever they paid for them at the time of export is the value for duty.

Mr. MACNUTT: They would have to pay the freight. These repairs came from their own factory, but in reporting them they charged more than the factory price and they would have to add the freight. It does not seem possible that the duty was applied on the Winnipeg retail price.

Mr. REID: No. I can not explain the matter until I get the full facts. I will send a detailed statement to the hon. gentleman's home within the next two or three weeks so that he will thoroughly understand the matter.

Mr. MacNUTT: Thank you.

Mr. TURRIFF: A matter of this kind is a far reaching one. In the three Prairie Provinces the amount paid by the farmers for repairs to machinery will run into many hundreds of thousands of dollars during one season. If it should turn out on the minister's investigation that any company is importing goods and paying duty, as they should, only on the wholesale price, and, when they come to deliver these goods to their customers, charging them—because there is no doubt that the bushings were not brought in as lead—an additional 2½ per cent over what they had paid, and in addition charging them on the retail price, they are taking a very considerable amount more out of the farmers than they are entitled to. If the minister finds that that is the case, I think it should be made known not only to my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt), who brings this matter up, but to farmers generally, so that they may know that they are liable to be overcharged. The matter ought to be looked into.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is absolutely right. It would not only be an injustice to the farmer who is purchasing goods if it should happen to turn out in that way, but it would be an injustice to the Government if these people were charging a higher amount of duty than that which they really paid. Of course, we cannot come to any conclusion until we know what the real facts are. We will take it for granted that everything has been right until we have the facts before us, and then, if there is anything wrong, it will be remedied no matter who is affected.

Mr. VERVILLE: If I understand the procedure, a member can bring almost anything to the attention of the House, and I therefore have a few remarks to offer you on what I regard as a subject of importance. In a letter which I received I have been asked to bring some facts in regard to the city of Montreal to the attention of the

House. The conditions to which I desire to call the attention of the House apply generally throughout the country but more especially in Montreal. I will read a letter, and that will be followed by a report in one of the newspapers which I am also asked to read. The letter is as follows:

Mr. Alphonse Verville, M.P.,
Montreal.

Dear Sir:

Having in mind the fact that prorogation is near at hand, we take the liberty of asking you to bring to the knowledge of the House as soon as possible an article that appeared in the Labour World, of May 13, which is self explanatory.

We are informed that similar circumstances prevail in other centres throughout the Dominion, but are of the opinion that they are more pronounced in the city of Montreal.

In view of the fact that there is considerable agitation in certain quarters to promote conscription, which we consider unnecessary, and to which we are emphatically opposed, we feel that arbitrary action in turning down, for minor causes, those who have shown their willingness to do their bit, cannot but tend to discourage voluntary enlistment, and is of such importance as to merit the most serious consideration of those in authority.

Yours very truly,

J. T. FOSTER,
President.

GUS. FRANCQ,
Secretary.

I might say that this letter is signed by the president and secretary of the Montreal Trades and Labour Council. I want to read this article in order to have it on Hansard, and, as the letter says, it explains itself:

You are "Unfit"—More than 25 p.c. of our recruits are discharged in the Montreal Battalions—What are they aiming at?

Great excitement has been noticed lately amongst the local overseas regiments.

The reason is simple. Many of our volunteers have to pass a second medical examination and the number discharged is considerable. Some battalions have lost as many as twenty per cent, others twenty-five per cent.

Why are these examinations so rigid? At the beginning a young man who did not enlist at once was called a "slacker." If he listens to the persuasive voice of the recruiting officer he puts his name down and to the office he goes. There, despite his modesty, he is stripped naked and closely examined as to his fitness. Not a detail seems to have been overlooked. He is passed. Off he goes to his duties, happy in the idea that he is serving his country and the civilization incident thereto. Finally, after the various stages of routine, he dons khaki, shoulders his rifle, and is ready to die for his home and country.

Dressed in his uniform he attracts the admiration of his friends, his sisters, and sometimes wives, sweethearts and parents, all in the possession of the proud feeling that he is serving his king. Blessed with native enthusiasm he goes forth a real soldier. He is put through all the drills; he is put on guard duty despite bad weather; in fact he serves like all soldiers do in all the exercises, the drills and the marching, bayonet drills and what not. In short, he is ready with eyes straight and tightened lips to brave the trenches of Flanders dreaming of his return to his country as a hero having done his duty.

After five or six months of this new life, a new inspection from the doctor is ordered. He cannot understand that this is necessary, having already undergone this experience. However, he goes forward in great confidence because he has to use a vernacular, "been there before." And he is the most surprised man in the world to hear the doctor saying: "You are unfit."

Is it that his anatomy is not fit to be destroyed by a machine gun or shot down by a German sniper? What is the matter? Oh! nothing, except perhaps a crooked toe, or an eye that cannot tell an "O" from an "A" at fifty yards, or may be something less important because he has already passed his examination as quite perfect a few months previously.

Is it the time he has spent in the barracks that has caused this degeneration in body?

Is the first medical examination serious, or is it done just to give reason for a second which is just the contrary? One or the other is a farce.

Take then the life of the soldier. He has no doubt left a position before enlisting; perhaps a good one. Having been discharged as unfit, his certificate may militate against him when applying for a new job, wherein medical examination is necessary. There is every probability that he will be classed by certain people among the "Misfits," or in other words a man who has been discharged from the army because of some misconduct. The poor lad has spent four or five months in a training which is of no use to him and which he will never practice. At the same time he is sore on society and disgusted more or less with himself.

Take then the country itself. It has been paying out useless money; costing as it does more than two dollars a day for a soldier, and this is a very low estimate—the cost amounts to the neat sum of three hundred dollars, which is absolutely thrown away. It must be remembered that we have had, during the last weeks, in Montreal alone, more than five hundred soldiers, volunteers, discharged unfit for service and the money goes from—us, the taxpayers—paid absolutely for nothing.

It is money wasted because either the first medical doctor did not understand his business, or the second one did, as one declared the soldier fit and the other unfit.

Why then is that recruiting does not go ahead more rapidly?

How are you going to get young men to enlist?

Have we too many soldiers that we can afford to dismiss them on the slightest pretext?

Why should it be so easy here when it is so hard in the army of France or Belgium?

Is it made easy so that more opportunities may be given to the young officers of the city to study "High Life" and remain swelling "around the city." We do not believe it to be so.

On the other hand, we must ask, is it a trick intended to belittle recruiting in the province of Quebec? This province has the finest record for bearing children and will it, at the same time, have the poorest recruitng record?

From another point of view, it may be that

many of our boys are discharged because there are far too many battalions recruiting and in their eagerness almost any one is taken.

We do not know the real reason. Who will tell us?

Next week further questions will be asked.

This article appears in the Labour World, a bilingual paper; it is printed in both French and English, and may contain a few typographical errors. As the writer states, a man has to be almost a cripple before the Belgian or the French army lets him go. Let me give a case that came under my notice last Sunday night. Francq, one of the men who sign this letter from the Montreal Trades and Labour Council, has three sons whom he has given to the country. One left eighteen months ago for Belgium, and has been in charge of a machine gun in the trenches for ten months. He has returned, but will be off again shortly in another regiment. Two other sons joined the 163rd nearly six months ago. I saw these two men on Sunday night; both had had to leave the army.

Mr. PARDEE: Why?

Mr. VERVILLE: They were unfit; that is all we know. Now, there are soldiers all over the country guarding bridges and canals and other public works. Why should not these men who are discharged as unfit be allowed to take the place of able-bodied soldiers doing guard duty in Canada, for they surely would be fit enough to guard a canal, or a bridge or anything of that kind? Many of the men discharged as unfit have left good positions; I know some myself who have. Now if they had been to the front, they would have some chance of getting their old positions back, but the chances are slight when they have been discharged as unfit and have never been overseas. Again in large cities the different provinces have opened employment bureaus for returned soldiers, but these men who have been discharged as unfit are unable to get any work through them because they have not got the necessary papers. This kind of thing is going on in other places in Canada but, as the article says, it is more acute in Montreal, and for the life of me I cannot see why it is allowed to go on. Anyone who understands anything about military affairs knows that thousands of men are required besides those who do the fighting at the front, and many of these young men who have been discharged as unfit are quite capable of doing service at home.

There is another point I should like to bring to the attention of the Government. I do not know whether the practice prevails in other cities, but in Montreal, when a man enlists, he has to pay $10 as a guarantee for his outfit. If he stays six months this amount is refunded, but if he stays only five months and twenty-eight days, it is not. I know one officer who paid $28 for his outfit when he joined the army. He was sent out in different parts of the city to help in the recruiting campaign, and he left part of his outfit at the officers' quarters, thinking it would be quite safe there. A short time ago he was discharged as unfit, and they told him that if he turned in his outfit they would allow him the $28, althougth he had not been in the army quite six months. When he went to the officers' quarters to get his outfit it had disappeared, and he couldn't find it anywhere. So the authorities said "Well, we shall have to deduct $28 from your pay." And they did so. I do not know what the rules and regulations of the Militia Department are, but I do know that that man is out $28. I do not know whether that is made necessary under the regulations of the Militia Department, but it seems to me there is no reason to put down $10 as a guarantee of any kind. Is it a guarantee of good faith. I do not know whether it is done throughout Canada or not.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. VERVILLE: I hope not. If they do it down home, that is enough. In fact, one place is too many. All this does not go to help recruiting in Montreal, nor will it help it anywhere else. In Montreal they are trying to raise a regiment of mechanics, and I have been asked to give my sanction to some extent to a regiment of that kind. But how can you expect to enlist men when you tell them: "Enlist, and you will not have to go to the war." I told the officer who told me that that he ought to be ashamed of himself. I said: "Do you think the mechanics are cowards? If you go on in that way, I hope you will not get a mechanic in all Canada." As a mechanic myself, if I were told that I should enlist because I was not going to the front, I would not take the job; for I am not afraid to go. The article says there are about 500. It may be about 500 more inside of two or three weeks. I know there are any number of young men who have enlisted, having been told: "You might as well enlist; you will never get to the front." If that is the way you are going to swell the number of

soldiers in order to make up a total of 500,000 men, it would be better to have 250,000 men and have them actually go.

This is probably more important than it seems at first sight. I know as a fact that it is going to hurt recruiting. I would not go so far as the article does when it says that probably this has been done more in Montreal than elsewhere. I do not see why this should be done in Montreal, because the men there are as healthy as those elsewhere. To show what is sometimes done, let me give an instance. An effort is made to get a battalion of shantymen. I know some of these men who were refused because they had flat feet. But I would like to find the doctor who rejected any such men who is man enough to walk all day with these woodsmen. This class of men can stand more hardship than any others in the country. The doctor should have known that the work of these men and the conditions under which it is carried on make it necessary that they should be that way, and they grow that way. But that does not say that they would not be good soldiers.

I call the attention of the Government to this matter, and I hope they will tell us whether this first examination is false, or whether it is because they had so much per head to examine them, or whether it was to increase the number of men for a show. If this first examination is a farce, I hope the Government will stop it. Let us have a good examination, and those that are not fit to pass, let them not wear a uniform at all.

Mr. ROGERS: I can understand that if there are many in Montreal who share the view of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve that recruiting might be delayed in that portion of Canada. If the statements he presented are such as he believes, I can see that misunderstandings would arise. It is true, of course, that a certain number of soldiers are rejected by reason of physical defects. But, speaking with a somewhat general knowledge of a great
12 p.m. portion of the Dominion, I can say that I never heard anything about the matters that have been referred to by my hon. friend. I do not understand that those conditions exist even in Montreal, beyond what has been stated in the paper from which he has read. Hon. members know that the Government have taken every step possible to see that we get the largest possible number of recruits. We are putting forth every effort to that end, and probably in no part of Canada are efforts more continuously exerted than in the city of Montreal. I am at a loss to understand the statements made by my hon. friend, because I am satisfied from my knowledge of the administration of the Militia Department that it is not their intention to hamper or reflect upon those who so generously come forward and offer their services either in Montreal or in any other part of Canada. Not only do they not reflect upon these individuals, but they appreciate their willingness to offer their services. The statements of my hon. friend will be recorded in Hansard, and I will have them looked into carefully. I cannot understand the statement, for example, with respect to a double examination. One gets the impression from what was read that this applied to recruiting in Montreal particularly. I assure my hon. friend that this is not the case. I know the minds of those responsible for the administration of the Militia Department and their desire to afford every facility for every individual who comes forward in placing his services at the disposal of the country in this crisis. I can only assure my hon. friend and those responsible for that article that that is the position taken by the Government in regard to securing recruits in all parts of Canada. We have to-day something over 300,000 already recruited, and we are most anxious to have the number increased to 500,000. I cannot understand the statements of my hon. friend. However, we will have them looked into closely. I should be very sorry indeed to have the statement as placed on Hansard go to the world and be accepted as a statement of the facts, because so far as my knowledge of the facts goes, the statements are far from correct.

Mr. OLIVER: I am sorry to be compelled to say that my knowledge differs from that of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. I have the most positive knowledge that the conditions as set out by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve do exist in other parts of the country.

It is only a short time since the Prime Minister, in making a statement to this House as to the number of enlistments, stated that what he called wastage amounted to over 20,000. I questioned him as to what was meant by the word "wastage" and he said, if I remember correctly, that it meant men who had enlisted and afterwards were discharged as being unfit. Over 20,000 instances of wastage of that charac-

ter certainly substantiates very thoroughly what the member for Maisonneuve has said. Besides, I am aware of my own knowledge of the fact that officers, being anxious to fill their battalions quickly, were not particular as to the men they accepted and that when they had filled their battalions they proceeded to follow what they were pleased to call the "weeding-out process." Men who were taken on when they should not have been taken on were subsequently discharged, as I suppose they properly had to be. It was a cruel and unjustifiable thing; it was everything objectionable that my hon. friend has stated it to be, and the effects must necessarily be as he has stated them—a sense of injustice, because an injustice was certainly done. We must admit, of course, that a man may pass the doctor on his enlistment as being perfectly sound, and afterwards, during the period of training, may develop a weakness that would prove his unfitness, and it would not be wise to take him overseas on active service. There is necessarily and properly a re-examination of soldiers before they leave for overseas to find out whether or not anything has developed. There must always be some wastage because of that second examination and the possibility of weakness developing. But I am prepared to support absolutely of my own knowledge what my hon. friend has placed before the House, as well as what the Prime Minister placed before the House, that officers raising battalions have not always been careful in the interests of the men they enlisted only to take those who they were sure were physically fit. In doing so they have ultimately done an injustice not only to the men, but to the service and to the cause.

Mr. WRIGHT: I think that possibly the gentlemen who are criticising the Militia Department in connection with this matter are rather severe. Certainly a considerable number of men are finally rejected who pass the medical examination on the first instance, and perhaps properly pass it. The officer who would be responsible would be the medical examiner, and I rather think the suggestion that men unfit for service are passed is a reflection upon the medical profession. After a man has passed his examination and is enrolled as a soldier, many causes might affect his final acceptance. It may be the case that some illness or defect may have escaped the observation of the preliminary examiner or that the physical training may have brought out some incipient disease or weakness. Then, men sometimes develop or betray characteristics which render them unfit for service, such as mental defects, quarrelsome dispositions, and so on. Sometimes they turn out to be notorious criminals; sometimes they develop other characteristics which makes it impossible for the officers to get on with them. So that out of the total number enlisted the number that are finally weeded out before the battalions go overseas may not be abnormal after all. I do not think it follows that because a considerable number of these men have been weeded out there has been any prearranged plan of padding or filling up on the occasion of the preliminary enlistment, because I take it that the medical examiner would hardly be influenced by the officers to the extent that he would be induced to pass men who were unfit for medical service. I hardly think that the medical profession would engage in that kind of work. I do not see how they could do it, unless they deliberately disregarded the rules and regulations laid down by the Department of Militia, and if they did that to an appreciable extent we would have to weed out some of the medical men that have been appointed. If I understand the matter correctly, the heads of the battalions are largely responsible for the medical men who are appointed and they are supposed to be men who will do their duty. I take it that on the whole they are performing their duties fairly well.

Mr. TURRIFF: The statement that is made by the member for Maisonneuve that in certain cases soldiers in Montreal have been obliged to put up $10, and under certain circumstances do not get it back is one that my hon. friend the Minister of Public works, who is leading the House should have investigated at once. It is quite possible that some unscrupulous officer might be doing that without the knowledge of the department. It certainly would have a bad effect, if it became known that this was done without the Government's authority, and I would like to see the matter investigated and a public statement made in regard to it as early as possible.

Mr. ROGERS: I have already stated that the matter will be taken up in the department to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER: Is it a fact that a man must deposit $10 when he enlists as a guarantee of his uniform?

Mr. KEMP: Did the hon. member for Edmonton ever hear of such a thing in Edmonton?

Mr. OLIVER: I have never heard of it, but the member for Maisonneuve has the statement that in Montreal a deposit is demanded, and I am asking whether that is recognized by the Militia Department?

Mr. KEMP: I never heard of it.

Contingent expenses in connection with the voters' lists—further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have a matter that I wish to bring to the attention of the House; it is pretty late.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is entitled to go on; of course, the hour is late, and if it could be done to-morrow we might take it up then.

Mr. TURRIFF: It will take me about half an hour. I do not want to discuss it on concurrence; it is a time when the House does not want to take up any time in discussion. I would like to discuss it to-morrow if there is some item to be put through.

Mr. ROGERS: I was hoping to get through with all Estimates to-night, if not with Concurrence as well.

Mr. REID: There will be another Estimate to-morrow. We will be going into Supply again, even if all these Estimates are passed.

Mr. ROGERS: We will see that you have a chance to go on on Estimates to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER: There is an item which I want to discuss before the last Militia Estimate passes. I can deal with it either now or to-morrow.

Mr. ROGERS: There will be an opening to-morrow on Supply.

Mr. REID: We will have an Estimate to-morrow, and on that hon. members can talk on any department.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish to refer to the case of C. C. McNab, of Braeside, who was a telegraph operator, I think, in the employ of a private company, during the Northwest rebellion. He tells me that on account of disease which was contracted while rendering service at that time, he became blind and has been blind for many years. He made application to the late Government and the Militia Department informed him that after investigation they had decided that as he was not in the employ of that department they could not deal with his case. I think that probably, speaking technically, he may have no claim upon the Government, but under all the circumstances, as the evidence seems to point to the substantiation of his claim that he became blind on account of service to the country, although paid by a private company, the Government might well consider if he could not be treated in the same manner as a man who had become maimed or afflicted in the country's service. The then acting minister and myself had some correspondence, but we never arrived at any conclusion.

Mr. KEMP: I remember the question to which my hon. friend refers. I took it up with the deputy minister, who looked over the file and directed my attention to the decision already arrived at. I communicated that to the hon. gentleman. I presume the only way that a matter of that kind could be dealt with would be through a special Estimate, a compassionate allowance or something of that kind. I shall draw it to the attention of the acting minister, the Prime Minister, and ask him if he will take it up.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine it will have to be dealt with by the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister, because it is admitted that the Militia Department, as a department, is not especially concerned with this.

Progress reported.

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1916-17.

A message from His Royal Highness the Governor General transmitting further Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1917, was presented by Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

On the motion of Mr. Rogers for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. GRAHAM: What will be the business to-morrow? The report of the committee investigating pensions has to be presented. Does the Government intend introducing legislation based on that report? The Prime Minister rather intimated to me the other day that he thought that might be necessary.

Mr. ROGERS: My understanding of the matter is that legislation will not be necessary to carry out the recommendations of the committee; they can be carried out under the Militia Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can the hon. gentleman tell me if any conclusion has been arrived

at as to prorogation—what the Government's idea is as to the time when we can prorogue?

Mr. ROGERS: I think we ought to get through the business very easily to-morrow. We could then prorogue on Thursday at the latest. I was in hopes that we would get through in time to prorogue to-morrow night. If we had got through Concurrence this evening, we could have prorogued to-morrow.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Senate has to deal with all these matters.

Mr. ROGERS: We have to give them some time, and that is why I hoped to have Concurrence to-night. The Senate meets at 11 o'clock in the morning, and we will be able to hand them over some business. They have some business to take up, and they will have the Bill that was passed to-day. That no doubt will receive some consideration, and by the time they are through with it, we will probably be able to present them with Concurrence.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose Supply will be the first business to-morrow, in order to get the Supply Bill to the Senate before we take up pensions.

Mr. ROGERS: We can take that up after we get through with Concurrence.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.33 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, May 17, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

REPORTS.

Annual report of Canal Statistics for the season of navigation, 1915.—Mr. Reid.

Report of the Auditor General for 1915, vol. III.—Sir Thomas White.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

MR. A. DEWITT FOSTER.

Mr. THOMSON:

1. Is Mr. A. DeWitt Foster, late member for Kings, N.S., in the employment of the Government?
2. If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No.

MR. R. H. KENNEDY.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Is R. H. Kennedy, M.L.A., employed for recruiting purposes in Colchester county, N.S.?
2. If so, when was he appointed, and is he still acting as a recruiting officer? If not, when was he relieved?
3. What is his remuneration and the total amount paid to him to date on account of salary and expenses?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: R. H. Kennedy, M.L.A., was appointed recruiting officer for Colchester county on October 10, 1915, with pay at the rate of $3 per day till January 31, 1916. Since January 31, he has been a voluntary recruiting officer for that county, and is still acting. Amount of salary paid, October 10, to January 31, $183. Travelling expenses, same period, $161.50. Total amount paid to date, $344.50.

ESTATES OF DECEASED SOLDIERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I beg to lay upon the Table a memorandum which has been prepared by the Estates Branch of the Department of Militia and Defence with regard to the distribution of the estates of soldiers who have lost their lives while on active service with the Canadian Expeditionary Forces. It was thought that this information might be of use, and without reading it perhaps I may be permitted to have it incorporated in Hansard. The memorandum is as follows:

On the death of a soldier whilst on active service in France the casualty is notified, by cable, to England, and then to Ottawa; his personal effects are collected, placed in a package, and forwarded to the Base. There they are checked and an inventory is sent with them to the office of the director of pay and records services (estates branch), London, England, where they are there again checked and rewrapped for distribution.

When there has been very heavy fighting there is little chance of collecting any effects, and in many cases if death has been caused by heavy shell fire there are unfortunately, neither effects nor remains; but in some cases the London office receives the personal effects of soldiers dying in territory occupied by the enemy.

If a man has left any personal effects in England before going to the front, these are collected and forwarded to the London office and the whole of his personal effects are thence forwarded to the estates branch, Ottawa, that is, if the beneficiary or next of kin resides in this country.

The deceased's pay account is closed as soon as his death is officially reported, and it is then known as his non-effective account. A lapse of four or five months is necessary before a non-effective account can be properly certified as correct, and in some cases six months. If the next of kin, or beneficiary resides in this country, the account is forwarded here for settlement.

The pay books are all forwarded to the London office, and if the same contain a will, it is extracted and placed on file for safe keeping and properly indexed.

When the non-effective account, personal and surplus effects reach the office of the Estates Branch, Ottawa, the legal domicile of the deceased is carefully gone into and in the case of an intestacy the military estate is distributed according to the law of the province or country of the deceased's domicile.

It is worthy of note that a minor (unmarried) cannot acquire a domicile of choice but has the same domicile as his father—that of origin.

A soldier, even if he is not of full age, may, under section 9 of the Wills Act, whilst on actual military service, dispose of his personal estate either by a holograph will, by letter, or by a verbal statement substantiated by witnesses. This section applies to all the provinces in Canada, with slight difference in Quebec. Section 849 of the Civil Code of Quebec provides that a soldier on military service may make a will which if valid in England as regards its form would likewise be valid in Quebec, though by section 835 a minor is incapable of bequeathing any part of his property by will. So, therefore, a soldier domiciled in Quebec, if a minor, is declared from making a valid will; but if of full age can dispose of his personal property without the necessity of the regular form.

All wills are carefully examined here, the domicile decided, and the intention of the testator is carried out as far as possible. A military will can only dispose of personal estate. Real estate is in no way affected unless there is a will duly executed and attested by witnesses according to the ordinary legal practice. This is a point which should be brought to the attention of the soldier when he is making his will, as sometimes it is impossible to carry out his full wishes after death.

The legatees named in the wills are all notified, a certified copy is forwarded to them, and an identification form is enclosed for completion and return to the office of the Estates Branch.

The officer in charge of the Estates Branch is fully empowered by an Order in Council, dated 28th March, 1916, promulgated under the authority of the Regimental Debts Act, 1893, and an order made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 3rd December, 1915, to decide all questions of domicile, of validity of wills, of law and of fact, and to distribute all military estates in the manner laid down by the different sections of this said Act. No appeal can be taken from this officer's decision.

All estates are distributed without delay as soon as the necessary papers reach the office of the Estates Branch; but it must be borne in mind that it is always from four to six months at the very earliest before an estate can be legally distributed.

Numerous cases are delayed by a will turning up at the last moment, but every care is taken that no wrongful distributions are made.

In the case of missing men, thirty weeks must elapse before the necessary steps can be taken to presume death (a presumption entertained for official purposes only) and the estates of such missing men cannot be distributed until four months after such presumption of death has been made.

H. Spencer-Relph,
Captain,
Officer i/c Estates for A. & P.M.G.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

TRADE COMMISSION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce give the House the names of the gentlemen who have been selected as members of the commission to promote better trade relations with the allied countries?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not the names in full, but I can give my hon. friend the surname of each member: Mr. André Dupuis, Vice-President of the Chinic Hardware Company of Quebec; Mr. Waddleworth, of Montreal, President of the Chemical Society, and a member of the Board of Trade of Montreal; Mr. Pauze, President last year of the Chambre de Commerce, Montreal; Mr. J. M. Wood of the Gordon McKay Company, Toronto; Mr. Geo. W. Allan, of Winnipeg; and, from the Maritime Provinces, Mr. Frank Hathaway, of St. John; six in all. The commission will be provided with a secretary and the secretary who has been selected is Mr. Roy Campbell, a graduate of the University of Toronto, who has lately been secretary or assistant secretary of the Manufacturers' Association in the city of Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the Mr. Frank Hathaway referred to a former member of the Provincial Legislature of New Brunswick? The reason I ask is that I saw in a newspaper that it was his son who had been appointed.

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Frank Hathaway has no son.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is Mr. Frank Hathaway, the gentleman to whom my hon. friend referred.

ENLISTMENTS IN NORTHERN ALBERTA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. OLIVER: In discussing the militia Estimates, I asked the Prime Minister if he would have prepared a detailed statement of enlistments in Northern Alberta. He was good enough to promise that that would be done. I hope it will be available before the close of the session.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understood that the deputy minister had taken a note of everything the hon. member had asked for. However, I do not think he has furnished me with that statement, but I will call his attention to it.

PLANS OF NEW PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROGERS: I would once again invite the attention of the members of the House to the matter of the reconstruction of the Parliament Buildings. The committee who have the matter in charge have reached the point of considering the advisability of providing an additional story. We have the plan of the old building, as it stood, and of the building proposed to be constructed. They are in Room 1, and the committee will be very pleased, I am sure, if hon. members would take the trouble some time during the afternoon to visit that room, where they will meet one of the architects who will explain everything they might desire to know in respect to the proposal which is approved by the committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Have the committee come to any decision upon that?

Mr. ROGERS: We have considered it very fully, and I think the committee are fairly unanimous in favour of the additional story.

Mr. PUGSLEY: As a member of the committee, perhaps it would not be out of place for me to say that the committee had before them the strong recommendation of Mr. Pearson, one of the architects—the other architect not being present at the time—in favour of an additional story. My own view was that, as we trust that the reconstructed building will last for a very long time, and as the number of members of Parliament is likely to increase very considerably in the not distant future, it would be desirable, if possible, to give considerably increased accommodation, providing that it would not interfere with the architectural aspect of the building. I think the view of the committee was quite unanimous that that result could be obtained, and that with the additional story the building would be a very handsome one indeed, and one of which the country would be proud.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Have the architects expressed any preference in the matter?

Mr. ROGERS: The architects have, I think, a preference for the additional story.

TEMISCOUATA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: I am requested to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) whether he has authorized the sending of a despatch down to anybody at Ile Verte, Temiscouata county, stating that an expenditure of $1,000 would be made on wharves out of a sum voted for that purpose by this House. It is reported that the message was sent by the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Casgrain):

Mr. ROGERS: I have no knowledge of the message referred to.

LOBSTER FISHERY IN NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: I am advised that the lobster fishing in Northumberland straits only opened on May 11, or six days ago. I would ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) to take that fact into consideration, and to regard favourably an application which will be made to him by the fishermen and packers for an extension in order to make up the time during which they would have been entitled to fish had the season opened at the regular period.

Mr. HAZEN: It frequently happens that, although the fishing season is somewhat late in opening, the catch of lobsters is so good during the balance of the season that the average catch is as good as it is in other years when the fishing season opens earlier. The whole situation will be very carefully watched, and instructions have been given to that effect already by the officials of the department. The facts will be considered when the time comes for a decision as to whether the season shall be extended or not. As an ordinary proposition, it is not desirable to extend the season for catching lobsters. The seasons have been fixed by commissions that have been appointed to deal with the lobster question and the question of fishing generally, and when the last commission made its report it was evident that unless something was done in some way to restrict the amount of fishing that was being carried on, there would be great danger of the lobster fishery of the country being destroyed. It was in consequence of this that provision was made for a shortened season.

Last year, in many parts of the country, the lobster fishery was very satisfactory, and larger lobsters were caught than had been caught in past years, showing that the shortening of the season in the past three years had some effect in that direction. I understand, however, that there are some occasions when, in consequence of ice conditions and other weather conditions, the fishermen are unable to fish for many days during the season. We have had cases of that sort, and upon investigation we have found that, while they had several slack days in which they could not follow their calling as they have done in some previous seasons, yet the catch has been quite as large, and that being the case there was no necessity for the extension of the lobster season. All these are facts which have to be taken into consideration. I will instruct my officails very carefully to watch the conditions that exist along the Northumberland straits this year, and give such consideration as is possible, having regard to the preservation and perpetuation of the lobster-fishing industry.

Mr. MACDONALD: With the consent of the House, I wish merely to point out that the report of the commission having fixed the season in each particular year, if the season has been shortened this year on account of ice conditions from April 26 to May 11, it causes an absolute loss to the men who depend on that industry for their living.

WAR SUPPLIES—CLOTHING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MACDONALD: At the request of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte), I would like to ask the Chairman of the War Purchasing Commission whether he is going to give us, before the House rises, the return which was ordered by the House six weeks ago in regard to clothing which was purchased by the commission.

Mr. KEMP: A few days ago the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) brought this question up. We had a personal conversation in regard to the matter, and he intimated that he would see if he could not modify the order in such a way that it would be possible to comply more readily with it. I expected to hear from the hon. member before this, but I have not heard anything from him since.

Mr. MACDONALD: He is in Nova Scotia.

NEW MILLS FISH POND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: I am requested by a citizen living along the Restigouche river, who takes an interest in salmon fishing, to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the following question:

I understand that the fish pond at New Mills has been destroyed this spring and that they will not be able to use it this summer. Would you find out from the department where this fish pond is to be placed?

Mr. HAZEN: I have no information to the effect that the fish pond at New Mills has been destroyed. I understood that some injury had been done to it by ice, or something of that sort, but I did not know that it had been destroyed to such an extent that it could not be put into condition to be used this year. Suggestions have been made by people living along the Restigouche river as to the proper place for a fish pond. One suggestion favoured the establishment of a fish pond on the Quebec side of the river, somewhere, I fancy, in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil). But, as far as I am aware at the present moment, I think the pond at New Mills will be available for use during the present season.

ENLISTMENT IN GASPE AND BONAVENTURE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to ask the hon. Acting Minister of Militia and Defence another question, and I do so at the request of a citizen in Bonaventure, who takes great interest in recruiting. Recruiting is now being done in Gaspé and Bonaventure for Quebec regiments, and I would like to know if there is any way by which we could ascertain how many men from Gaspé and Bonaventure have been enlisted in New Brunswick regiments. At the outbreak of hostilities a large number enlisted in those regiments. Now they are enlisting in Quebec regiments, and we would like to know how many of our people have enlisted in New Brunswick regiments. Is there any way by which that information could be obtained?

Mr. KEMP: My hon. friend has directed his question to me. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister is the Acting Minister of Militia and Defence at the present moment and I shall refer the matter to

him and ask him if it is possible to furnish my hon. friend with the information he asks.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

PAY OF LOWER GRADE EMPLOYEES.

On the motion for Committee of Supply:

Mr. PROULX: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to bring to the attention of the Government a matter of public importance. At the end of the session of 1914 my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) said that at the next session it was his intention to introduce a Bill to increase the salaries of civil servants of the lower grades; but nothing has been done in that direction yet. Shortly afterwards war broke out, and since then it has been the alleged policy of the Government not to give any salary increases during the war. This matter was brought before the House a few weeks ago by the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), and I was in hopes that something would be done this session, but I see nothing in the Estimates providing for an increase in the salaries of the lower grade employees. Some of these men—packers, messengers, sorters and so on—receive only from $500 to $600 a year, and they cannot get more than $800, which is the maximum for that class. Many of these men are married and have families to support, and the Government must know that it is impossible in these days, when the cost of living is so high, for a man to bring up his family properly on $500 or $600 a year. I would suggest that the Government grant a flat increase of $100, but not go beyond the maximum of $800. When this matter was up a few weeks ago the Minister of Public Works said that there would be no salary increases during the war. I have made inquiries, and find that in the Interior Department alone, in 1915, ten persons received salary increases ranging from $150 to $500. The annual increase in the lower grades is ordinarily $50 a year, but in the higher grades it depends upon the recommendation of the head of the department. The Minister of Public Works suggested that these employees who were dissatisfied should enlist and go to the front. I might tell him that seventy-five of these employees are between the ages of forty-five and seventy-seven, so it is impossible for them to go. Another suggestion the minister made was that they might go west and take up land. Many of these men have had no experience on the land and have no capital, and, of course, it would be impracticable for them to take up farming. I therefore consider that the minister has not given any sufficient explanation why the Government is not doing anything for the employees of this class. I trust that the Government will do something even now, before the session closes, and that next session, or perhaps after the war, the Minister of Finance will provide for this class permanently.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It is not the intention of the Government to bring down any further proposals dealing with the salaries of civil servants. I do not think it advisable that that question should be dealt with in piecemeal fashion; it should be dealt with as a whole or not at all. The Government is of the opinion that it is not advisable to consider increasing the salaries of the Civil Service during the war.

Mr. PROULX: In 1908 there was a flat increase of $100 or $150 to the Civil Service.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Civil Government—House of Commons—to appoint M. Crossley Sherwood to second division, subdivision A, as assistant clerk of Orders and Records of the House of Commons, $1,600.

Mr. TURRIFF: I am glad the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce are in their seats, because when I point out the facts of this case, I think they will see that it is only reasonable that this item should be withdrawn. What are the facts? Mr. Sherwood may be a very worthy young man; I do not happen to know him. He has been a sessional clerk for the last two years, and the late Speaker, Hon. Dr. Sproule, said that if he wanted to get into the service of one of the departments he would have to pass the usual examination. Mr. Sherwood has not passed that examination, and is therefore ineligible for this position. Some time ago I asked for the correspondence to be brought down in connection with this matter, and I find that on the 17th of January, 1916, the Clerk of the House wrote to the Civil Service Commission asking to have Mr. Sherwood appointed. This was done at the request of His Honour the Speaker. That letter was answered by the Civil Service Commission on January 26, as follows:

Dear Sir,—The commissioners have had under consideration the statement of the clerk of the House of Commons that the Speaker of the House is desirous of filling the position of assistant clerk of the Orders and Records Office, a position in subdivision B of the second division. It was stated that the Speaker wishes to have Mr. H. C. Sherwood appointed to the position, provided he can comply with the requirements of the Civil Service Act.

The commissioners have no objection whatever to issuing a certificate for Mr. Sherwood under those conditions. It has been pointed out to him, however, that in order to qualify for appointment he would require to become a successful candidate at one of the regular examinations for Grade B of the second division. He went up for the second division examination in May, 1915, but failed to qualify as a successful candidate. He did not apply for examination in November last. Mr. Sherwood is, therefore, not qualified under the Civil Service Act to receive the necessary certificate from the Civil Service Commission.

It may be added for the information of the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Commons that as the result of the last semi-annual examination in November, 1915, there was a considerable number of fully qualified candidates for Grade B of the second division, from whom selection may be made for the position in question. The Civil Service Commissioners would be pleased to have either the Speaker or the clerk make a selection from the list of successful candidates. In any case the person selected will be subject to the usual six months' probation in order that his capacity to meet the requirements of the position may be passed upon by those responsible for the work to be performed.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) Wm. Foran.
Secretary.

Thos. B. Flint, Esq.,
Clerk of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

I want the Minister of Finance to bear in mind that this is a position in Subdivision B of the Second Division. It is obvious from the letter I have read that this young man is not entitled to the position; he has failed to qualify, and the Civil Service Commission will therefore not recommend him. Under the Act they cannot give Mr. Sherwood the necessary certificate. What is the use of holding examinations if it is not for the purpose of selecting men for positions such as this? Even if Mr. Sherwood had passed the examination he would be entitled to a salary of only $800 a year.

But in face of the fact that he cannot qualify, the Government proposes, by means of this vote in the Estimates, to put him in at a salary of $1,600 a year over the heads of men who have qualified, and who would only be entitled to receive $800 if they were appointed to this place. That is manifestly unfair. This matter has been brought to my attention by half a dozen civil servants outside the House of Commons altogether and connected with other departments, who point out the unfairness of putting a man over the heads of others who have been fifteen or sixteen years in the service, and who have passed their examinations, and giving him a bigger salary than they could receive if appointed to a similar position. I am satisfied that when this matter went through council my hon. friend the Minister of Finance and my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not understand the facts of the case, or they would never have consented to this item being put in the Estimates, nor would the Prime Minister have consented.

In addition to that, the young man has a very prosperous business on Sparks street. Walk along Sparks street between Elgin and Metcalfe, and at No. 65 you will find a handsome store owned by this young man—a good and prosperous business. He says, and makes no bones about it, that he would never have accepted this position if it meant giving up his business. Naturally he thinks that if he can get $1,600 a year on the side, there is no reason why he should not take it. I do not blame the young man so very much. Yet the fact remains that other men who have passed the examinations would gladly take the position at $800.

Mr. REID: What is this business?

Mr. TURRIFF: Photographic supplies—at 65 Sparks street.

Mr. REID: Is not that his father's store?

Mr. TURRIFF: No. Look up the telephone directory and you will find the name there—H. Crossley Sherwood, photographic supplies. It is this young man's own business. Now, why should he be put in at double the regular salary when he has not even passed the examination? The only reason I can see for it—and I judge from what I know of how appointments are made—is that my hon. friend the member for Ottawa desires to force this through. And why? Because this young man's father is secretary of the Conservative Association in the city of Ottawa. That secretaryship is an honourable position, and I have no possible objection to any man holding it; but I do not think that the Minister of Finance, who has been preaching economy to us during this session, should allow anything like this to take place at a time when we should be practising economy. Surely

the members on the Treasury benches did not understand the position when they put this item in the Estimates. This is a small matter, if you like: it means the paying of $1,600 a year instead of $800 a year. But it means also the pitchforking of a man into a position over the heads of others who have been in the service for many years. If there is one thing more than another that is affecting the Civil Service and making trouble and dissatisfaction, it is such acts as this. The young man writes a letter to the Speaker, and you would think he was the Government by the way he points out how his appointment should be made. He shows that he cannot be appointed under section 21, and goes on to say that the way that is here proposed is the only way in which he can be appointed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Why could he not be appointed under section 21?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That provides for the appointment of experts.

Mr. TURRIFF: This young man is not an expert, as I shall show, unless he can qualify as an expert in showing how he can be appointed—in that respect I think he has some claim to be counted an expert. Here is a letter written by the Clerk of the House to the Speaker. I will not read the whole of it:

You, in January last, requested me to take the proper steps to have Mr. Sherwood appointed and I at once communicated with the Civil Service Commission and the commission replied. This correspondence is annexed.

It shows that the grade of the office being subdivision B of the second division, the certificate of qualification of that grade under the Act must be issued to Mr. Sherwood before he can be appointed, and the commissioners have no objection to giving him the certificate if he can comply with the law on that subject.

I have carefully read Mr. Sherwood's letter to you, and would point out that Mr. Sherwood cannot be appointed under section 21 as the office does not require a person of any profession or technical or any peculiar qualification, and I could not report to that effect, as it is, like most all the clerkships of the House, a mere ordinary clerkship, requiring no profession or technical qualifications whatever.

This being so, Mr. Sherwood cannot be appointed under section 21.

The reference to Mr. Glazier's apointment as clerk of the Agricultural Committee—

This was referred to by Mr. Sherwood in his letter to the Speaker.

—is not in point. Mr. Glazier was appointed in February, 1911, as a practical and experienced agriculturalist at the special request of the committee which insisted that the clerk of the committee should be a farmer of experience, and Mr. Glazier went before the Civil Service Commission and got his certificate as such.

That is, he passed his examination.

I have reported to the Speaker of the day that "the knowledge and ability requisite for a proper discharge of the duties of his position are, from an agricultural standpoint, partly professional, partly technical, and otherwise peculiar, and that Mr. Glazier has special qualifications for such work, having been himself a practical agriculturalist and having had a large experience in parliamentary work." The certificate of the Civil Service Commission was to the same effect.

If Mr. Sherwood is to be appointed under the Civil Service Act there is no way that I know of by which we can omit obtaining the Civil Service certificate of qualification for the grade referred to. I have not spoken to the Parliamentary Counsel on this subject, but I would respectfully suggest to your honour that his opinion be requested on the legal aspects of the case and that the correspondence be placed in his hands for consideration before further action. I have no objection whatever to Mr. Sherwood's appointment, but it is important that when it is made it should be unobjectionable from a legal standpoint. Any other course would lead to many difficulties.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
T. B. Flint,
Clerk of the House of Commons.

That was on February 14 last. On February 16 His Honour the Speaker, not paying much attention to that recommendation, wrote to Dr. Flint as follows:

Dr. T. B. Flint,
Clerk, House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.
Re H. C. Sherwood.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, and thank you for your information.

Will you kindly communicate with the Finance Minister and tell him that I desire to give the position of assistant clerk in the Orders and Records Office of the House to Mr. H. C. Sherwood at the salary of $1,600 per annum, and that I would like to have direct legislation naming Mr. Sherwood in the appropriation Bill for that office.

Will you please see Mr. King, Chief Clerk of Votes and Proceedings and Records, about this matter and ask him also to take the proper steps to settle this matter, as above mentioned, and oblige.

Yours sincerely,
Albert Sevigny.

When that recommendation left the office of the chief clerk to come before the House it stated that the application was for a clerkship in subdivision B of the second division; but when it appears before the House it is for a clerkship in subdivision A of the second division. I do not know where the mistake occurred, if it was a mistake; but anyway, these are the facts of the case. It is evident that an effort was made to railroad this young man in at double

salary, even though he had not passed an examination. I think that no more glaring case ever occurred. Then the Clerk of the House, in accordance with the letter from the Speaker, wrote to the Minister of Finance as follows:

Dear Sir Thomas:

I am directed by His Honour the Speaker to communicate with you as to his wishes in the matter of an assistant clerk in the Orders and Records Office of the House of Commons.

He desires to appoint Mr. H. C. Sherwood of Ottawa to that office at a salary of $1,600 per annum, and he desires to have this done by direct appointment in the Appropriation Act. The grade of the office is B of the second division.

All these appointments, I understand, have to be recommended by a certain board. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Speaker of the House, and Sir George Perley were the members of the last board. You will find in the Civil Service list of 1915, page 273, the following: "Vacancy, 2-B, assistant clerk in Votes and Proceedings office." The board recommended that this position be filled, and I understand that as there was no vacancy in the staff of the House of Commons in subdivision A of the second division it was not competent for this House to put a clerk in subdivision A without a resolution or Order in Council. In order to do this, as I have said, it would be necessary to pass a resolution or Order in Council. In the face of these facts, simply because the young man in question has some political pull, everything is overridden, dissatisfaction is caused throughout the Civil Service and the country is out $800 a year that it should not be out, especially under the present conditions and in view of the economy urged by the Minister of Finance. I think that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in view of the facts that I have stated, ought to see that this item is withdrawn. I depend a little more on the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Finance than upon some of their colleagues in a matter of this kind. One thing I cannot understand is how the change came to be made from subdivision B to subdivision A. I point out further to the Minister of Finance that as we are going to prorogue to-morrow there will be six or eight months during which this clerk will have absolutely nothing to do. Under these circumstances, in the interests of the Civil Service and of the country generally, I ask that this item be withdrawn.

[Mr. Turriff.]

Mr. ROGERS: In answer to my hon. friend, who seems very much disturbed about the item now before the committee, at this late hour in the session it is not my purpose to discuss the treatment meted out by the present Government to its employees in the city of Ottawa and elsewhere. I can only say in a most respectful manner that the statement of my hon. friend regarding this case simply adds insult to injury so far as it concerned the treatment that we have extended to employees of the late Administration. The hon. gentleman has dwelt at some length upon Mr. Sherwood securing a salary of $1,600 a year in the position which he is now filling. The position is a very important one, requiring special knowledge of the work. We have had the services of Mr. Sherwood temporarily in this office for four years, and he has performed his duties with entire satisfaction to those associated with him in the office, and, I think, to the House. As to the assertion of my hon. friend respecting political pull, Mr. Sherwood did not require to rest his case upon that consideration, because he was so eminently qualified to fill the position that the Speaker was justified in making the recommendation to the Minister of Finance that this amount be placed in the Estimates. The best justification that I can give the committee for the action of the Speaker in making the recommendation that he did is a letter written by Mr. Colwell, who is head of the branch, and who has had Mr. Sherwood associated with him during the past four years. It was as I understand it, on this strong recommendation of Mr. Colwell that the Speaker made the recommendations which we are now considering.

Mr. TURRIFF: I see no record of it in the papers brought down.

Mr. ROGERS: I have not seen the papers brought down; but I have here a letter from Mr. Charles S. Colwell.

Mr. TURRIFF: It was kept off the file.

Mr ROGERS: It is addressed to the Speaker, dated 6th of March, and reads as follows:

Hon. Albert Sévigny,
Speaker, House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Speaker,—In compliance with your recent request for some particulars regarding the official qualifications of Mr. H. Crossley Sherwood, who is seeking a permanent appointment in the House of Commons service, I have

much pleasure in submitting for your approval the following information.

Mr. Sherwood has been, by my request, with the approval of the Speaker and Clerk of the House, temporary assistant in the office of Routine and Records during the past three sessions of Parliament; and his services have always been eminently satisfactory. By my request also, Mr. Sherwood was recalled for the present session, or until some one else equally acceptable was permanently appointed as assistant.

During all the time Mr. Sherwood has been associated with me as temporary assistant, I have invariably found him to be an efficient, energetic and courteous clerk,—always willing to learn. In my opinion Mr. Sherwood is a young man of unusual talents and rather superior ability and diplomacy, who is likely to make a success of anything he undertakes and applies himself diligently to, either in official or commercial life.

If Mr. Sherwood should be favoured with the permanent appointment of assistant clerk of the Routine and Records Branch, and if he decides to remain in the service, I have no doubt whatever that, with his natural ability and experience, he would be, within a few years at most, sufficiently familiar with the numerous duties of the office to eventually become a creditable successor to me, when in course of time my retirement from official life may be necessary.

The duties pertaining to the Routine and Records Branch are somewhat complicated as also decidedly peculiar and technical in their character. This fact is not always properly recognized, understood or appreciated as it should be by the "powers" and others who ought to be interested. And no man, young or old, no matter how clever he might be, can possibly become capable of properly handling the affairs of this office, without outside assistance, in less than several years of actual experience and close application. The Routine and Records Branch is one of the most important links in an exceedingly important chain of the House of Commons Service. This conclusion is reached as a result of my fifteen years personal experience in that branch of the service, and can be easily verified.

Trusting, Mr. Speaker, that what I have herein written you may be of some assistance to Mr. Sherwood in his efforts to obtain a permanent place in the House of Commons service.

I have the honour to be,

Obediently yours,

Ch. F. Colwell,

Chief Clerk of Routine and Records.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That is from his superior?

Mr. ROGERS: That is the gentleman who was at that time the head of the department, who has since been temporarily dismissed; and so far as I am concerned I sincerely hope that he will be permanently dismissed.

Mr. PROULX: Was it for writing this letter?

Mr. ROGERS: No, it was for writing the speech delivered by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

Mr. TURRIFF: That is not true.

Mr. ROGERS: Because I have here a memorandum prepared by Mr. Colwell giving the history and the story of the letter that was written by Mr. Sherwood, and recounting all the facts here. It seems that my hon. friend was a very regular attendant at the office of Mr. Colwell during the session, where he was able to have the assistance of Mr. Colwell in placing certain orders on the Order Paper from time to time. I have no desire to go into the details. Mr. Colwell has admitted to the Speaker that he wrote certain memoranda which I shall not trouble the House by reading, because it would be only a retailing of affairs that I would regard as unworthy of the House. Therefore, all I have to say is that we have evidently been fortunate, according to Mr. Col-

3 p.m. well, in having secured the services of a man so eminently qualified to fill the position; and if it is filled as well as Mr. Colwell says it will be, by Mr. Sherwood. then $1,600 a year is a very reasonable salary. I may say that when Mr. Colwell was appointed a few years ago he started in at once, in the same position, under the reign of hon. gentlemen opposite, with a salary of $1,800.

Mr. TURRIFF: As chief of the office.

Mr. ROGERS: As chief of the office, but he started in at that, and he was not as well qualified and prepared at that time as apparently Mr. Sherwood is to-day, after his four years' experience. I do not think my hon. friend has much to complain of or very much reason to take the time of the House in bringing up this trivial matter, because I am sure the record of the present administration stands high—at least, it ought to stand high in the estimation of hon. gentlemen opposite—for the manner in which we have respected their appointments both in Ottawa and elsewhere. That is a condition of affairs which I do not approve of myself, and I frankly acknowledge it here in this House. If we are going to have, in return for that record, insult added to injury, then I for one will endeavour, with whatever little energy I may possess, to correct this condition of affairs by cleaning out a lot of the staff we have in Ottawa and elsewhere who devote 90 per cent of their time, as Mr. Colwell has been doing, to political affairs rather than to the duties of the offices to which they are appointed. I think, therefore,

that hon. gentlemen opposite have no grounds for complaint.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think it is only fair to Mr. Colwell for me to say that this matter was brought to my attention by half a dozen civil servants outside of the House of Commons altogether, and I went to Mr. Colwell for information, just as I would go to any other chief clerk or deputy minister when I wanted information in connection with anything concerning their departments. It is absolutely unfair to Mr. Colwell if he has been suspended and is going to be dismissed, as my hon. friend suggests, if he can bring it about, on the ground that he gave me information, because he gave me no information that I did not go to him and ask him for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The very natural observations which have been presented to the House by the hon. member for Assiniboia have been met, I am sorry to say, by the Minister of Public Works in a manner which I hope he will, on reflection, regret. It is useless to wrangle over this matter. When he insinuates that the late Government did not deal with civil service appointments as they should have done, I retaliate by calling his attention to the manner in which dismissals have been made by the thousands in certain departments. I will make an offer to my hon. friend in this matter. We have a law which regulates the Civil Service. I ask nothing more than that law shall be observed, for the Civil Service or against the Civil Service, as the case may be. Is he prepared to do anything else? Does he not think that is a reasonable offer? Does he not now think that appointments should be made according to the law which we have laid down in reference to this matter? This appointment is an exception to the law which has been laid down for the regulation of the Civil Service. It was made on the application of Mr. Speaker, and I call the attention of the House to the manner in which it was made. This is a letter addressed by the Speaker to Dr. Flint, the Clerk of this House. It has been read, but I shall read it again, because the whole germ of the difficulty is to be found in it:

re H. C. Sherwood.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, and thank you for your information.

Will you kindly communicate with the Finance Minister and tell him that I desire to give the position of assistant clerk in the Orders and Records Office of the House to Mr. H. C. Sherwood at the salary of $1,600 per annum, and that I would like to have direct legislation naming Mr. Sherwood in the Appropriation Bill for that office.

Why is it that the Speaker asks for an appointment of that kind and asks to have a special appropriation of Parliament?

Why is it? Simply because the gentleman in question is not qualified under the Civil Service Act. No one questions his ability. Mr. Colwell gave him a good certificate, and upon that certificate it was quite within the province of the Speaker to recommend his appointment. But there is a condition attached to such appointments; it is that the man who is recommended for the position should qualify for that position as the law requires. The law was passed in 1908, with the concurrence of both parties in the House, to put an end, as was suggested, and, as I believe, rightly suggested, to appointments being made matters of patronage. That law was passed, and it requires that every man, before being appointed to an office, must pass an examination. Is that a fair regulation, or is it not? Is it not quite proper that an applicant for a position in the Civil Service should, by passing an examination, show that he is competent to serve the country? Mr. Colwell wrote this letter on the 26th March. I do not know the circumstances. Mr. Colwell evidently wanted to be agreeable to the Speaker. The Speaker wanted this young man appointed. I do not inquire what were the circumstances. It is stated that he is the son of an official of the Conservative Association in Ottawa. That does not matter, if he was entitled to be selected. They say that he is intelligent. My hon. friend says that he is also in business. Evidently he has given more attention to his business than to his studies, because he knew that to get the appointment he must pass the Civil Service examination, and he took that examination and failed. If he wanted to be appointed, having failed once—that he is intelligent is admitted—he should have applied himself to the studies which would have qualified him to pass when he tried again. It was open to him to go to his books and acquire the necessary knowledge, and apply again to the Civil Service Commission. But to-day, after this young man has failed in his examination, after it is recorded by the Civil Service Commission that they cannot give him the certificate which the Speaker must have in order to appoint him, he very

coolly asks that Parliament should appoint him, thus setting aside the law altogether. I ask, can anything be said in reply to the observations which have been made by my hon. friend from Assiniboia, that this is not the way to improve the Civil Service? Is it to be believed by anybody that a man can disregard the law relating to the Civil Service and that, for some reason or another, he can override that law and obtain his appointment from the party in office? Does any one believe that this would be conducive to the dignity of the Civil Service, or to the good administration of the country? My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce during this session, spoke very forcibly upon the evils of patronage. Nothing could have been more charming than what he said on that occasion. This is an example of the evils of patronage. Can my hon. friend justify this appointment which is in direct disregard of the law? I think my hon. friend will not rise in his seat in defence of such a course.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Will the right hon. gentleman say whether or not, from 1908 till 1911, officials were named in the Estimates under his Administration, just as this man is named in these Estimates?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker—

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I ask the question. My right hon. friend says the law is being violated because we are naming an official in the Estimates. I ask my hon. friend whether or not, from 1908 till 1911, a similar course was not pursued in regard to any official or officials.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I can not say at this moment.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I can.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Let us assume that several appointments were made in that manner. Certain officials in the customs and other officials have to be appointed in this way; but here we have a man who failed to pass his examination and who is trying to pass over the rules of the Civil Service Act. I do not think that such an appointment was made by the late Government. I may be in error; perhaps my hon. friend has something in his mind, but I do not think so. I will put another question to my hon. friend: does he approve of this Government doing wrong because we did wrong when we were in office? Is that what he told the people of this country in 1911? Where would it lead to if a party coming into office disregarded its pledges and said, "Our opponents did the same?" I repeat that I do not believe —I do not know, because matters which took place between 1908 and 1911 are far away from my memory—I do not think the late Government was guilty of making an appointment under the circumstances in which this appointment has been made. If my hon. friend has a case in mind I shall be glad to hear of it. Even if we had done so—and I do not believe it—would that be a precedent or a justification for what the Government is doing to-day? Let us follow the Act or abolish it. Everybody knows that we must have a good Civil Service if we want to have the affairs of this country properly administered. Nobody will deny that. My hon. friend will be the first to admit that. We have an Act; let us follow it. There are circumstances in which some justification might be made for disregarding the law. I am not so positive, or so dogmatic, as to say that there is to be no exception, but the exceptions must be justified, and in this case there is no justification at all. It is an abuse of the rules of the Civil Service, an abuse of the law passed by this Parliament. When it is considered that this man attempted to qualify himself and failed, and that he will not attempt to qualify himself, I say that there is no possible justification for such an appointment.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My right hon. friend, like the rest of us, occasionally loses his sense of proportion, and this is one of the occasions. He suggests that the Government is doing something wrong in inserting the name of this man in the Estimates. The Government is doing nothing wrong. The Civil Service Act is in full force and effect, and it would be impossible to appoint this man to the position to which he has been appointed without the sanction and authority of Parliament. If Parliament approves of this Estimate the Civil Service Act is to that extent repealed with the consent of Parliament, so that I entirely dissent from the view put forward that anything wrong is being done. Here we have before us an exceptional case, the case of a man well qualified for the position, but unable, presumably, to pass the Civil Service examination. What has been done in this case has been done in fifty, in a hundred cases since 1908, namely, where a man is qualified for the position and is not able to

pass the Civil Service examination, an exception is occasionally made and the man's name is inserted in the Estimates. I may say that I do not know this man.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Neither do I.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend produced some correspondence which had taken place between the Speaker and myself. The Speaker passes on the name of the party whom he thinks suitable for the position. The presumption is that the Speaker has given the matter consideration, or that the Committee on Internal Economy has given it consideration. It comes before the Minister of Finance, who inserts the item in the Estimates, and it is considered by the Treasury Board and by the Council. The question asked is whether the man is qualified, whether he has had experience in the office. According to the letter read by the hon. Minister of Public Works from the chief of the department, this man is eminently qualified for the position. The salary is $1,600 per annum.

From the way that the hon. member for Assiniboia brought the matter forward one would imagine that this was a question of international importance instead of being that of the appointment of a $1,600 clerk to a position requiring the skill and experience which apparently it does. The Civil Service Act, while serving a useful purpose in regard to the great majority of public appointments, is inflexible to a degree. Cases arise continually, and it is perfectly clear to any one who has common sense, in which the service is debarred from taking on men well qualified for the positions because they are not able to pass an academic examination. One case was brought to my attention the other day in which a first class messenger—and they are difficult to get to-day—was debarred from taking a position in the Civil Service because he could not do long division. I doubt very much whether my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition could pass the examination at which this would-be messenger failed. He could not be a messenger because he was not able to divide 5,685 by 334.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Could he do subtraction?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think better than my hon. friend can; my hon. friend could not pass that examination. I doubt very much if any of these hon. gentlemen could qualify for the 2nd division. I doubt if any hon. gentleman opposite, even my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, could to-morrow pass the matriculation examination. They could do it once, but they could not do it to-day. I am just instancing this case because it illustrates how the Civil Service is suffering by a strict adherence to the letter of the law. I agree that the Act is a useful one and that its provisions generally should be observed, but to regard in the letter all the provisions of the Civil Service Act and to make no exceptions, such as that which is being made to-day, would, instead of being to the advantage of the Civil Service, prove a detriment to it. It would prevent the Civil Service from obtaining desirable appointees who might not be able to pass the examination although eminently qualified for the positions in question. A business man seeking a clerk for his office does not submit the applicant to a test such as that to which he is subjected by the Civil Service Commissioners. He inquires generally as to the education he has had, and then he estimates whether he is qualified for the position. While I am saying this in regard to exceptions to the Civil Service Act, I desire to say that I regard the Civil Service Act as a highly desirable enactment, but that no exceptions should ever be made to it would appear to me to be against the public interest rather than advantageous, and I am quite certain, although I have no particular cases in mind, that I could find fifty cases from 1908 to 1911 in which parties who could not pass the Civil Service Act were named in the Estimates of my right hon. friend. My right hon. friend to-day has put forth the common law view, the fixed view of the letter of the statutes. I know that he, like myself, is an admirer of Abraham Lincoln. I would commend to him an extract from a letter which Abraham Lincoln once wrote to one of his officers in the Northern army on behalf of a junior officer whom he desired to be promoted. In that letter he said something like this to the commanding officer: I want you, if you can, to consider favourably the promotion of So-and-So to such a rank irrespective of whether or not he can tell the shade of Julius Caesar's hair. What he had in mind was that he wanted him to be appointed to this office on his merits, but he did not want him to be necessarily debarred from the position by reason of his not being able to pass an examination as to the military history of the Romans.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is said that Caesar wore a wig.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: He did not have much hair to show.

Mr. PROULX: There is one phase of this question that has not been touched upon by the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) or the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said that under the Civil Service law this appointment came under 2B, where the minimum salary would be $800 and the maximum $1,600. It was changed to 2A. I do not know at whose direction this was done, but he is getting $800 more than he should have received. When we are told that poor messengers getting only $500 cannot get any increase to enable them to support their families, notwithstanding that they are employed not only during the session, but the whole year round, a man with a business in town is appointed at a salary of $1,600 instead of $800. While an appointment of this kind is made poor men are starving with salaries of $500 and $600.

Mr. TURRIFF: The hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Finance have laid stress on the point that this was a particular appointment needing skill and ability. Let me read again to my hon. friends the statement of the Clerk of the House of Commons, who knows what the office requires. Here is what Dr. Flint says to the Speaker on February 16:

> The office does not require a person of professional or technical or any peculiar qualifications, at it is, like most all the clerkships of the House, a mere ordinary clerkship, requiring no professional or technical qualifications whatever.

I have nothing to add to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I might be permitted to say a few words on this. It is true that Mr. Sherwood was recommended to me and to the Government for the position. Mr. Sherwood is represented to the committee as being a young man; one would believe that he was a young man of about 15 or 16 years of age.

Mr. DOUGLAS: That is a boy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Sherwood is a married man with a family living in Ottawa, and the recommendations which I received on his behalf could not have been better. I asked for some information from the Clerk of the House as to the appointment, and it is true that in his letter of the 14th February the Clerk of the House advised me that Mr. Sherwood would have to get a certificate from the Civil Service Commission. That point was mentioned by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff); but in that letter from the Clerk of the House there is also another point which the hon. gentleman omitted to mention. Here is what the Clerk of the House said:

> If Mr. Sherwood is to be appointed under the Civil Service Act there is no way that I know of by which he can omit obtaining the Civil Service certificate of qualification for the grade referred.
>
> The only other method is the one suggested by him in his letter, viz., a direct legislative Act naming him in the appropriation Bill for the office and fixing his grade and salary after its insertion in the Estimates. This is a matter solely in the jurisdiction of the Government.

This course has been followed in a great many cases not only this session but in other sessions, and it is the course which I have adopted on this occasion. Mr. Sherwood has had a very good certificate given him by his chief, Mr. Colwell, who has described him as a very good man and perfectly qualified. At the opening of the present session, when Mr. Colwell was ill, Mr. Sherwood was in charge of the office and everything went well. Mr. Sherwood has been attending to his duties during the session, and he is doing well; he could not do better, according to his chief, and he desires appointment to the office.

Would it be possible for Mr. Sherwood, who is attending to his duties here morning, afternoon and night, to prepare for the Civil Service examination? I submit that consideration to the House, and I think that every hon. gentleman who wants to be fair will admit that it would not be easy for Mr. Sherwood to prepare for an examination. The Speaker is responsible for the good administration of this department. Here is a man who is perfectly qualified. His functions are very, very important, as can be judged by the letter of Mr. Colwell, which was read this afternoon. If there is anything wrong in connection with the work of this office any member can come to this House and place the blame upon the Speaker. I ask the House if I was not well advised in asking the Government to put this amount in the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. PROULX: Why was the grade changed from subdivision B of the second division, to subdivision A of the second division?

Mr. SPEAKER: Because it is a very important position; and I think that this is

a matter that can be decided by the members of this House just as well as by the Civil Service Commission. I think that, for a married man who has a family, the salary of $1,600 a year, especially in these hard times, is a very reasonable salary for any position.

Mr. PROULX: Is it not a fact that he works only during the session?

Mr. SPEAKER: When this legislation has passed he will be a permanent officer, and will have to come here every day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We have had no answer to the question why, when the Clerk of the House stated that the only position to which Mr. Sherwood could be appointed was subdivision B of the second division, and when Mr. Speaker had that request transmitted to the Government, the classification was changed by somebody from subdivision B to subdivision A. The result is that, whereas if Mr. Sherwood had been appointed to subdivision B, his salary could not rise above $1,600 without his passing later on an examination and qualifying for the higher division, his classification has been changed in these Estimates from subdivision B to subdivision A, so that he begins immediately at $1,600 and his salary will increase automatically up to $2,100. That has not been explained to the committee and I think it ought to be. It appears from the statement of the Clerk of the House that Mr. Sherwood is being appointed to a class in which there is no vacancy, a class which is already filled; and is being appointed to a higher position than Mr. Speaker apparently recommended he should be appointed to. I do not think this is a mere trivial matter, as the Minister of Finance has said, because there is a principle involved. The principle is whether we should have any regard whatever to the Civil Service Act or whether whenever anybody who has some influential friends is desirous of an appointment to a position under the Government, it will only be necessary for him to go to those who have influence and his name will be put in the Estimates and he will be appointed, irrespective of the requirements of the statute. It does seem to me that, to take a young man who is unable to pass the Civil Service examinations necessary to qualify him for the discharge of the duties of a routine clerk, and put him at once in this high division, starting at a salary of $1,600, in a higher class than that which many employees of the Government who have been for years in the Civil Service have been able to attain, is excedingly unfair. We know that there are hundreds of clerks working all the year round, not merely during the four months that Parliament is in session, who are receiving less than $900 per year; men who are better qualified than Mr. Sherwood, but who cannot rise above the $900 because they have not been able to pass the qualifying examination. It is very discouraging to them that a young man, not able to fulfil the requirements of the Civil Service Act, should be pitchforked into a higher position at a salary $700 more than they are able to attain, and with the certainty that his salary will increase automatically until it reaches $2,100. That is very discouraging to the hundreds of employees in the Civil Service who have passed examinations and who cannot rise beyond $900 a year without passing further examination and being recommended by their chiefs for promotion. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works ought to threaten dire vengeance upon employees of the Civil Service simply because there is some little criticism of the attempt which the Government is making to override the Civil Service Act. This young man has simply been employed as a temporary clerk, and has not been able to pass the Civil Service examination; yet he is to receive immediately a salary of $1,600 a year for four months work, because, say what you like, that is all he will have to do. He is employed for four months in the year, and during the rest of the time he will be able to attend to the ordinary mercantile business he is carrying on in Ottawa. He will be receiving a salary about equal, considering the time he is employed during the year, to that which a deputy minister receives. The salary of a deputy minister, as provided by the Civil Service Act, is only $5,000 a year; and he has to work the whole year round and to carry very great responsibilities. Yet this young man, as I have said, who has been only a short time in the service, for this short period of from three months to four months, about one-quarter of the time that a deputy minister has to work, is to receive a salary practically equal to that which a deputy minister receives. I do not think it is at all encouraging to the Civil Service. I cannot see why my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has approved of this. That hon. gentleman, during this session, made

remarks with regard to subsidies which aroused very warm approval throughout the country; but I am very much afraid that, in respect of patronage as in respect of many other matters, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce reserves his eloquent remarks and his strong arguments for the ears of the private members of this House and for the ears of the public, instead of for the benefit of his colleagues in Council, because we find that continually the Government is bringing down to this House measures of which, if we are to judge the Minister of Trade and Commerce from the speeches he makes here, he cannot be expected to approve. I should like to hear whether the Minister of Trade and Commerce approves of this departure from the terms of the Civil Service Act, approves of this yielding to the demands of those having influence with the Government, and approves of the making of this appointment in defiance of the provisions of the Civil Service Act. It is surely a step towards yielding to those pernicious views with regard to patronage which are of the very worst description.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I wish to call attention to an answer which I received in this House during this session in regard to the frequent overriding of the Civil Service Act. It strikes me as an extraordinary circumstance. The hon. gentleman will remember that when the Act was passed in 1908 it was drawn to the attention of the House that there would be cases in which experts were required for the service of the Government —eminent engineers, for example, coming from outside of Canada and entering the Government's service for a time. It was clear that it would not be practicable to submit such men to examination. Clause 21 was put in the Act to enable the Government, by going through a certain process, to have men of that class appointed. I asked the question during the present session, how many men had been appointed in the different departments of the Government under section 21 since this Administration came into power, and the answer I received was that these appointments numbered 220. That is an alarming number. Of course, 220 experts were not appointed. A large number of appointments were made of men who were more than thirty-five years of age and could not be appointed under the terms of the Civil Service Act. But dozens and scores of these people were appointed in violation of the Act, by calling them "experts." I would ask the Minister of Finance to look into this matter. If we are to have a Civil Service Act that is to be of any use it will not do to ignore its provisions in this way.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the hon. gentleman would like to know to what extent the Civil Service Act has been ignored, I would recommend him to look over the Estimates under the late Liberal Administration from 1908, when the Civil Service Act came into force, until 1911, when this Government assumed office. He will find cases on all fours with this case—

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not talking about this case.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have not had an opportunity of looking into the matter carefully, but I would call attention, for instance, to item 319 of the Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909. I find the following:

> To provide for the appointment of F. X. Saucier to a second-class clerkship at $1,200, from 21st July, 1908.

Mr. REID: In what department?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In the House of Commons. Why was it necessary to name Mr. Saucier? I do not know Mr. Saucier; I assume that he was a man qualified for the position. But the right hon. leader of the Opposition—I am sorry he is not in his place at the moment—was doing wrong in this matter according to the views of his supporters. Here is a case of an appointment made under authority of the Estimates, just as in the case of Mr. Sherwood who is named in this Estimate. Then I would call the attention to the Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1911.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If Mr. Saucier had not passed the examination, the item would have read "Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act."

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Not at all. Let the hon. gentleman look at the Estimate now under consideration. He will not find there the words "Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act." That is implied.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think the hon. gentleman will find that the late Administration, upon the advice of the Minister of Justice of that day, inserted these words. If they

did not appear, it was assumed that the party had passed the examination.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Minister of Justice, I have no doubt, advised it, but they did not carry it out. The Government named officials whom they desired to have appointed—no doubt for good and sufficient reasons—who were not able to take the Civil Service examinations. The Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1911, contains this estimate:

To provide for Miss Kate M. Fraser in third division, subdivision B, $500.

Why permit a special item referring to Kate? Why not name the position to which Kate was to be appointed instead of naming Kate in the Estimates? Then there is another item No. 399:

To provide for the appointment of the following officers, now in the Outside Service in Victoria, B.C., to the Inside Service at Ottawa at the following salaries; from April 1, 1910:
W. B. McLaughlin, second division, subdivision A.. .. .. $2,000
H. G. Dalby, third division, subdivision A. 1,000

Why was it necessary to name these gentlemen? It would not have been necessary at all unless the Civil Service Act stood in the way of their being given appointments which they are given by this estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Civil Service Act distinctly provides for bringing in officials from the outside service.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the Civil Service Act is complied with. But in this case the Civil Service Act was not complied with, and that is the reason it was necessary to name them in the Estimates. I am not finding fault with the naming of these officers in the Estimates. What I say is that what was done in these cases is what is done in this present case, and what has been done in scores of cases since the Civil Service Act came into effect.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. gentleman is wrong. If he will take the Estimates under the late Government, he will find that wherever there is a case—and it was very exceptional—when the terms of the Civil Service Act were not complied with, the words "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act" were inserted.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no doubt that by reason of a certain predilection or bias that he has in favour of the late Administration, the hon. gentleman is confident in his present view. But I want to tell him he is wrong. Appointments were made continually by means of the Estimates where the provisions of the Civil Service Act—for some good reason, no doubt—could not be complied with. There is no doubt about it; it has been done repeatedly.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. gentleman is absolutely wrong.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, I think we shall have to agree to disagree, because I know I am absolutely right. Now, my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) states that instead of $800 a year a salary of $1,600 a year has been fixed, and calls attention to the fact that the Clerk of the House stated that the grade of the position is B of the second division. Now, my hon. friend will observe that in the same paragraph of the letter in which that statement appears, the Clerk stated that the Speaker desires to appoint Mr. Sherwood to this office at a salary of $1,600, and desires to have this done by direct appointment under the Appropriation Act. The Clerk of the House made a mistake as to the grade, because the subdivision of the second division which carries a salary of $1,600 is A and not B. The Estimate, as it is now before the committee, is correct—it refers to second division, subdivision A.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If Mr. Sherwood had been appointed in subdivision B he could have had a salary of $1,600. But, placing him in subdivision A of the second division means that his salary increased automatically to $2,100.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Minister of Finance has not dealt with my point at all. I suppose the reason is that he could not blame the same fault on the late Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What was the hon. gentleman's point?

Mr. SINCLAIR: It was that over 200 so-called experts have been appointed under section 21 of the Act, since 1911. You see by the facts of the appointments that many of the men appointed under section 21, as "experts," were unable to get in legally, because they were too old.

They could not pass their examinations; they were over age. In these cases section 21 was resorted to in violation of the law, because that section was intended to apply only to cases in which experts were required by the Government. In those cases exam-

inations were dispensed with because the men to be appointed were eminent professors, eminent engineers, or persons well qualified to do the work required by the Government.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There may be great experts and there may be lesser experts, but whether the man in question be a greater expert or a lesser expert he cannot be appointed unless he gets a certificate from the Civil Service Commission that as regards that office he is to be looked upon as an expert.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There has to be action on the part of the Government as well.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Civil Service Board has to give a certificate that as regards the office in question he has expert qualifications which enable him to be appointed.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It may be that the board is subservient to the Government; I do not know about that.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would not say that. I think that the Civil Service Board has been, on the whole, a fair board; I do not think it is prejudiced in favour of the Government. As a matter of fact, if I have one complaint more frequently put to me than another it is that the Civil Service Board is rather against the Government than in favour of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They were against the late Government.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are against all Governments.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not a bad attitude.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I remember when the Civil Service Act was passed in 1908 that my hon. friend gave very valuable assistance. After due deliberation he agreed that 35 years of age should be the maximum age of persons appointed to positions in the Inside Service. But if he examines the appointments made by his Administration he will find that in scores of cases section 21 has been resorted to in order to get men into the service who are much over 35 years of age. I think the fixing of that maximum age was a good provision, because if men were appointed over that age they would be pensioned later and these pensions would increase the cost of the service. I do not mention this for any political purpose or in order unnecessarily to condemn the Government. I simply want my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to look into it and if that abuse is going on to use his influence to prevent its recurrence during the coming year.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a fact that from the very outset of the operations of the Civil Service Act those having charge of appointments in the House of Commons staff have objected to recognizing it. The ground was taken, if I remember correctly, that while the Act was all right for the rest of the staff, they did not care to have it applied to the staff of the House of Commons. I think Mr. Sherwood is a good man; anything that I have entrusted to his care has been well performed. The situation is this: the Speaker of the House of Commons has recommended Mr. Sherwood in violation of the Civil Service Act. Had the Civil Service Act been complied with, some other appointment would have been made—we may as well face the facts. However, Parliament approves of this course and the Speaker is upheld. I hope that sometime when I have a recommendation to make, Parliament will be soft-hearted as it has been in the present instance, and approve of some appointments that I may suggest in violation of the Civil Service Act.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will all depend on its merits.

Mr. GRAHAM: It will depend more largely, I think, on the man who makes the recommendation. Speaking of the Civil Service Commission, last year the acting Minister of Railways lead off in lambasting not only the law but the men who were enforcing it. I think that other members of the Government have become infected with the same microbe. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will remember the scene in the House of Commons and what took place before and after. As a matter of fact, some members of the Government did not like the Civil Service Commission, and for that reason they did not intend to obey the law. They ought to have the courage to repeal the law if they do not intend to obey it or even approximately to obey it. The Act does impose some hardships. This case is but a mild one compared with one that I could mention. When I was minister I could not get a messenger because he could not pass the Civil Service examination. He was a trustworthy young man; I think he could have done long division, although I am not so sure about short division. Any-

way he would have made a good messenger, but the Civil Service Commission absolutely declined to grant a certificate, and I went no further. There is another case. A young man who had not quite reached the age required of those presenting themselves for examination had enlisted and he wanted to write on his Civil Service examination before going into camp. He did not want his certificate until he became of proper age. The Civil Service Commission, however, would not let him write. Legally, of course, they were right, because the law says that an applicant must have reached the age of eighteen years. It struck me that this was a hardship, particularly as conditions exist now that never existed before. If the young man had been going on a pleasure trip or had been going into business, I could easily see the absolute necessity of complying with the law. But he has enlisted, and because he lacks a few months or weeks of the age required, he was not allowed to write. I am not sure that the Act should not be amended or made a little flexible under exceptional conditions such as that.

Mr. ROGERS: How would it do to make the commissioners a little flexible?

Mr. GRAHAM: They have no power to go beyond the Act unless they violate the law. They are not like the Government, because the Government can introduce an Act in violation of the law, but the commissioners cannot. Many universities have in cases of this kind given their students the advantage of unusual privileges in the matter of taking examinations. For instance, in connection with the Boer war I know several cases where young men who were taking part in the war were allowed to take their examinations under special conditions. I would suggest to the Government that they either repeal the Civil Service Act or sail a little closer to it. If the staff of the House of Commons is not to come under it—and it does not come under it very much—the law had better be amended to provide that that staff shall not come under it. In the next place, I think that some amendment ought to be made to give the commissioners power to act in such cases as I have mentioned. It is absolutely ridiculous that we should have a law on the statute-book by which a young man who wants to pass the Civil Service examination before he goes to fight for his country is not allowed to do so, simply because he is a few weeks under age, even though he does not want a certificate until he does attain the proper age.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is a matter which I desire to bring to the attention of the Government in connection with the shipping of goods from any part of Canada to British Columbia via the Panama canal. This matter has been brought to the attention of the Government on several occasions by the people of British Columbia, more particularly by the business interests of Vancouver, Prince Rupert and Victoria. All that these people are asking for is that the Minister of Customs appoint a customs officer to assist in the bonding of goods going from any part of Canada to British Columbia via the Panama canal. It appears that, under the present regulations, it is almost impossible to handle the trade unless an officer of the Canadian customs is located at New York for the purpose of seeing to the transhipping of the goods to the steamers that will go via the canal. This matter was first taken up by the business interests of British Columbia, and I think I could not do better than to read to the minister the resolutions passed there. On the 4th of November, 1914, at a meeting held at Vancouver of men representing financial interests and investments in British Columbia, on behalf of principals and clients in Canada, Great Britain, France and other countries, a resolution to the following effect was passed:

Appreciating the facts that—

The development of the resources of this province, especially the coast cities,

The exportation of products of this and adjoining provinces,

The importation of raw materials for factories now established and to be established here,

As well as the importation of goods necessary to be brought here for consumption, are largely dependent upon our water facilities;

Realizing the great possibilities for the people of this province, to be derived as a result of the Panama canal route,

Realizing that these possibilities can only be converted into realities by placing ourselves in a position to utilize the water facilities offered,

Are resolved that we put forth the most vigorous effort to encourage shipping to come to this coast, particularly at this time when the Dominion Government are nearing completion of the dock and grain elevator at this port, and the prospect so bright for moving the prairie grain through the coast ports in the near future,

We further resolve that we heartily endorse the request of the British Columbia Boards of Trade to the Government at Ottawa, for the appointment of a customs officer at New York, firmly believing that the opening of this new channel of trade will bring to British Columbia unlimited benefits.

This is a question affecting not British Columbia alone, but more particularly Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. The people at the coast ask that they should be allowed to import their goods by the cheapest possible route, and if that is not done the loss will fall not upon the people of British Columbia alone, but on the manufacturers of the eastern provinces as well. We must all recognize that Canada is a great stretch of country extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and that many classes of goods manufactured in Ontario and Quebec could not possibly be shipped to Vancouver by rail. Canned goods of all descriptions and heavy hardware and many other classes of goods cannot possibly be shipped by rail to British Columbia. Unless they can be taken by water from eastern Canada to Vancouver, their use on the Pacific coast of Canada will be impossible.

4 p.m. The result is a direct loss to the people of the eastern provinces, as well as to the people of British Columbia. Not only is this route via the Panama canal necessary for the goods that are manufactured here and consumed in British Columbia, but it will put our merchants in the coast cities in a very much better position than they are now for exporting to China and Japan and many other foreign countries. At all events, the people of British Columbia, the merchants, manufacturers and financial institutions, and everybody interested in that province, are demanding the right to bring in goods by water freight instead of by railway freight, especially classes of goods that cannot stand the 3,000 mile railway haul. I ask the Minister of Customs on what ground the people of this part of Canada should dictate to the people of British Columbia as to how they shall bring in their goods. If the people of British Columbia can get goods in by water freight at from 30 per cent to 50 per cent less than they can get them in over the railways, why should we interfere with their doing that? I wonder what the people of Ontario and the Prairie Provinces would think if this Government undertook to say that they would not be allowed to use water carriage on the Great Lakes because we have built railroads that can carry this freight and we have got to keep the traffic in the hands of the railroads because we have put a lot of money into their construction. The people of the East and of the prairies would not stand that for one moment. It would be too absurd. Well, it is not more absurd than the action of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs who, for the last couple of years, has deliberately and emphatically denied to the merchants of British Columbia the privilege of bringing in their freight by water instead of by land. All that is necessary to accomplish this is to have a Canadian customs officer in the port of New York; and one of the steamship companies, British company at that, which intends to put on a line of steamers from New York to Vancouver via the Panama canal, has undertaken to pay the salary of a Canadian customs officer; so that this plan will not cost this Government anything, while it will accomplish a great deal to help out the merchants at the coast, and also the manufacturers in the eastern provinces. My friend the Minister of Customs has stated in the correspondence that has taken place on this matter that a country cannot send custotms officials into foreign countries. But let me point out to my hon. friend the minister that a great deal of transcontinental trade carried over the Canadian Pacific railway has been American through freight, and in order to enable the Canadian Pacific railway to carry the freight, the American Customs Department have placed American customs officers in Vancouver for the purpose of facilitating the transfer of that freight. What has been the result? The Canadian railways have reaped a rich harvest by carrying American goods over the Canadian Pacific Railway line, and that has been brought about by the Americans doing exactly what the people of Vancouver and Victoria are asking the Minister of Customs to do, and what he has so far persistently refused to do. To my mind the reasons that have been given in the past have not been sufficient reasons. At first it was stated that the railways were against this proposition. Well, I am not sure that the railways are against the proposition. The railroads are not going to lose anything in connection with this proposition for the simple reason that they are not now getting the freight. Take a carload of canned goods put up in the province of Ontario. You have to ship that cargo of goods over one of the transcontinental railways and land it in Vancouver. One man attempts to bring in a carload of goods in that way. Another man buys a carload of the same class of goods manufactured in the United States, ships them to New York, gets a rate by the Panama canal so low in com-

parison with the railway rate that he is enabled to pay the duty on the American manufactured goods and to land them in the city of Vancouver at a very considerably lower rate than it would take him to land the same class of goods manufactured in the province of Ontario. My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, in his endeavour to prevent goods manufactured in Canada from going by water to the people of Vancouver, is cutting the Canadian manufacturer out of his own market, and he is not benefiting the railways in any degree, because the railways cannot get the freight as the people of Vancouver can buy American goods cheaper.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the Minister of Customs would refuse to allow goods which are being shipped say from Montreal, Quebec, or St. John or Halifax to Vancouver, to pass through American waters to the Panama canal to be landed in Vancouver or Victoria?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes. What I understand from the correspondence I have here and from the statements made by members of the Boards of Trade of Vancouver and other cities on the coast is that the Minister of Customs has given instructions to the collectors of customs in these coast cities that they are not to take entry of any goods shipped in that way, that is, goods which have passed over a short haul on American railroads to get to New York.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When they are on the vessel all the way does the Minister refuse?

Mr. REID: There is no objection to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would be surprised if there was.

Mr. REID: In the case of a vessel loaded at St. John and going through the Panama canal and discharging its cargo at Vancouver—there is no objection.

Mr. TURRIFF: There is no objection to that; the objection is that there is no service either from Montreal or from Quebec in summer or from St. John or from Halifax in winter to Vancouver by the Panama canal, and that in order to take advantage of the water rate by the Panama canal you have to ship goods at the present time from New York. It is pointed out that it is very much further from Montreal or from St. John to Vancouver, taking the summer and winter ports, the difference being some 1,400 miles, than from New York. It is very much further from the manufacturing establishments of Ontario and Quebec to the Canadian ports by rail in many cases than it is to New York. In the meantime we have no steamship company that will undertake to make a trip from Montreal or St. John, summer and winter, to Vancouver by the Panama canal. Therefore, there is no method by which the Canadian manufacturer can ship his goods by water from a Canadian port at the present time. No doubt he may be able to do so later, but in the meantime if he wants to take advantage of the low water rate by the Panama route he has to ship from New York. The difficulty, they claim, is that you cannot send your goods to New York and have them transhipped in bond without a Canadian customs officer being there to look after the shipping. All they ask is that a Canadian customs officer be placed there. The Maple Leaf Steamship Company of Great Britain has offered to pay the salary of a customs official, if appointed, in order to get this trade. They would make regular sailings; the merchants of British Columbia would get their goods cheaper. and they would get them from Canadian manufacturers, whereas in the meantime they have to buy American made goods in order to get them cheaper. At one time it was thought that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association was opposed to this proposition, but I notice from the correspondence that that body is not against it. The railway companies are not opposed to it and, so far as I can find out, the only person that stands in the way of the wishes of the people of British Columbia is the hon. the Minister of Customs. It is a little thing to ask for. The carrying of freight does not belong to the railway companies any more than to the steamship companies. We have spent, and are spending tens of millions of dollars in providing dockage and harbour facilities in those British Columbia cities, while at the same time my hon. friend is refusing to allow the people of British Columbia to take advantage of a condition that would be to the betterment of British Columbia and the people of eastern Canada.

I desire to give the British Columbia view of the matter in order to make the situation clear, and I shall quote from an article published in The Sun of Vancouver, B.C., on Wednesday, February 9, 1916:

Many moons have waxed and waned since this port was offered a service by the Maple Leaf line from New York to Vancouver, sailing out-

bound from here to the United Kingdom and France. It was just such a service as Vancouver was absolutely in need of. It would have provided cheap water transportation for Canadian goods to be used in this province, besides furnishing tonnage for our exports.

As a condition of securing this valuable service it was necessary that the ships of the line should call at New York rather than at Halifax or any Canadian port. The distance from Vancouver to Halifax is 1,450 miles greater than from Vancouver to New York.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who says that?

Mr. TURRIFF: The Vancouver Sun.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is all wrong.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have a statement here from the Board of Trade of Vancouver, dated September 10, 1915, and this is what it states:

Vancouver to New York, 6,000 miles; Vancouver to Montreal, 7,450 miles.

So that the difference from Vancouver to Montreal is 1,450 miles. The other statement apparently is not correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We can do all the business from St. John and Halifax.

Mr. REID: That is what I say.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is what those people say, but there are no steamers sailing, and there is nothing in view. Meantime the people of British Columbia suffer, and they ask this Government to appoint an official. All they have to do is to name an official and it will not cost them a dollar. Let him be stationed in New York in the meantime and the moment you have a service, from St. John in the winter and Montreal in the summer, to Vancouver, then withdraw your man from there and see that the freight goes from Canadian ports to Canadian ports. But, in the meantime, are the manufacturers of Ontario to be punished because there are no facilities to ship by water either from Montreal or St. John to Vancouver? That is the position. I am not asking, when you are able to ship from Montreal or St. John that you should then help trade to go by way of New York, but in the meantime, if you cannot get a service from St. John or Montreal to Vancouver, why not take advantage of the water route? It is not as if you were hurting anybody. You are not hurting the railways, which do not get the freight in any case, and you are giving an advantage to the people of British Columbia, who, irrespective of every other consideration, are a unit in demanding that they should have the privilege of taking advantage of the cheap freight rates. Is there any argument, any reason, against it? The reasons which have been put up by the Government are two in number. The first is that it would throw the trade largely into the hands of another country. While it is true that we are not getting this trade, we would have this trade carried by a British line of steamers, not an American line. But rather than allow a line of British steamers to carry this trade, apparently, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs absolutely refuses to pay the slightest heed to the demands of his own friends from British Columbia that he should simply name a customs officer, have him sent down there and allow these goods to be carried by a British steamship company. That is all the people of British Columbia are asking.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why not have them come to St. John? We would treat them well.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend from St. John is quite right in asking: why not have them come to St. John? But my hon. friend should address that inquiry not to me, as I have no power in this matter, but to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Panama canal has only been opened recently.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Panama canal has only been opened recently but the people of British Columbia are waiting to take advantage of that canal and they have been prohibited from doing so by the Minister of Customs. The second reason that the Government offer is the following:

We have spent immense sums of money in building railways across Canada and something is due to the Government and these railway facilities.

All I can say is that the railway companies are not going to get any of this trade simply because the class of freight I am speaking of is not able to stand a 3,000 mile rail haul. The consumers and exporters in Vancouver can buy American made goods, pay the duty on them and land them in Vancouver at a considerably cheaper rate than they can buy Canadian goods and ship them over the railways without paying any duty whatever. As long as that condition continues, you will have a dissatisfaction in British Columbia that cannot be avoided, and you will still have a widening of a certain amount of feeling that exists between the East and the West which the legislation of this Government, and more par-

ticularly this particular item, is hardening every month of the year and every year as the years go round. It may have bad effects in the future. If the people of British Columbia become accustomed to trading across the line, it is always more or less difficult to get the trade back again, even although you may have a steamship line from Montreal or St. John to Vancouver. Would it not be better that in the meantime Canadian manufactured goods should go to the customers of the manufacturers in British Columbia via the Panama canal on British ships, even if they had to be shipped a couple of hundred miles on American railways to get them into New York in order to take advantage of the British line that sails from New York to Vancouver? There is the proposition. Would it not be better to encourage Canadian manufacturers by having their goods carried to the people of British Columbia, even if the steamers do call at New York instead of Montreal or St. John in the meantime, or until we can make the necessary arrangements to have a line of steamships from St. John to Vancouver? Now, I want to continue this article from the Sun:

> The distance from Vancouver to Halifax is 1,450 miles greater than from Vancouver to New York.

That should be that the distance from Vancouver to Montreal is 1,450 miles greater than from Vancouver to New York.

> 1. To the eastern Canadian manufacturers—By their thus being able to ship their products "in bond" to British Columbia—thence to Russia, Japan, China, New Zealand and Australia—at the minimum rates, in competition with the manufactured goods from Europe or the United States.
>
> 2. To the manufacturers and producers of British Columbia, as it will provide lowest cost of transportation "inwards" for raw materials, as well as lowest rates for export of products "outwards."
>
> 3. To the consumers of British Columbia, and to those of western Canada up by rail through British Columbia, in getting a fairer ratio of prices for all commodities.
>
> 4. To the ports of Vancouver, Victoria, New Westminster and Prince Rupert, by encouraging shipping, especially from Britain, to call at New York for Canadian goods for British Columbia, the Orient, and vice versa.
>
> The only thing which prevents us from profiting by the offer of the Maple Leaf Line is a letter from the Minister of Customs to the Customs Department at this port prohibiting the admission of Canadian goods arriving by sea if they have passed by the short haul over United States rails to such ports as Boston and New York.

You see, if that is a correct statement, the Minister of Customs is prohibiting the entry of such goods into the ports of British Columbia.

> It is not necessary to amend a statute or repeal an order in council. It has never been pretended that the action of the Minister of Customs was dictated by the Government as a matter of policy. Beyond their apparent reluctance to order a withdrawal of the letter, there is nothing to show that British Columbia's unfortunate position is due to anything but the personal act of the Hon. J. D. Reid, dictated by the manufacturers of Ontario or eastern railway interests, and both these interests, we submit, have acted on a narrow and mistaken view as to the results which would follow from allowing British Columbia to enjoy the use of the great advantages supplied by nature.

From the correspondence that I have received I believe that neither the railways nor the Manufacturers' Association are particularly opposed to this.

Mr. NESBITT: That man is off about the manufacturers being opposed to it because they want to get their goods in the cheapest way they can.

Mr. TURRIFF: The people of British Columbia could not understand the minister's action on any other ground. The article goes on:

> All that is necessary is the withdrawal of the Hon. Mr. Reid's letter, and the stationing of a Canadian customs officer at New York to ship and receive goods departing from or arriving for Canada. The bonding privilege is freely extended to American railways by Canada, and will be as easily extended to Canadian railways by the United States. The only reason given by the minister for not granting British Columbia's request—that no country in the world has appointed a customs officer in a foreign country—does not possess even the elements of truth. United States freight is handled through Vancouver in both directions under the supervision of the United States customs inspector, and the fish business of Prince Rupert is handled in the same way. If instead of advancing such a fatuous argument, Dr. Reid will candidly admit that he is assisting in the gentle act of throttling the trade and shipping of British Columbia at the dictation of certain eastern interests, we will respect his candour, however we may regard his judgment and statesmanship.

That is the position. Both the East and West are losing valuable trade, simply because the minister or the Government will not try to meet the wishes of the people of British Columbia. As we are trying to prorogue by to-morrow, I do not feel like taking up the time of the House in reading several letters on this subject that I have here from the Minister of Trade and Commerce and from manufacturers and others, all putting up strong arguments why British Columbia should not be throttled in this way. These are not statements of

newspaper editors, but the deliberate opinion of different boards of trade. Let me read a telegram from Vancouver, dated March 20, 1916:

By resolution of the Intermunicipal Industrial Committee of the lower mainland, consisting of delegates from the Municipal Councils of South Vancouver, Burnaby, Point Grey, North Vancouver city and city of Vancouver, am directed to advise you that this representative municipal committee is strongly of the opinion that this coast should receive its full share of benefit to be derived from opening of Panama canal, which can only be done by our ability to ship goods of Canadian manufacture through port New York until such time as a line be established from eastern Canadian ports. We therefore urge the immediate inauguration of requisite arrangement at port of New York.

(sgd.) M. McBEATH,
Mayor of city of Vancouver,
Chairman Com.

The Boards of Trade of Vancouver and Victoria have also taken action on the same line. The correspondence shows that the people of British Columbia are a unit on this matter; there is not a dissenting voice among them; they all claim that their trade is being throttled by the Government. They say they have seen the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who gave them a more or less sympathetic hearing, but that the difficulty lay with the Minister of Customs, and I now appeal to the minister whether he cannot do something to meet the wishes of the people of the coast cities. Why should he not take action that would result in the trade that belongs to Canada being kept in Canada for our own manufacturers and merchants, and in a British steamship line transporting the goods from New York to Vancouver? The only advantage American interests would get out of the whole transaction would be the short haul over the American railways, plus whatever they might get in trans-shipping the goods from cars in New York city to the steamship line. I trust the minister will be able to see his way clear to meeting the wishes of the people of Vancouver and other coast cities of British Columbia.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Customs): This matter has been before me for some little time, as has been stated by the hon. member for Assiniboia, and it has given me great concern. I personally am anxious to do all I can for the province of British Columbia or any other part of the Dominion. I must say that my hon. friend treats this question very lightly. All we have to do, he says, is to put an officer in New York and the whole matter is settled. He tells us that American officers are at Vancouver for the purpose of seeing that American goods are sent through from there to the United States. That may be true. But let me explain the bonding privileges between Canada and the United States. The bonding privileges allow a car that is loaded with goods and sealed at Vancouver to be shipped through to its destination and the seal broken by the officers of the same country. In the case mentioned by my hon. friend, the fish caught in American waters up at Alaska, and brought down to Vancouver, have to be transported as quickly as possible. The American officers see the fish loaded on to the cars, the American seal is put on the car, and when the car gets to New York the seal is broken by an American officer; so the car is both sealed and unsealed by American officers. Similarly, if a manufacturer in eastern Canada wants to route through the United States some goods he is shipping to British Columbia or some place in the West, the car is sealed by a Canadian officer before it leaves Canada; it then passes through the United States, comes into Canada again, and the seal is broken at the car's destination by a Canadian officer. My hon. friend can see that there is therefore no possible chance of these goods being exchanged or getting out of the possession of Canadian Customs officers.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend would not suggest that it would be impossible for a Canadian Customs officer in New York to see the goods transferred from the car to the steamship without being changed.

Mr. REID: I was coming to that. The hon. member says that the Maple Leaf line is willing to pay for an officer, and he says that all these goods that are going to New York will be carried by a British line of steamers. The Maple Leaf Line is owned by the United States Steel Corporation, which is one of the largest corporations in the United States; and which, I believe from information I have received, is the one that is raising this agitation and is trying to prove to the people of British Columbia that they would gain great advantage if their line of steamers were to carry this freight from eastern Canada to British Columbia. They have also used the argument that the goods would always be carried on British steamers. Now, we cannot control the port of New York or any

other American port. Would the hon. member advise us to put a customs officer in New York to see to it that goods shipped to a British Columbia port or elsewhere should not be carried by American steamers leaving for those ports, but must be carried on British steamers? Would not that be likely to cause trouble with the United States? Our relations are most friendly, and for us to absolutely refuse to allow our products to go out of an American port on an American vessel would be very likely to raise trouble.

Mr. NESBITT: They do not want you to confine yourself to British boats. But would it be possible to establish a customs office and have the shipping that way?

Mr. REID: I was just coming to the question of putting it on another vessel. I have stated that the bonding privileges must always apply to a Canadian or British vessel, for you could not ship in a foreign vessel and keep control. We, as British subjects, would have no control over that vessel.

Mr. NESBITT: Then, you cannot ship in bond via New York to Vancouver?

Mr. REID: It is a very difficult matter to arrange. I have found so many difficulties in it that I have not been able to carry out the wishes of those who have raised this agitation. Another question has come up. This House has always been of the opinion that, if possible, we should carry our goods through our own country.

Mr. TURRIFF: We all agree with that.

Mr. REID: When some of the people from British Columbia were here to interview me on this matter, they led me to believe that the freights via New York were very much lower than they would be overland to Vancouver—that is, from such ports as Montreal, Toronto, or Hamilton.

Mr. NESBITT: By rail?

Mr. REID: Yes. They said that the rate from New York to Vancouver would be, I think, 50c. per 100 lb. I asked the Chairman of the Railway Commission to instruct his officials to make out a statement showing the rates by rail on a long list of articles commonly shipped between eastern Canada and Vancouver. Then I had the officials put alongside these rates the rates from such places as Montreal, Toronto, and Hamilton, to New York, with the 50c. per 100 lb. added as the freight to Vancouver. To these rates must be added insurance and wharfage charges, I find that there is very little difference between the charge on a full carload, shipped from eastern Canada by rail to Vancouver, and the same quantity shipped to New York and thence by vessel to Vancouver. Of course, all that I am saying now refers to rates under normal conditions, not rates charged under war conditions. The difference of these rates under normal conditions would be so small that I do not believe there is a member of the House who would ever discuss the matter if he had before him the statement which I have had prepared. I also had a statement made out showing the local freights on smaller lots such as a ton or 500 lb. Of course, on these small lots and with local rates, the rates were very much higher by rail, and it would pay better to send by New York. But I do not consider it quite fair to make comparison with the local rates in this way. As to goods going in carload lots, there is very little ground of complaint when the whole matter is looked into. Besides, the only points to which these lower rates via New York would apply, would be Victoria and Vancouver. In inland places, like Kamloops for instance, the same would not apply.

Mr. TURRIFF: But the minister will find that the rail rate from Montreal to Kamloops, which is a couple of hundred miles east of Vancouver, is very much higher than the rate to Vancouver.

Mr. REID: I was just about to say that. I suppose that it is on account of the water competition at coast points. There are two other reasons why I have had to give this matter most serious consideration before disposing of it.

We have built up in this country a great railway system between eastern and western Canada. The province of British Columbia has incurred large liabilities in connection with railways that have been built in that province. The Dominion Government itself is trying to develop the territory betwen here and British Columbia as well as to develop the Canadian Railway systems. The hon. member for Assiniboia advocates that instead of sending freight to British Columbia by our railway system we should send it to New York and thence by steamer through the Panama canal to Vancouver and Victoria. I think we

should consider carefully any proposed action which would tend to injure our railway system. Two years ago an agitation was started in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba for the reduction of freight rates. It was shown on that occasion that if reduction were granted the railways would not be able to pay the expenses of operation, and that great injury would result to the West. No member of this House has been more strongly in favour of the development of our own great harbours than I have. I have been a party to assisting Vancouver and Victoria in their harbour development. I have also done what I could in the matter of the development of the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax. If there is to be connection by water through the Panama canal between eastern and western Canada, I believe that a line of steamships should be established leaving Montreal and Quebec in the summer and St. John and Halifax in the winter. I have asked persons with whom I have discussed this matter if some arrangement could be made by which the Maple Leaf line in the summer should come to Montreal and Quebec and in the winter to St. John and Halifax in order that our goods carried between the East and the West should go through our own Canadian ports. It is suggested that we put an officer in New York until the war is over or until we can arrange for the operation of this line. My experience, however, has been such as to lead me to believe that if you establish a route by putting an officer at a port of this kind, the route will remain for all time to come. If we should do that in this case, when we should come to arrange for the operation of a line of steamers leaving Montreal and Quebec in the summer and St. John and Halifax in the winter, we would be handicapped by that arrangement which we had made. It does not seem to me that the present is the proper time to bring this matter up. It is true that it is about two years since this agitation started. But it is nearly two years since war was declared between Great Britain and Germany and since that time it has been practically impossible to get vessels to carry the traffic between Canada and the Mother Country. I understand that at the present time the Maple Leaf Line have no sailings via the Panama canal; and my information is that you cannot count on any line of steamers doing this work at least until the war is over. Even if steamers could be obtained to carry freight between New York, Seattle and Vancouver by the Panama canal, rates are so high owing to war conditions that there would be no advantage in shipping by that route. I have given the reasons why I believe that this matter should remain in abeyance at least until the war is over. Having regard to the existing conditions, to the railway situation, to the intention of the Government to hold an investigation into railway matters with a view of reorganizing our railway system and to the policy of the Government in the matter of the development of our harbours—Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John, Vancouver and Victoria—I feel that the committee will agree that the matter should rest until a later date.

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): Under the permission which was given to the members by the Minister of Customs last night to bring up any subject when the House went into Supply to-day, I would like to bring to the attention of the minister and of the committee the case of an elector of the county of Missisquoi, one Albert Ernest Lagrange of Frelighsburg. On June 23, 1913, Mr. Lagrange, who is a cattle buyer, purchased from different farmers throughout his locality a car-load of hogs, which he loaded for shipment to Montreal. It was later ascertained by a very vigilant officer of the Department of Customs, Mr. Frank Fyles, of Abercorn, that there were in this carload three or four hogs which had been imported from the United States and on which no duty had been paid. These hogs were imported not by Mr. Lagrange, but by the party from whom he had purchased them. The entire car-load was held up and seized and in order to release the car from seizure, Mr. Lagrange followed it to St. Johns, the port of entry, and there placed in the hands of the collector of customs his cheque for $1,600, the full value of the car-load of hogs. The hogs were released the next day and sent to Montreal. After having been sent to Montreal and disposed of, steps were taken to ascertain where the different hogs were purchased and it was discovered that four of these hogs had been smuggled in from the United States by a farmer called Peter Larose, of Frelighsburg. He was a tenant farmer and had no property except a team of horses, a very valuable wagon, and a set of harness. The outfit which he used to smuggle in the hogs was seized by an officer of the

department. Mr. Larose, however, happened to be a friend of the party in power, and had voted for the defeated Conservative candidate in Missisquoi county. That defeated Conservative candidate came to the rescue. After he had had an interview with some official in the Department of Customs at Ottawa this team of horses, the harness and wagon, which were worth $250 to $300, were released upon the payment of $50 to the department by Peter Larose. In the eyes of the department he had paid the penalty for having smuggled the hogs into Canada. This occurred in 1913, and we are now in the year of grace 1916, and the $1,600 deposited by this man LaGrange is still in the hands of the department, and the department absolutely refuses to refund this money to him. I have looked through the reports of the Auditor General and of the department, and I can find no entry showing to what purpose this money has been applied. I will go further. About a year after it had been proven that this man had had nothing to do with the smuggling in of the hogs which happened to be in his carload, he went to a Conservative member who occupies a seat on the other side of this House and gave him a synopsis of his case. I prefer not to mention this member's name publicly, but I can give it privately to the minister if he so desires. This Conservative member told the man he would have no difficulty whatever in getting the money, and he asked him to make a deposit of $25, which the Conservative member still has while the department still has the $1,600.

This matter was brought to my attention on April 24 of the present year, and naturally I took the step that any hon. member of Parliament would have taken in connection with the matter. I did not bother the minister, but went direct to the department and saw Mr. McDougald, the Commissioner of Customs. He reported that this matter had been pending for three years, and that no decision had yet been given by the minister. The matter was still pending when I saw the Commissioner of Customs on April 28, 1916. I asked him then if there was any reason why this deposit should be forfeited and he told me that he did not know as the matter was still in the hands of the minister, who was taking a very long time to make up his mind. I asked him to bring the matter to the attention of the minister at once and he promised to do so, and on May 1, 1916, he wrote me as follows:

5 p.m.

Ottawa, May 1, 1916.

Geo. H. Boivin, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Re Seizure No. 18860/89—A. E. LaGrange.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your inquiry as to the above seizure, I am to state that the deposit of $1,600 is held as forfeited.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) John McDougald.
Commissioner.

Mr. REID: He got off cheap; he could have been prosecuted as well.

Mr. BOIVIN: Remember that the charge was for smuggling in three or four hogs, that these hogs were in a carload which was shipped to Montreal by an indirect route at a great loss to this man, that it was discovered that these hogs had been imported by somebody else, that the party who smuggled them in paid the penalty exacted by the department—and, after all this, the deposit is still held by the department. I am bringing this matter up in order to ascertain from the minister what I could not ascertain from the Commissioner of Customs, and that is, why the full value of the whole cargo of hogs was confiscated by the department when only three or four hogs had been smuggled into Canada by another party?

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman must understand that hundreds of cases of this kind come before me, and each case is dealt with on its merits. In some cases we exact merely the value of the article seized, in other cases we impose a penalty as well, and in other cases we have prosecuted. In this particular case a seizure was made by our officers. I do not know whether my hon. friend knows this man, but my information is that he has been buying American hogs for many years all along the line, and shipping them to Montreal. This had a double effect. In the first place, the farmers living along the line where he was buying had to compete with American hogs that were smuggled in, and this man knew he was doing the farmers the greatest possible injury by bringing in American hogs and breaking the price on this side. The hon. member knows that drovers, when they are buying hogs or cattle, go right into a man's place and see the stock; they know whether that man has had those hogs before. The reason I made the man pay the full value of the carload was that I was of the opinion that he knew well

enough those hogs had been smuggled in by this poor man; perhaps he wanted to benefit by the lower price and got the poor man to smuggle them in. I had certain other information, and I do not believe the hon. member could get that man to make an affidavit that he did not know that those hogs had been smuggled in. According to my information he has been getting American hogs in for years, thereby doing great injury to our own Canadian farmers and to the treasury of Canada. Furthermore, although he knew that the Department of Agriculture had prohibited American hogs from coming into Canada, he had been bringing them in for years and taking chances of spreading hog cholera and other diseases amongst our Canadian stock. The hon. gentleman may think that the penalty was severe, but I can tell him that the man would not make an affidavit that this was the only case of smuggling in of hogs that he knew of. I think he got off very lightly. I maintain that he got off very easily, and if he ever does the same again while I am minister, I want the hon. member to tell him that I will not only impose the penalty of a fine, but prosecute him as far as the law will allow.

Mr. BOIVIN: The hon. minister seems to forget altogether that it was the other man who smuggled the hogs and was punished for doing so.

Mr. REID: I will explain that. This man was a poor man who had nothing in the world but a team of horses.

Mr. BOIVIN: He is a tenant farmer.

Mr. REID: He was probably sent over by the other man to smuggle the hogs in. The hon. member says I should have treated this poor man as I treated the other man who is a wealthy man and has been smuggling in hogs for years and bringing disease into the country. He wants me to treat this poor unfortunate man who has nothing in the world but a team of horses the same as the other man who is wealthy, but I will not do that. The penalty I imposed on the man with the team of horses was a fine of $50, and to him that $50 was five times more of a penalty than it would be to a man who had a carload of hogs. I say that this poor tenant farmer was led into the difficulty by the other man, and I think that the warning which the latter got was not only good for him but for all the people in that district who may have been induced by him to do the same thing. I do not want, nor does this Government or any other government want to take the last dollar from a poor man. We want to give him a chance and a fair warning. With regard to the man who paid the $1,500, I want to say that if ever he gets into a scrape again he will not get so easily off.

Mr. BOIVIN: I quite agree that a man who is caught smuggling ought to pay the penalty. I think that everybody in this House agrees with that view, but I do not think that a man should be punished because the minister has heard through a third or fourth party that he may possibly have smuggled in years gone by. That is not the question before the House now, and it is not the question which should have been considered by the hon. minister, and the minister knows it. I will go further and say that if this man had been a good political supporter of the defeated Conservative candidate as Peter Larose is, he would have been treated differently. This man proved to the satisfaction of the department that every hog in that car had been purchased from a bona fide Canadian farmer who had got for it the bona fide Canadian price. Peter Larose was not merely a teamster who had nothing in the world but a team of horses and a wagon. He was a tenant farmer, residing upon the farm of Miss Chamberlain, at Frelighsburg, and the cheque which was given to him for the hogs was made payable to the order of the owner of the farm. It is impossible for the minister to say that one single hog in that car was smuggled with the knowledge of the man who put up the $1,600. The minister says that in years gone by this man had smuggled hogs from the United States. All I can say is that, if the minister has on that part of the line collectors of customs who will allow any man to smuggle in hogs for four years, and go unpunished, they should be dismissed, and officials should be appointed in their place who would do their duty and punish the smugglers. This man is willing to go before any court in the country and to pay any fine that may be imposed on him by any court in the country if he is found guilty, but having made in good faith a deposit with the collector of customs at St. Johns, which the collector promised would be returned to him in full if he established where the hogs came from, and having lost the interest

on the money for four years without receiving any communication from the minister and without being told of its confiscation, he objects to receiving a curt letter informing him that the deposit is to be held, but without giving any reason for the minister's action. One thing the minister could at least do. This man gave a Conservative member of Parliament $25 to use his influence on his behalf, and I would ask the minister to use his influence with the Conservative member of Parliament to have the money returned to Mr. La Grange. If the minister has any proof to offer against him, he should prosecute him, but I do object, and I think every fair-minded member in this House should object to the Minister of Customs constituting himself judge and jury in every case that comes before him, especially when he has no evidence before him but hearsay evidence that the man may have smuggled two or three years previously.

ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS OF SOLDIERS.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER: I have taken some interest in the discussion of the Militia Estimates, and when they were under consideration on the last occasion it was arranged with the Prime Minister that an item should be left standing so that I might have the privilege of discussing a certain matter. I will not delay the House to any great length; I merely wish to express in a formal manner the opinion which I hold very strongly, and which I know is held by others, that the time has come when there should be a more liberal allowance to the dependents of soldiers who are serving. When the war broke out it was arranged that a separation allowance amounting I think to twenty dollars a month should be given to the families of soldiers who had enlisted. That is supplemented in some cases by assigned pay. It was agreed that the separation allowance and the assigned pay were not adequate support for the dependents under the existing conditions of the country, and so the Patriotic Fund was organized for the purpose of collecting money from the public at large to supplement the separation allowance and the assigned pay and so bring the measure of support available to the dependents of soldiers up to a point which, in the words of the Patriotic Fund circular, would provide a decent living.

Last year I took the view which I propose to express at the present time, namely, that while the Patriotic Fund organization is most desirable and most necessary in order to deal with the special cases that continually arise in regard to dependents left by soldiers who have gone to the front, it is not right or reasonable that these dependents should have to depend upon public subscriptions for any part of that amount which is recognized to be a necessary allowance for their support. When the war broke out, of course, everything was done hurriedly, and it can easily be understood that every condition could not be adjusted at that particular time. But time has gone on, it is a year and a half now since the war broke out, conditions have developed that possibly were not expected to develop at the time and it is found that the Patriotic Fund is called upon to pay a fixed amount, forming part of the necessary allowance for the family and dependents of a soldier, over and above the extraordinary circumstances which frequently arise and which naturally would be dealt with by such an organization as the Patriotic Fund. I find that in eastern Canada there is a stated allowance from the Patriotic Fund to the dependents of a soldier of $5. In the western provinces the amount is very much larger. I maintain that when, by experience, it has been demonstrated that a soldier's family requires an amount over and above the separation allowance and the assigned pay, that man's separation allowance should be increased to that amount and the Patriotic Fund should not be called upon to meet that requirement. Until conditions had developed and become adjusted, the Patriotic Fund was created for the purpose of filling the gap between the Government provision and the requirements of dependents, but now that these requirements have come to be recognized as established, I see every reason why the Government's separation allowance should be increased so as to relieve the Patriotic Fund from that permanent liability, so to speak, which is such a tremendous call upon the patriotism and benevolence of the people of the country.

It has been said by the gentleman who so ably manages the Patriotic Fund that this fund is necessary to intervene between the requirements of depenedents and the arrangements of the Government because conditions differ in different provinces, and because the Government could not make an arrangement whereby the separation allowance would be different in one

province from what it is in another. That argument was perfectly good at the outbreak of hostilities when conditions were new, but now that conditions have become settled and adjusted, it is absolutely established that in British Columbia the family of a soldier require a certain fixed amount to give them a decent living, while in Prince Edward Island a certain less amount is required. The facts are now thoroughly understood from one end of the Dominion to the other, and I maintain that the time has arrived when the Patriotic Fund should be relieved from that burden which it now carries and which is properly a part of the burden to be carried by the nation at large. I recall having heard the gentleman who is at the head of the Patriotic Fund suggest, as another reason for the existence of this fund, that it gave an opportunity to those who were not able to render personal service to do service by the contribution of their wealth, their earnings or their savings as the case might be. That is a perfectly good position to take providing it is not pushed too far. But I submit that when the people of a patriotic, liberal and benevolent disposition are called upon to supply a fixed requirement that properly rests upon the nation at large, it is not a fair proposition and that requirement should not be continued. As long as the burden was light it mattered comparatively little which way it was carried. Now, the burden has become very great upon the people who are liberal minded and who have responded, I may say, magnificently to the demands that have been made upon them up to the present time. These demands are still increasing, and must necessarily increase. It is not fair that, because certain of our citizens are liberal minded, patriotic and benevolent, that section of the community should carry this burden on their shoulders when it is a burden that properly rests upon the shoulders of every citizen of the country and should be shared in equally by those citizens according to their tax-paying power.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Is the hon. gentleman suggesting that the Patriotic Fund should come to an end?

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I gather that from what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: He suggests that the burden be placed upon the public?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If I understand him correctly he asks that the burden, as carried by the Patriotic Fund, should cease.

Mr. OLIVER: No, that part of it, that is a fixed and stated amount, should be borne by the state and not by private subscription. When it becomes a fixed fact, that in the province of Ontario, we will say, instead of a dependent wife being able to get along with $20 separation allowance and $15 assigned pay, she requires in addition $5 from the Patriotic Fund, the state should assume the burden of providing that $5 and the Patriotic Fund should not be called upon to meet that requirement. The idea that is present in my mind as to the proper function of the Patriotic Fund is to take care of extraordinary conditions which always arise and which no Government could possibly take care of. That is the proper purpose of it, as I would understand it. But it certainly is not proper that this fund, depending on public subscriptions, and levied on a part of the people, should be depended upon to meet those requirements which are stated and fixed requirements, thoroughly well understood, and which certainly should be borne by the state as a whole, by which means every citizen has a share in the burden and responsibility.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Would you increase the separation allowance?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Under the Patriotic Fund people do not receive the same amounts in different provinces.

Mr. OLIVER: No.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Then how could the Government arrange that they could give people in one province a certain separation allowance and in another province another separation allowance? They could do that, could they?

Mr. OLIVER: Yes. After the declaration of war, when nothing was adjusted, when conditions had not settled down, there was possibly a very good reason for the use of this fund to the extent to which it is at present used, and that reason I have heard stated by the president of the fund, but that condition does not exist to-day. It is settled now that in British Columbia a

family requires a minimum amount, a part of which is now provided by the Patriotic Fund. There is no reason why the Patriotic Fund should be called upon to supplement the present allowance in order that the minimum amount may be allowed. There is no reason why the Government should not provide a proper amount.

Mr. HAZEN: I understand my hon. friend to argue that the amount dependents of soldiers require for their wants and requirements, over and above the assigned pay, separation allowance and what they may get from the Patriotic Fund, should be supplied by the state. If that is done, what is left for the Patriotic Fund to do?

Mr. OLIVER: The proper purpose of the Patriotic Fund is to take care of special circumstances that may arise, in which the requirements are over and above the ordinary. I need not say, after the discussions my hon. friend and I have had on recent occasions, that these special cases come up by the hundred, and there is every reason for a Patriotic Fund for the benefit of these dependents. But apart from that, it is thoroughly understood that a certain fixed requirement exists in British Columbia, for instance, and a certain fixed requirement in Ontario, and Prince Edward Island, and so on, and I say that public benevolence and patriotism should not be called on to meet that requirement. It is a fixed requirement and should be met out of the public treasury. It is not fair, either to the soldier or his dependents, or the Service, or to the state, that the present condition of affairs should continue. Let me point out in this connection that it is recognized in many places throughout the country that the money is not collected on a fair basis. A county council will say: We will contribute so much to the Patriotic Fund, and will then proceed to raise the amount by taxation. This is done by municipal and county councils throughout the Dominion; they meet their contributions to the Patriotic Fund by levying a tax. I maintain that the time has come when the state at large should levy the necessary taxation to meet those requirements, instead of calling upon the benevolence and patriotism of the people. That is the view I desire to bring before the House, and desire to bring it forward very strongly for this reason. As the demands increase and they must increase —I fear that the next call for subscriptions to the Patriotic Fund will not meet with the same generous response that has been met with in the past; and certainly we cannot afford to allow the dependents of our soldiers to fail to receive that contribution that was the expectation of the soldier when he enlisted. When the soldier enlisted he expected his family to receive certain assistance: separation allowance, assigned pay, and a certain fixed amount from the Patriotic Fund. While that was not a legal and a binding bargain I maintain that this country is bound in honour to see that every dollar of that money is paid, and that the allowance is kept up to what the soldier when he enlisted, understood his dependents would receive. I am sorry to say that during the past months, for reasons said to be good—and very likely good, because it was believed the Patriotic Fund was not able to stand the strain that was being put upon it—there have been certain readjustments and a certain scaling down of the allowance paid to the families of soldiers at the front. I need hardly say that a case of that kind leaves a very unfavourable impression; it is unfortunate that cases of that kind should ever occur, but they do occur, and it certainly is not for the good of the cause that they should occur. I maintain that the State should fully discharge its obligation in respect of the dependents of soldiers at the front and that the Patriotic Fund should take care of extraordinary conditions that may arise in regard to those dependents; in that respect, it has a responsibility, and that is the only responsibility the country at large should expect it to fulfil.

There is another matter that I feel to be so very important and so very serious that I cannot allow it to go by without noticing it. I have had occasion when the Estimates of the Department of Militia have been up to consider the arming of the troops both as to rifles and machine guns. The Prime Minister said that a report had been made in regard to the Ross rifle, with which the Canadian troops are armed. I asked if that report could be made public, and he said no. The only conclusion I can reach is this: That if the report had been favourable it could and would have been made public. But from the fact that it is not considered sound policy to make it public, the only conclusion to be drawn is that the report could not have been considered favourable. I appreciate very deeply the responsibility I take, but I ap-

preciate also the responsibility that rests upon a representative of the Canadian people in this House—a responsibility that demands that no effort shall be left undone to secure to the highest possible degree the efficiency of our troops, and particularly the efficiency of the weapons with which they are armed.

The Ottawa Citizen of this morning publishes what purports to be extracts from a letter from Gen. Alderson, who is spoken of as Commander-in-Chief of the Canadian forces at the front, and the letter is said to be in reply to a communication from Ottawa on the subject.

Mr. ROGERS: Who is it addressed to, and what is the date of it?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not say. The paper does not give the date. This responsible journal, published in the capital of Canada, publishes what purports to be extracts from a letter which it tacitly represents to be an official letter from General Alderson, recently commanding the Canadian forces in France. I cannot imagine any Government allowing such statements to appear in the public press for one hour without taking steps to contradict them, if they are susceptible of contradiction.

I read an extract from what purports to be a letter from General Alderson. The suggestion of the newspaper in which it appears is that it is an official letter:

> I may say that "very soon after we got out here with the First Division," says General Alderson, "I found that the men were picking up the Lee-Enfields whenever they could and throwing away the Rosses. I issued an order that this was not to be allowed, and prior to the second battle of Ypres that order was carried out. The experience of the battle showed that the Ross jammed so badly that I was obliged to let this order die a natural death. When the division was re-armed with the Lee-Enfield the men cheered loudly on hearing the news, and it was found that there were already more than 3,000 of the rifles in the division.
>
> I hold no brief for the Lee-Enfield, and I did, and still do as regards the 2nd and 3rd Divisions, discourage any crying down of the Ross, although I know, as does every one else, that the Lee-Enfield is out and out the best active service rifle.
>
> I believe the Ross to be a closer shooting rifle and I think, and I often say so, that with teams of equal shots on the range and using the rifles as single loaders the Ross would win.
>
> General Alderson then refers to a statement that with three certain marks of ammunition, which he names, the Lee-Enfield "cannot be relied upon to fire fifteen rounds."
>
> "This is absolute invention," he declares. "I attach a copy of a report on the test of ammunition we had when Carson and Max Aitken were last here together. From this you will see that the Lee-Enfield fired from 100 to 125 rounds, as rapidly as possible, with all three marks of ammunition named, while the Ross jammed from the 25th to the 50th round.
>
> "This report, which as you will see was signed by both Carson and Aitken, does not state, as it should, that the Lee-Enfield, although handled by men not trained to it, fired (owing to it being much easier to charge the magazines) its 100 rounds in about one-third less time than the Ross. Nor does the report state, as was the case, that the hands of the men using the Ross were cut and bleeding owing to the difficulty they had in knocking back the bolts.
>
> "None of those present, and there were many commanding and other officers there, could have failed to notice these important points."
>
> General Alderson then refers to a statement by a writer of a certain letter that the classes of ammunition in question have "again in some mysterious way" found their way to the Canadian trenches. "That, too, is against the Ross," General Alderson continues. "Moreover, it emphasises what we have been told officially, viz., that while we are stationary it will be possible to keep this ammunition away from the units armed with the Ross, but that when we get on the move it may not be possible."

Mr. PUGSLEY: What ammunition is that?

Mr. OLIVER: I could not say. It is ammunition that is complained about in some way. I am sorry that the Prime Minister was not in his place when I brought this matter up, but the item was under discussion and I was compelled to deal with it now or not at all. I am glad to see the right hon. gentleman now in his place. I have stated that I appreciate the very serious character of this statement, but it appears in a newspaper published in the capital, and I cannot conceive that such a report would be allowed to have publicity for an hour without being specifically contradicted if it could be contradicted.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend might have been better advised to submit the matter to some member of the Government, and perhaps to myself, before bringing it up in the House. The statement that has appeared in the press was brought to the attention of the Government this morning, and, after consultation with my colleagues, I have already taken certain action with regard to it. I desire to say, in the first place, that even if the Ross rifle were the best rifle in the world it would be possible to destroy its usefulness by making and circulating public statements of that character about it; and it is far from a patriotic service to discredit the only rifle which we are capable of producing in Canada at present. No one is more convinced of the absolute necessity that our

men fighting in the trenches shall be armed with an efficient and effective weapon than the members of the Government, in common with all good citizens. As I stated in a debate in this House during the present session, there has been criticism of the Ross rifle. There has also, I believe, been criticism of the Lee-Enfield rifle. I repeat what I have already stated on that subject, that probably each of these rifles may have some special advantages over the other.

So far as I am aware, no such letter as that which appeared in the Citizen of this morning has come to the attention of the Government. However, I shall make further inquiry before eight o'clock to ascertain the facts. Diligent inquiry as to the existence of such a letter will be made, and the subject is already under investigation. Even if such a letter were written, it is my judgment that its publication without any communication with the Government, without any inquiry as to the existing situation is not a patriotic service to this country at this time. I am not alluding to my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver); he has taken it from the public press, but his action does, of course, give it greater publicity than it otherwise would have had.

I desire, further, to announce this—within the past week a communication has been sent to the Commander-in-Chief at the front, desiring him, on his own behalf, and for the information of the Government of Canada, to make a thorough test of the Ross rifle under precisely the same conditions as those under which that rifle is ordinarily used by our men at the front, and to make also a corresponding test and investigation of the Lee-Enfield rifle. I have no reason to believe that there will be any lack of effective action by Sir Douglas Haig in making that test and investigation. When it has been made, it will be for the Government and for the military advisers of the Government to consider whether and to what extent it should be made public. It is desirable in view of all these allegations that such a test and investigation should be made; and I felt it my duty after careful consultation with the Minister of Militia and Defence during the past week to request that that course should be taken.

I repeat that we are making inquiry into the reasons which led to the publication of this alleged letter in the press and of the source from which it emanated. We shall take such action in regard thereto as may seem proper and appropriate under the circumstances and in the interest of the people, especially in the interest of the gallant men who are using this rifle at the front.

Mr. OLIVER: I understand that the Prime Minister will give some information to the committee at eight o'clock?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. OLIVER: Will there be an opportunity then to say something in regard to it?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me that the hon. member for Edmonton should not be found fault with for bringing this very important matter to the attention of the committee. It must be borne in mind that this letter purports to be a letter from the gentleman who has been commanding the Canadian forces at the front and who is, I understand, in charge of the Canadian expeditionary forces in Great Britain.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He is not in charge of them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: He has been in charge of the Canadian forces at the front.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He has been in charge of the Canadian forces at the front, and the post which has been suggested—I do not know whether he occupies it as yet—is that of Inspector General of the Canadian forces in Great Britain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We can hardly believe that the Citizen would publish a letter of such great importance unless they were satisfied that it was a genuine letter from General Alderson. It bears on its face evidence of its being a reply to some one who had the right to communicate with General Alderson with regard to the Ross rifle. I would assume that it is in reply to a letter which has been sent to him by the Minister of Militia. It bears evidence of that on its face, because it is evidently written in reply to some one who has been defending the Ross rifle. Besides, the familiarity with which General Alderson refers to Mr. Carson and Sir Max Aitken shows that it is written to one with whom his relations have been intimate from a military standpoint. I suggest to my right hon. friend that he should, in connection with the inquiries which he makes, endeavour to ascertain whether a letter was written by the Minister of Militia to General Alderson, and whether or not this letter is in reply. This is a subject in which the House and

the people take a very deep interest, and it would be well that full information should be afforded in reference to the matter. It is desirable that any question with regard to the arms which are supplied to our boys at the front should be settled in satisfactory manner. Every one will agree that no equipment should be furnished to them except it be of the very highest character. There is one very singular remark which is made in the letter, in reference to ammunition. I would judge from the statement of General Alderson that in some inexplicable manner ammunition has been supplied to the soldiers which ought not to have been supplied to them. This is a matter which ought to be inquired into and with regard to which the House and the country are entitled to information. There is certainly no very great harm in bringing these matters before the committee for the purpose of having any mystery in regard to them cleared up, as compared with the injury which might result through defective ammunition or arms being supplied to Canadian soldiers at the front. I think the hon. member for Edmonton has performed a very important duty in bringing the matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. ROGERS: I wish to suggest an amendment to the resolution now before the committee with a view to correcting a clerical error. I move that the word "Randolph" be substituted for the word "Robert" in the item providing for a compassionate allowance to the late Mr. Fanning. The name should be Randolph Fanning.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have been requested by the widow of the late Mr. Laplante to ask the Government whether something better could not have been done for her. I think that Mrs. Laplante was deserving of a little more consideration on the part of the Government. Was the matter discussed with members of the family?

Mr. ROGERS: I do not know that.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We took pains to get information and to consider very carefully all the circumstances surrounding the condition in which Mrs. Laplante was left. A less amount was at first suggested, but after investigating the matter we came to the conclusion that $5,000 would be a reasonable amount to pay. I think that my hon. friend will come to the same conclusion

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am speaking from hearsay. I was told that the family of Mr. Laplante lost in the fire some very valuable papers which, if edited as they were intended to be edited by him, would have given his family quite a revenue. That is the reason I bring this matter to the attention of the Government. Of course, if it has been thoroughly investigated I have nothing more to say.

Amendment of Mr. Rogers agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I find that the communication to Sir Douglas Haig, the Commander in Chief, to which I alluded was not sent as long ago as I thought. It was sent about three days ago. It stated that, in consequence of some criticism which had arisen, the Canadian Government were prepared to leave all questions as to the Ross rifle to the judgment of the Commander in Chief after he had made all necessary tests made under such conditions as are experienced at the front. That is the situation to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: Was that a cablegram?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That was a cablegram, yes. As to the letter which has been published in the press, I communicated with General Hughes, who told me that he had received no such letter, and that there is no official letter of that character. That is all the information I can give to the committee about it.

Mr. OLIVER: The letter is of such a character, the statements contained in it are so serious, that I should think the Government would be very well warranted in pushing inquiry as to how such statements came to be published under the presumed authority under which they were published. We have a censorship in Canada, and if this letter is not a bona fide letter of General Alderson's, it certainly ought to come within the range of the activity of the censor.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Inquiry was made by the Solicitor General, whom I asked to take up the subject with the censor. The censor informed him that he had no knowledge of the proposed publication or of the letter, and that the first intimation he had of it was the appearance of this alleged communication in the press

We do not propose to drop the matter without further inquiry.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Without making any disparaging statements, I may call attention to the fact that last year I read to the Minister of Militia a letter which was published in the Canadian Courier, signed by one of our boys at the front, in which he stated that the first thing they did when they left the camp in England for France was to discard the Ross rifle.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: And I might say that possibly some incidents of that kind may have taken place to which not too much importance should be attached. I believe that a good deal of the equipment which the First Canadian Division took over was left on Salisbury Plain when the troops went to the front.

A Board of Inquiry was called by the representatives of the Canadian Government on the other side for the purpose of determining whether that equipment was inefficient for use. As a result of that inquiry it was declared to be perfectly good equipment, although in some respects not precisely of the same character as that adopted in Great Britain. Thus the people of this country got credit for that equipment which was taken over, after being declared perfectly efficient for the purpose for which it was designed.

Mr. NESBITT: I questioned all the boys who came back from the front to our town about this, and they all agreed that the Ross rifle was perfectly all right.

Mr. ROGERS: The statements before the House are undoubtedly very serious. They have a deep meaning and must be of deep interest to a great many people in the country. I rather regard the statements that have been made, such as that of the hon. member for Rouville of a moment ago, which I am sure he really did not intend to make—

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was simply recalling the fact that these attacks against the Ross rifle are not new. Last year, just for the purpose of inquiry, I read to the Minister of Militia a letter published in the Canadian Courier, signed by one of the boys at the front, in which he stated, inter alia, in giving news about the departure for France and that sort of thing, that one of the first things they did was to discard the Ross rifle. I am not passing judgment on the Ross rifle. I am well aware that there are several competitors for the supply of weapons in time of war, and it might be quite possible that it is the policy of certain people to play an unfair game as against the Ross rifle. I am not passing judgment, but I am saying that it is not at all a new accusation.

Mr. ROGERS: I appreciate what my hon. friend has just said. It is certainly not a new accusation, and the letter that has been quoted, if we are to understand it at all, is not new either, although it has been published without any date and without the address of the person to whom it was sent. But the letter seems to leave an impression that there is something very seriously wrong, although a correct reading of the letter, with a knowledge of the circumstances, would not bear out that impression. We have already had information that when our men went over at first, in the using of the different series of ammunition with which they were supplied, a certain amount of jamming took place in the Ross rifle it is said and also in the Lee-Enfield rifle. That is information which I believe to be correct, and which we have had; and if this letter was written of that date, why then, of course, it is a thing of the past. The conditions complained of at that time have been remedied. The chamber of the Ross rifle has been enlarged in such a manner that the difficulties that were met with a year ago or more have been corrected. So far as I know, with any information it has been possible for me to obtain, there has been no difficulty and no jamming of the Ross rifle for many months past, especially since the chambers were corrected to receive almost any series of ammunition that might be supplied. It is true that in the early days, before they had the war ammunitions running as correctly as they are to-day, certain difficulties arose, and it seems unfortunate that we should have this letter published without any date, with a view, evidently, of trying to create a very false impression and to create a feeling of unrest in the minds of the mothers, and the sisters and the wives of the bravest and the best of our sons, who are now doing duty on the firing line, fighting for us. It is most unfortunate that there should be published such a letter as that which appears in the Citizen newspaper of the city of Ottawa. I am not surprised that that paper would be guilty of publishing this letter, or anything else by which they could hope to create excitement.

I should like to read a letter or two from gentlemen who have a knowledge of the facts, in order that we may, if we possibly can, correct the false impression that has been created by the publication of this letter, because I say that, so far as I can ascertain, this letter is not an official letter. I know from the statement of my friend the Prime Minister that it has not been received by him, and I know from the Minister of Militia that it has not been addressed to him. Therefore, if such a letter is in existence, the individual, if he is an employee of the Government or if he is a member of the staff, or if he holds any other position in this country, who would be guilty of publishing this letter in the mysterious form in which it is published —the proper place for him would be in the tower of this building; and so far as I am concerned, I should be glad to be a party to placing him there.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But the tower is down.

Mr. ROGERS: I will promise my hon. friend to provide a suitable tower for the individual who wrote that letter if we can locate him, and we will take good care of him, too. Allow me to read the following letter dated London, 14th April, 1916:

Sir,—It will be of interest to you to know that Lieutenant Ross, 17th Battalion, in practice this afternoon fired 145 rounds in 7 minutes. I believe a speed of 160 rounds is attainable. Best rate claimed by Hythe Staff with Enfield is, 121 rounds.

In one minute test Ross rifles averaged 21 rounds (nearly) against 17 (nearly) for Enfield. Expect to see Ross record improved, but not Enfield.

An interesting test was made with eight firers. Four men trained with Enfields were given Ross rifles. Four Ross men were given Enfields. As might have been expected Ross men did not do well with Enfield, but the remarkable thing was that all Enfield men without training, exceeded or equalled best previous records with Enfield. Detailed records will be sent you shortly.

Respectfully,

(Sgd.) Roy B. Gibson.

Major-General Sir Sam Hughes.

I read this report from Capt. C. H. Ackerman to the Minister of Militia:

Kingston, Ontario, 18th January, 1916.

From,—Captain C. H. Ackerman,
2nd Battalion Canadians,

To,—Major-General Sir Sam Hughes,
Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa, Ont.

Report on Ross rifle.

Sir,—I have the honour to report on my experiences in the trenches with the Ross rifle.

The Ross rifle used by the First Canadian division in France was exchanged for the Lee-Enfield rifle during the second week in June by the Second Battalion to which I was attached. I myself, used this rifle in the trenches and I felt I did very much more effective work than I could have done with a Lee-Enfield, owing to the improved rear aperture sight of the Ross and the protected block foresight which is covered with a hood and permits of a more uniform light which is essential to good shooting. The rear aperture sight is a decided improvement on the open back sight because the full sighting power of the eye is concentrated on one point through this aperture and this power is, when the rifle is properly sighted, directly in line with the block foresight and the target; this, I consider the one outstanding advantage over the Lee-Enfield rifle. (If it is not conducive to better shooting than the Enfield, why did the National Association object to its use at Bisley in 1913).

In the second battle of Ypres, at St. Julien and Langemarck, when we were first called upon to put the rifle to a severe active service test, we had trouble extracting the shell or in pulling the bolt back after a shot was fired, and I believe other battalions experienced the same difficulty. After our battalion came out to rest I had occasion to test, under orders, from my commanding officer, all the rifles in my company that had given trouble. In my test I discovered the Canadian ammunition to work perfectly and some series of British worked comparatively well, but the most of the British ammunition caused the bolt to stick after each shot was fired. Even without firing the same difficulty was experienced, so that proved conclusively that the various series of ammunition used were not uniform, shortly afterwards the rifles were all taken from the First Canadian division and the chambers were slightly enlarged .459" to .464" at the base, overcoming the difficulty of having the bolt drag during the extraction of the shell.

I, myself, left the trenches wounded in June and was unable to observe personally the results of the enlarging of the chamber, but have inquired since coming home and I find that difficulty has been overcome and now I consider the Ross rifle the most perfect of the four rifles that I had the opportunity of trying, viz., Mauser (German with no protection for foresight and with open back sight.) Lebel (French with same sighting apparatus) and Lee-Enfield (British with partially protected foresight).

I have heard it said that the aperture back sight of the Ross rifle was too frail, but in more than four months of trench warfare, I had trouble with no more than three sights in my platoon of 55 men. This trouble was caused by permitting the rifle to fall against some hard body with the leaf raised; this same trouble might easily happen to an Enfield.

When our men first saw the Lee-Enfield what appealed to them most was the magazine which held two charges or ten pounds of ammunition. This, at first, appeared to be an advantage, but actually it resulted in a greater waste of ammunition than was experienced with the Ross. It must be remembered that in actual trench warfare, many hundreds of thousands of rounds of ammunition are fired from rifles and wasted, owing to the lack of a suitable target and when the difficulty of bringing in ammunition under fire is taken into consideration, the man with a ten round magazine is bound to fire off his whole magazine of ten in all probability waste all ten.

'Tis true that in case of a German attack on our trenches, a man has more confidence in a

rifle when he knows he has ten rounds ready to fire without unloading, but in my own experience, I found that the responsibility of breaking up a German attack on our trenches very seldom rested on the fire of our rifles. It rested on the support of our artillery, machine guns, bombs and the usual defensive works in front of the trenches such as ditches, wire entanglements, etc.

The above report is a true statement of my own experience with the Canadian service rifle and I feel that personally I would want no better rifle to go into action with again.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) C. H. Ackerman,
Captain,
2nd Battalion Canadians.

Here is another letter from J. C. Macdougall, Shorncliffe:

With reference to the minister's cable of the 14th instant regarding the jamming of the Lee-Enfield and Ross rifles when using bad ammunition.

No cases of jamming of either rifles have occurred here for months, and the confidence of the men in both weapons and ammunition has been established. Both rifles jammed in the past when using B.14 and G.14 and certain Marks of D.C. ammunition. The steps then taken were to withdraw the bad ammunition.

I desire to read, also, a report from a gentleman whose name will be received with respect, not only by the members of this House, but by the people of Canada at large, in respect to this important matter. I am troubling the House with the view of putting this on record so that there may be no feeling of unrest among the people of Canada, who have such a deep interest in the welfare of our soldiers at the front. This letter is dated Headquarters, Shorncliffe, 26th April, 1916, and is addressed to Sir Sam Hughes:

Re DEMONSTRATION OF RAPID FIRE

Ross and Lee-Enfield Rifles.

I enclose you herewith a report (which has just reached me) of a demonstration of rapid fire with both the Ross and Lee-Enfield rifles which was carried out on the Hythe Ranges on the 8th April, 1916, together with statements showing results, and from which it will be seen that the Ross rifle is a superior small arm to the Lee-Enfield, capable of developing a higher rate of fire, whilst still maintaining its accuracy.

With kindest regards,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) S. B. STEELE,
Major-General.

The report which General Steele transmits for the information of the department, and for the information of the people of Canada, is as follows:

Musketry Office,
Headquarters,
Canadian Training Division,
Shorncliffe,
11th April, 1916.

From: Lieut.-Colonel E. Prismall,
Att'd. G.S. (Musketry).
To: The General Officer Commanding,
Canadian Training Division.

Sir,

DEMONSTRATION OF RAPID FIRE.

I have the honour to report:—

A demonstration of rapid fire with both Ross and S.M. Lee-Enfield rifles was carried out on "A" Range, Hythe, at 2.30 p.m. 8th April, 1916.

Officers present.

Major-General S. B. Steele, G.O.C. Troops, Shorncliffe.
Brig.-General Landry, G.O.C. 11th C.R.I.B.
Lieut.-Col. Ashton, O.C. 12th C.R.I.B.
Lieut.-Col. Cowan, O.C. 13th C.R.I.B.
Lieut.-Col. Prismall, Musketry Staff Officer, and other officers from the Divisional and Brigade Staffs and Battalions of the Canadian Training Division.
Executive Officer, Lieut. A. Raker.

The demonstration was divided into two parts. In the first part a number of men fired as many rounds in one minute as they were able.

In the second part two firers, one with the Ross rifle and the other with the S.M. Lee-Enfield fired for seven consecutive minutes as many rounds as they were able.

The results, which are attached, show that a high rate of fire can be reached by trained firers. Constant practice in loading and handling the rifle, however, is necessary if a high standard of efficiency is to be reached and maintained.

The seven-minute continuous fire illustrated practically the limitations of rapid fire and the effect on both rifle and firer. The fatigue of the firers, the heating of the barrel and consequent difficulty in aiming were apparent.

Both rifles worked well, extraction was good, and the bolts worked smoothly.

The ammunition used was D.A. 1915.

After this demonstration was concluded, a series of shots with defective ammunition (B. 14) was fired, and greater trouble was experienced in extraction with the Lee-Enfield than the Ross rifle.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) E. PRISMALL,
Lieut.-Colonel,
Att'd. G.S. (Musketry)
Can. Training Division.

Attached to this letter is a table showing the number of shots fired by each individual and giving the names of the men in the test. I will give it to Hansard, so that it will go out to the country and satisfy the people that we have the good fortune to possess a rifle that takes second place probably to none at the present time. It will reassure them that it is not the misfortune of our soldiers to suffer from the effects of a bad rifle. It is true that in the earlier stages of the war they did suffer from the effects of bad ammunition, but that

defect has been corrected. I repeat that it is most unfortunate that any uneasiness should be caused by the publication of the letter which has been referred to, and which is probably of old date and intended simply to create uneasiness and unrest. It is most unfortunate in the interests of the country, and in every other way, and it is only fair, and, indeed, the duty, of the hon. members of this House to correct any such impression, and to assist in punishing, if possible, the individual, whoever he may be, who was guilty of committing such an offence as to publish a letter without the proper heading, without date, and containing information that is not correct. The following is the table of results of the test referred to by General Steele:

Conditions—Distance 200 yards; targets, 2nd class figure, position, lying, firing over cover; 5 sighting shots allowed; each firer to fire at his best rate for 1 minute.

Corps.	Rank and Name.	Ross Rifle. Rounds. Fired.	Ross Rifle. Hits.	B.	I.	M.	O.	Score.
17th.....	Res. Bn. Lt. Ross.....	25	24	7	12	4	1	73
39th.....	" Sgt. Barrett.....	25	25	6	9	5	5	66
9th.....	" Sgt. Bay.....	24	20	7	10	3	0	64
	" C.S.M. Laurie.....	23	23	2	11	10	0	61
32nd.....	" C.S.M. Borrowdale.....	21	19	4	9	6	0	55
11th.....	" L-Cpl. Bell.....	21	21	4	12	4	1	61
55th.....	" C.Q.M.S. Loggie.....	20	20	7	8	4	1	61
9th.....	" C.S.M. Pratt.....	19	19	11	8	0	0	68
	Totals.....	178	171	48	79	36	8	509

Average rounds fired per man per minute..... 22·2
" hits " " ..... 21·3
" score " " ..... 63·6

Corps.	Rank and Name.	S.M.L.E. Rifle. Rounds. Fired.	S.M.L.E. Rifle. Hits.	B.	I.	M.	O.	Score
11th.....	Res. Bn. Cpl. Orquhart.....	23	22	4	6	10	2	56
30th.....	" Cpl. Jackson.....	21	21	7	12	2	0	68
36th.....	" C.Q.M.S. Parker.....	20	20	8	9	1	2	63
39th.....	" Sgt. Caverley.....	19	11	2	0	7	2	24
55th.....	" Pte. Morris.....	19	18	1	7	4	6	39
17th.....	" Sgt. Reed.....	18	18	0	13	4	1	48
12th.....	" C.S.M. Smith.....	17	15	0	7	7	1	36
	Totals.....	137	125	22	54	35	14	334

Average rounds fired per man per minute..... 19·5
" hits " " ..... 17·8
" score " " ..... 47·7

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to exaggerate the importance of this report, but I can hardly agree with the tendency of the Government to minimize its importance. I have here a copy of the Toronto Globe of this morning, and on the front page it contains the same article, taken from the Citizen of yesterday evening. It would seem therefore that the article really appeared in the Evening Citizen, which I did not see, and has been telegraphed all over the Dominion of Canada, I presume. I think that under these circumstances the question of whether such a letter was written by General Alderson is an important one to be considered. General Alderson was in command of the Canadian forces in France, and must have had some reputation and experience before he was given that command. When a man having the tremendous responsibilities that he had, as the officer in command during a very considerable period of the most serious fighting, puts pen to paper and makes the statements that are made in this letter, if they were made by General Alderson, all I can say is that I am sorry that the Government does not see fit to deal with the matter in a different way. It is not a matter of arguing at this end of the line, nor is it a matter of producing evidence of what is the opinion of some person in regard to the advantage of this particular rifle under experimental conditions, or at target practice. The question is, what is the value of the rifle while in service in the field. That is the serious point, and that is the point upon which General Alderson is absolutely definite. He makes the most definite and precise statements upon that point. That is a serious question and it is a question that cannot be answered except by contrary evidence as to the result of the use of the rifle in the field. I would respectfully suggest that the first thing to be done is for the Government to satisfy itself as to whether General Alderson wrote this letter or not. If General Alderson wrote this letter, then General Alderson is absolutely discredited as a military man, or else we are left entirely without defence as to the field service qualities of this rifle.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know what my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) means in suggesting that the Government should have taken some other course. We have sent a communication to the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Douglas Haig, who has supreme command of the British and Canadian forces at the front. We have told him that we leave the matter in his judgment after making tests of both rifles under precisely the same conditions as those through which they must pass when in use at the front. That means, as I understand, and I have referred the matter to General Hughes, that means, among other things, that there should be the ordinary shooting test; further, that the rifle must be thrown into the mud or sand, and otherwise put through the very same conditions as those which would be experienced in the ordinary course at the front so that it will be possible to see whether or not, after passing through these conditions, it jams or whether anything goes wrong with it. After these tests have been made, and after the evidence and reports in regard to them have been placed in the hands of Sir Douglas Haig, the British Commander-in-Chief, the whole question is left to his judgment to come to a just conclusion and determination. If there is any better course I would be glad to have my hon. friend suggest it because I am only too anxious to do everything possible to ensure the possession, by our troops at the front, of the best rifle that is available. Up to the present, I have not heard any course suggested which seems to be more useful than the course which has thus been taken.

Mr. REID: I would like to say that I discussed the Ross rifle with my brother-in-law, Col. R. L. Labatt, who was in the battle of St. Festubert, and he said that the Ross rifle was very satisfactory and as good as the Lee-Enfield. He informed me that some soldiers from the British Islands, who were using the Lee-Enfield, were only too glad to exchange it for the Ross rifle. I also discussed the matter with Captain Kidd, another officer of the 56th. He told me that the Ross rifle was very satisfactory. I also discussed the matter with several others who have returned and in every case they have said that they preferred the Ross rifle to the Lee-Enfield. On every occasion upon which I have discussed the Ross rifle with men who have returned from the front, they have praised the rifle.

Mr. MORPHY: Mr. Chairman, I had no desire to take part in this discussion, but when the subject came up, I went to my room and got the memorandum of a conversation which I had with an officer who returned from the front two months ago. I had a long conversation with him about the equipment of our troops, of which con-

versation I made a few notes and I find this under the heading of " The Ross Rifle ":

There is no better weapon in Europe than this Ross rifle which is being brought to assimilate with the Lee-Enfield. The difference between the two, which has been the subject of much discussion in England, is in favour of the sights of the Lee-Enfield, but if the Ross had the same sights, or sights of a similar kind, having great durability, it is thought that it would be the best rifle on the ground.

That was this officer's opinion, given to me in a general interview concerning the condition of the equipment of our troops at the front. I noticed in the press some time ago a statement that there appeared through the lines of the Canadian troops, in either typewriting or printed form, a series of questions, most leading in their character, concerning the preferences of the troops as between the Ross and Lee-Enfield rifles. The questions, a list of which I have seen, were entirely leading and designed to bring an answer favourable to the Lee-Enfield and antagonistic to the merits of the Ross rifle. It may be that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) had in his mind something that I think would be liable to generate in the mind of anybody, that this propaganda may be carried on by interested parties selling another rifle. As a Canadian it is cheering to me to know that the country sent about 50,000 rifles of Canadian manufacture to assist the troops in the field at a time when there were not enough rifles available from any source for service at the front. I think the country and the Government are to be congratulated upon the foresight that resulted in their being sent to our troops, even if the rifle were not the best on the ground, a serviceable rifle, which, after all, is spoken of highly by a great many people who understand it. I would like to call the attention of the Government particularly to another statement of this officer to whom I have already referred. He said that:

All changes that are being made in the borings of the Ross rifle and the sights could be, and should be, made in Canada.

I would commend the suggestion to the Government, as a matter for consideration, that if further borings or enlargements are to be made, the work should be done here so as to give employment to our own workmen in Canadian institutions.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think, in view of what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) has stated, and the very satisfactory information which he gave with regard to the qualities of the Ross rifle, it is fortunate that my hon. friend from Edmonton has brought the matter up, because this letter, or this alleged letter, will necessarily have very wide publicity throughout Canada, and very great unrest and anxiety will be caused by its publication. It is very desirable to have a public statement made in Parliament in regard to the matter. I quite approve of what my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) says the Government propose to do, but it seems to me that this letter, or alleged letter, of General Alderson's cannot be disregarded. I would respectfully suggest that it is the duty of the Government to ferret this matter to the bottom, find out whether this letter is a genuine letter that was sent by General Alderson, and, if so, the conditions under which it was sent. It is certainly a most serious matter for General Alderson to have written such a letter. Of course, it is a most serious matter for anybody to have written a letter professing to have been written by General Alderson, it is a very serious matter for a newspaper to publish this alleged letter from General Alderson if it was not written by him, and it is a serious matter for General Alderson to have written a letter disparaging the Ross rifle, which is, as my hon. friend has stated, the only rifle of Canadian manufacture. It is a very serious matter for him to have disparaged it, and the Government ought to find out by communication with General Alderson, or with somebody knowing General Alderson, whether he wrote that letter and what was his justification for having done so. I would think it would be quite possible to follow the matter up and get the requisite information on that point.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It would undoubtedly be a serious matter for General Alderson or any one else to write a letter of that character, and the only possible justification for writing it would be to bring about the remedying of conditions that he thought undesirable. But it would be equally a serious thing for any person to cause that letter to be published except under proper sanction. There are thousands of communications, I suppose, every week and every month, important in themselves, designed to improve conditions in the military or naval service or at the front, which it would be most undesirable to make public not only for the reason that they might cause public disquietude, but for the further reason that they would give information to the enemy which it

would be most unfortunate from our point of view for the enemy to have. I must confess my conviction that whoever has caused this letter, or alleged letter, to be published has taken a very grave responsibility. The Canadian Army Corps is, to my knowledge, holding at present a very important position—what one might call a post of honour—in the line in France and Belgium At such a juncture, when operations are impending which may possibly prove to be of the greatest magnitude, it is most dangerous to convey to the enemy, even if it were true, the information that the rifle with which the Canadian army, or a part of it, is armed is not a serviceable and efficient weapon. Indeed, I should not like to speak my full mind about such a course of conduct, but I do venture to say that, according to the view I entertain, it is about as grave a responsibility as any man could take upon himself. We shall certainly endeavour to find out whether that letter is authentic, and if it is not authentic, upon what authority it has been published as authentic. If it should prove that the letter is authentic, the inquiry must go still further: By whose authority, under what sanction, and for what reason was a letter made public which might be of service to the enemy and could not be of service to the people of Canada Why, especially, was it made public without inquiry and at a time when, if the Commander in Chief has acted upon our request, an investigation such as I have described to-night is already in progress? I can assure my hon. friend that the matter will not be allowed to drop.

Mr. OLIVER: I just wish to draw attention to one statement of fact, or alleged fact, contained in this letter, in order to strengthen the view I have expressed that a target or camp test is not an efficient test of a rifle for field service.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is not the test we have suggested.

Mr. OLIVER: General Alderson is alleged to have stated that in the second battle of Ypres the Ross rifle jammed so badly he was obliged to let die a natural death the order that our soldiers were not to throw away the Ross rifles and take up the Lee-Enfield. He says: "When the division was re-armed with the Lee-Enfield the men cheered loudly on hearing the news, and it was found that there were already more than 3,000 of the rifles in the division." That is to say, according to this letter, contrary to the General's orders, 3,000 men had thrown away their Ross rifles and picked up the Lee-Enfield. Now the factor upon which more than anything else depends the lives of these men and their success in the field is the efficiency of the rifle in their hands, and under those circumstances I cannot imagine that 3,000 men—intelligent men, earnest men, men of our own—would throw away the more efficient rifle and pick up the less efficient rifle. This is either a statement of fact or it is not a statement of fact. If this letter was written by General Alderson, we are bound to assume that it is a statement of fact. If it is a statement of fact, I do not think there is anything further to be said. It is now, not what is to be said, but what is to be done. The Prime Minister has outlined the course he proposes to take, and it is certainly the course to be taken. The only criticism that I would offer is that it is a course that should have been taken very long ago, because if the conditions alluded to in this letter as existing prior to the second battle of Ypres actually did exist, surely those conditions must have in some manner come to the attention of the Government, and in such a form as to have claimed their consideration. I cannot imagine that not to be the case; and, assuming it to be the case, action and not words was certainly what was required. It is a terrible responsibility to have any part in exposing this alleged condition, but allow me to say that the responsibility for the existence of such a condition is ten thousand times greater.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: My hon. friend, I think, must have forgotten what has been said in this House more than once, or he would not have made the observations which have fallen from him just now. The only difficulty with the Ross rifle that I ever heard of before I went to Great Britain last year was with regard to jamming. So far as I can remember, I heard of no other difficulty during my visit. That jamming was not confined to the Ross rifle; it occurred in a very great measure—in almost equal measure, I think—with the Lee-Enfield rifle; and if we had taken away from our men the Ross rifle and armed them with Lee-Enfields, jamming would still have occurred if the same ammunition had been used. Moreover, so far as we are aware, no Lee-Enfields would have been available. I cabled to Great Britain about five or six weeks ago in connection with further orders for the Ross rifle extending beyond April,

1917. I asked whether, if the war should not be over at that time and we should need further supplies,we could depend upon obtaining rifles from the British Government after April, 1917, to any, and if so, to what extent. We did not receive a reply that would justify us in depending upon them for one single rifle even after that date.

When it was discovered that the Ross rifle, as well as the Lee-Enfield rifle, did jam with certain types of ammunition—but not with others—it was thought desirable to enlarge the chamber of the Ross rifle. It was thought desirable by the British Government, as I am informed, to enlarge the chamber of the Lee-Enfield. This course was taken with regard to each rifle for precisely the same reason. I do not affirm that there was the same amount of jamming in the Lee-Enfield as in the Ross. I do not know about that; I have heard contradictory statements with regard to it. The Minister of Militia directed that the enlargement made in the chamber of the Ross rifle should make that chamber slightly larger than the enlarged chamber of the Lee-Enfield, in order that we might be on the safe side. I am informed that the Ross rifles were all called in and the alteration in the chamber was made, and in the new Ross rifles afterwards produced the chamber was made of the enlarged size. My hon. friend suggests the Government should have taken some earlier action. I have not heard of any difficulty except with regard to the jamming. The Government took the advice of the best experts it could obtain, and took the same course with regard to the Ross rifle that was taken with the Lee-Enfield under the advice of the British military experts. We made our chamber, as I have said, slightly larger than that of the Lee-Enfield. Notwithstanding this, we have since heard occasional rumours of criticism upon the Ross rifle. We have tried to keep in touch with the conditions with regard to it. We have communicated many times with Sir George Perley. Sir George has been present at tests in which, he tells me, when good ammunition was used, he had seen one hundred rounds each of two kinds of good ammunition fired from the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield, without the slightest difficulty —without any back-firing or mishap. But he has seen inferior ammunition used with both rifles and difficulties experienced with both. If there is anything we should have done, beyond what is suggested, I should be glad to have the views of my hon. friend with regard to it.

In view of later developments, we have asked the Commander in Chief—this is not something we propose to do, as one hon. member has suggested, but something we have done—we have sent a communication to the Commander in Chief asking him to have tests made of the Ross rifle and the Lee-Enfield rifle under conditions precisely similar to those experienced at the front, so that we may know what the efficiency of each rifle is under the conditions which the soldiers encounter in actual warfare in the trenches, so far as those can be duplicated; dropping the rifles into sand or into mud; embedding them in mud and pulling them out and then using them; dropping them into water; using them under every condition that can be imagined as likely to occur in active service. If there is any better test than this that can be devised I do not know what it is. I am perfectly willing to receive suggestions and, if reasonable, to act upon them.

Mr. OLIVER: Can the Prime Minister say what is the occasion of the exchange of the Ross rifle for the Lee-Enfield in the First Canadian Division?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: We have no information about it except that the exchange was made. We imagine and presume that General Alderson, finding that a number of the rifles had jammed, through the use of the ammunition to which I have alluded, thought it better to make an exchange, and the exchange was made. We had no voice in it and made no objection to it. But when, at a later date, the subject was brought up during the visit of the Minister of Militia to Great Britain, it was decided to take the course which has been mentioned—to enlarge the chamber of the Ross rifle.

Mr. OLIVER: What became of the Ross rifles that were taken from the First Division?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I presume they were called in and the chamber enlarged.

Mr. OLIVER: What became of them afterwards?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not know.

Mr. OLIVER: Is the Second Division armed with the same?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is armed with the Ross rifle, as I understand it.

Mr. OLIVER: Those that were called in?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I do not know whether they were armed with those that were called in or whether new rifles were sent over. But I understand that they are armed with the Ross rifle with the enlarged chamber.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to prolong the discussion, and particularly I do not wish to bring in here any discussion of the alleged imperfections of the Ross rifle. I have never given any opinion of my own with regard to this weapon, and have given no information as to what has come to my ears. I am merely desirous of bringing to the attention of the Government in this way which admits of no question, the alleged opinion of General Alderson, for the purpose of finding out whether this is the opinion of General Alderson or not. I am prepared to let the matter rest at that, with this exception—that I am compelled to repeat in a measure what I have said before: that at the time when the change was made of the rifles of the First Division, that is when the first division was disarmed of Ross rifles for the purpose of arming it with Lee-Enfields, it appears to me that, in view of the rumours that must have reached the ears of the Government at that time, that would have been the time when the action now taken should have been taken.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A great many tests of the Lee-Enfield rifle and the Ross rifle have been made on different occasions within the past year.

Mr. NESBITT: I desire to say a word before these Estimates go through. The Minister of Finance this year brought down Main Estimates amounting to $188,981,218. He told us that, owing to the war and the needs of the country, it was quite necessary that the country generally should economize, and that each individual in the country should do the same. We on this side innocently supposed that that included the Government. The Supplemenary Estimates for 1915-16, which were afterwards brought down amounted to $4,485,537. Then we had Supplementary Estimates for 1916-17, the total of which was $28,284,081. Add the $4,000,000 in the vote before us, and you have a total of $225,741,836. The hon. minister said that $25,000,000 of the Main Estimates would not be used. Deducting that amount you still have an estimated expenditure for this year of $200,000,000 in round figures. Then, we have a war vote of $250,000,000 which will largely have to be borrowed. I think the hon. Minister of Finance was absolutely right when he said that the country and the individuals who make it up would have to economise this year, and probably for several years, owing to the heavy expenditure which the country was being called upon to make. I congratulated him at that time upon his giving that notice, because coming from the Minister of Finance it has some weight. But in spite of that we find the Government including in the Estimates certain amounts the expenditure of which is unnecessary. We are reminded of the old adage, "Example is better than precept," which I think may well be applied to this case. We discussed the question of providing for the purchase of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway and the other railways mentioned in this item, and I shall not discuss them at any length to-night. The Lotbinière and Megantic railway is in just as good a position now from a financial standpoint as it possibly can be, and there is no reasonable object in purchasing it. It has been there for some years, and it connects with the Intercolonial. The other piece of railway from Quebec to St. Joachim is, they say, a paying road. I have no desire to take that road from its present owners if it is a paying road; I would like to see them make some money out of it. The other piece of road that is proposed to be taken over, from Montmorency Falls to Nairn Falls—

Mr. LEMIEUX: From St. Joachim.

Mr. NESBITT: I cannot pronounce that. Anyway, a portion of this Quebec and Saguenay road is only partially finished. The excuse for taking it over is that 30,000 people have lived in that district for one hundred and fifty years and are looking for a railway. In my judgment they will not have heart trouble if they wait a couple of years longer until the war is over.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: A couple of hundred?

Mr. NESBITT: Well, in a couple of hundred years perhaps we shall have got over this war indebtedness. Another excuse offered is that it is to relieve certain gentlemen who have invested in this pro-

ject, which is not supposed to be a paying proposition. If the Government are going to turn philanthropist and come to the relief of people who have invested in things which have not been profitable, I would like them to commence with me, because, like many other persons I could mention, I have invested in many things that did not pay. If the Government are going to proceed along this line they will have their hands full. These are the only two excuses that the Government have given for taking over this railway. This vote is for $4,000,000, but I firmly believe, with the hon. member for South Renfrew, that to put these roads in running order and equip them will cost $10,000,000 or $11,000,000; so that this is only the commencement. Therefore, as no reasonable reasons have been given for this expenditure, I beg to move that the item be struck out.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The hon. member has referred to my statement in the Budget as to keeping down the expenditures of the Dominion. I think I have shown on many occasions since the Budget was brought down that it has been the object of the Dominion since the war broke out to keep its expenditures within as reasonable bounds as possible. The figures themselves show that. Speaking from memory, the expenditures of the Dominion for the fiscal year immediately preceding the outbreak of war was in the neighbourhood of $180,000,000. This year we shall have to pay interest charges in connection with our increased public debt to the amount of about $25,000,000 in excess of interest charges which were paid for the fiscal year preceding the outbreak of war. Notwithstanding that fact, the expenditure on ordinary and on capital account of this Dominion for the present fiscal year will be less by $15,000,000 than it was for the fiscal year preceding the outbreak of war. I say that this is an absolutely creditable record, if we can accomplish it. Practically no public works have been gone on with except those under contract.

9 p.m.

Mr. NESBITT: Did not the hon. minister tell us, when he made his Budget speech, that the expenditure would not be over $155,000,000?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I said that $160,000,000 would be our expenditure on ordinary and on capital account. If we keep within that Estimate, as I hope, we shall be doing $20,000,000 better than we did for the fiscal year preceding the outbreak of the war. Since the main Estimates have been brought down we have been obliged to face the Canadian Transcontinental railway situation, which has been discussed in the House. I need not say that we have not been looking for railways to which to give public moneys. A certain railway situation exists, and we have to meet that situation. The course that we have followed has been such as to meet the approval of the great majority of the members of this House and the people of the country so far as the Transcontinental railway situation is concerned. Therefore, what I understood to be the argument of my hon. friend that we had added some $23,000,000 to the main Estimates falls to the ground. I would point out, further, that that expenditure cannot be classed as either ordinary or capital expenditure; it is an investment. We borrow the money in New York at 5½ per cent or thereabouts, and we lend the money out to a railway company at 6 per cent.

Mr. NESBITT: My argument was not against the expenditures on the transcontinental railways. It was that, owing to that and the war expenditure, there was no necessity for us to enter upon this expenditure.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend was developing his argument, and I understood him to say that, in addition to the Main Estimates, we brought down $23,000,000 for the railways.

Mr. NESBITT: I did not say that.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I pointed out that that expenditure would be on investment account, and that the Dominion Government would lose nothing on that, provided the interest was paid. My hon. friend next comes to the item of $4,000,000 to provide for the acquisition of the lines of railway which he has mentioned, and to provide for expenditure on account of construction. That is undoubtedly expenditure upon capital account.

Now what is the position with regard to these railways to which my hon. friend has drawn attention? In the first place, the little railway which he mentioned, the Lotbiniere and Megantic, involves the expenditure of how much? About $330,000. That is certainly not a large amount in the Estimates of the Railways and Canals Department, a department which, almost every year, takes over some branch line.

So that, so far as that particular item is concerned, I think it can be put on one side. I understood it to be stated in the House that there were earnings in connection with that railway, and the probabilities are that it will not be any considerable charge upon the revenues of the Dominion. At all events, it is not a very large amount; and, as far as I can make out, it has been the policy of both this Government and the late Liberal Government to add to the Intercolonial those branch lines. I have heard discussions in this House time and time again since I have had the honour of occupying a seat here, in which the view was put forward that the Government should, in the interest of the public, acquire most of the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial. We now come to the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix and to the Quebec and Saguenay railway. For what is the Government taking over these roads?

Mr. NESBITT: That is what I would like to know.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have given this matter a good deal of consideration. One might ask himself why, in the first instance, men should embark upon the construction of such a railway. The names connected with the railway at its inception are the names of men of some eminence in the province of Quebec. They are men of standing in the community, and the fact is that they believed in the Quebec and Saguenay. They acquired a charter which was granted by the Provincial Government in 1905. The names of the parties who took up that project originally are names of some standing in the province of Quebec. The charter was a provincial charter, and the Government of Quebec must have been impressed with the desirability, in the public interest, of constructing that road, or the province of Quebec would not have granted a subsidy, as they did grant a subsidy in lands and in money, for the construction of the road. That seems to me to be clear. We must assume that the Government of the province of Quebec knew what it was doing when it authorized a charter in the first place, and granted a subsidy in the second place. Further than that, the late Liberal Administration gave a subsidy for the construction of the Quebec and Saguenay. They also must have been convinced that it was required or desirable in the public interest, or they would not have taken the responsibility of making a grant of public money for the construction of that line.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are not all railways entitled to subsidies?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not think they are. My hon. friend would never lay down the proposition that, because men desire to build a railway, they are, as a matter of course to get a subsidy. My hon. friend knows as well as I or any gentleman in this House that the late Government did grant a subsidy to this line, and that they must have come to the conclusion that it was a proper line to subsidize in the national interest or they would not have taken the responsibility of doing so. Now, what can be said in favour of building a line of railway along that north shore? My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) gave some reasons the other day which appeared to me to have great weight. It is an old settled district of the province of Quebec. Settlement has been there for 150 or 200 years. The only access, for certain portions of the year, to the city of Quebec is by stage coach, at least that was stated. While it might be extremely imprudent from the standpoint of private enterprise to build a road—although I do not pass upon that because I am not sufficiently familiar with the situation—at the same time it might be very desirable in the public interest that the Government should either build or assist in building a road which would give access to that district and give these people a means of getting out in the winter time, in fact at all seasons of the year, to Quebec. It is by no means a conclusive argument against either the Government of Quebec or the Government of Canada assisting in the construction of or building a road of that kind, that private enterprise might find it unprofitable, because a Government must consider the various sections of the country, and if it reaches the conclusion that a certain line of railway should be built for the benefit of a particular district, it need not too closely scrutinize the question of whether or not that line will be immediately remunerative. That is my view. But I admit that a strong case must be presented before a Government takes any action of that kind. We have not been desirous of paying out public moneys, especially in times like these, except in cases which were regarded as urgent. What is the position?

Let us assume that the north shore should be served, that it is in the interests of the public that the 30,000 people in that district should have communication with the city of Quebec. There is the position this Government found. Some $5,000,000, as has been explained, had been expended by private enterprise on the Quebec and Saguenay, from the terminus of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix to Murray Bay. Some $5,000,000 has been spent and what is the condition of that road? For the last two years the proprietors have been unable to find the money to finish it. The road therefore has been deteriorating. The capital which has been invested in the road represents a larger sum than the road to-day represents, with the deterioration which has occurred. That depreciation or wastage is going on from year to year; washouts are occurring; the roadbed is being impaired. The way this matter has appealed to me is that if it is in the public interest of that section of the province of Quebec that that railway should be built —and that is the assumption upon which I am proceeding—then it is not economy to allow the road to continue as at present —with a deterioration of probably half a million dollars a year. My premise is that it is desirable in the public interest that that road should be completed and if that is so, then I think, instead of allowing the deterioration which we know is going on to continue, it would be the part of economy, if the Government is ultimately to complete the road, that it should do so and prevent the wastage. I lay that down as a common sense proposition. My hon. friend has raised the question, why do you buy the electric line between Quebec and St. Joachim?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I leave it to my hon. friend from Rouville, who is a master of the French language, to say if my pronunciation of that name is not truly Parisian.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is very good. It would not be good French if it were Parisian. That Parisian French is good French is a mistaken idea, common among my friends from Toronto.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Some of my hon. friend's colleagues think that they know French, but they do not. My hon. friend has asked about the electric line from Quebec east. My hon. friend is a pretty good business man, but will he tell me why the Government should have acquired the Quebec and Saguenay alone, a line which begins about 30 miles east from Quebec?

Would he tell me why the Government should acquire the Quebec and Saguenay line, which begins about thirty miles east of the city of Quebec, unless we acquire also the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix line? A line thirty miles away from the terminus of the Transcontinental railway would not be of much use either as a feeder, or as a line to be operated in connection with it.

Mr. NESBITT: I am afraid that my hon. friend is quite right, and I said that we should not acquire it.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That may be. I am positive that the interests of that portion of the province of Quebec which lies to the north of the St. Lawrence river require it. My hon. friend, as a private individual, might not desire to put money into it, or to build such a railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: If he did he would try to get it out again.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Quite so, but if the public interest is such that that railway is required it is the duty of the Government not to allow that large amount of capital to go to waste. It is necessary, therefore, to acquire the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway in order that we may connect with the Quebec and Saguenay and have a continuous line from the city of Quebec to Nairn Falls.

Mr. NESBITT: My hon. friend just commenced at the wrong end of his argument. He took it for granted that we should acquire the part that is not built.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The point of my argument is that there was a very large sum, some $5,000,000, invested in the Quebec and Saguenay railway, and if it is desirable that the Government should complete that road, as we submit it is, it is absolutely necessary that we should acquire the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway in order to have a continuous line. These are the considerations that have appealed to me in connection with this transaction. So far as the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix line is concerned, there are $2,500,000 of bonds issued some years ago, and bearing 5 per cent. The Government takes over that

line and assumes the obligation of the bonds. So far as the Quebec and Saguenay line is concerned, the Government is acquiring that railway on a basis of actual cost, not to exceed some $4,000,000, which, as a matter of fact, is much less than the actual construction cost. That is the situation, and it all comes back to the question whether it is in the public interest—in the interest of that large section of the province of Quebec which lies to the north of the St. Lawrence, that the Government should come to the aid of this road, acquire it, and complete it in order that the district may be served; or whether, on the contrary, the road bed of the Quebec and Saguenay line should be allowed to deteriorate from year to year at a loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars annually, and, ultimately, of all the capital invested.

It seems to me that that is the question. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition dealt with it very fairly. He had no objection to our acquiring the line. He knows the district down there, and my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) also knows the district. I doubt very much if either of those hon. gentlemen would stand up and say that it is not in the public interest that the road should be acquired in order that that district may have railway facilities. If you look at it from the standpoint of a railway promoter desirous of making a large amount of money out of the enterprise, that is one thing; but if you look at it from the standpoint of the people down there, who belong to one of the oldest settled districts in Canada, who are, I suppose, among the worthiest people in Canada, and who are debarred from getting to the city of Quebec for so many months in the year, I think these are considerations which would appeal to any public man. Take the National Transcontinental railway, built at a cost of $150,000,000, or $160,000,000, or $170,000,000. No one would stand up in this House and say that that would give a return on the investment. A return of four per cent on that investment would be some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 per year. No one will say that the Government is obtaining a return upon that railway. Private enterprise would not build a road of that kind, and yet it was built—I am not passing upon the merits—it was built, and hon. gentlemen opposite will defend the building of that road. They will not say that it is immediately profitable. They will say it was built for the purposes that have been so often mentioned in this House.

I do not want to make any special argument on this question. It is a matter involving the expenditure of a large sum of money, and the considerations which have influenced me favourably are that it is in the public interest of that northern district, lying along the St. Lawrence, to have railway communication with the city of Quebec. We are acquiring these railways for the Dominion of Canada. We are not making loans; we are not giving guarantees; we are not subsidizing. We are buying these roads, and when they are bought they will belong to the Dominion of Canada. The price is to be fixed by the Exchequer Court, and it is not to exceed a certain amount, which is much less, in the case of the Quebec and Saguenay railway, than the amount that has been spent upon it. These are the considerations which have had weight with me in this transaction.

Mr. TURRIFF: In the past four years we have heard in this House, week after week, month after month, session after session, hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches complaining of what the Grand Trunk Pacific railway cost, and of all the hon. members who complained none was louder or stronger than my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What is that?

Mr. TURRIFF: I say that of all the members on the Government benches who have fulminated week after week, and month after month, in this House against the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, none was louder than my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think there were some.

Mr. TURRIFF: None was louder in pointing out that the cost had been excessive, and that there was no justification for the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Let me tell my hon. friend the Minister of Finance one or two things. Leaving out the question of interest, the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, the best built railway on the continent of America, was less than $85,000 per mile. With a grade of 4-10 of one per cent one way, and 6-10 of one per cent the other way, with heavy rails, telegraph lines, station houses, everything complete, and in

first-class shape, it cost less than $85,000 per mile. Now my hon. friend the Minister of Finance comes forward and from his place in this House justifies the purchase of a right of way. It is only a right of way, on which 87 per cent of the grading has been done, and a great deal of that has been washed out. He defends the purchase of that road at a cost of $98,000 per mile.

Mr. REID: That statement is not in accordance with the facts, and the hon. member should not make it.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Acting Minister of Railways may say that that statement is not correct, but, taking the figures given by my hon. friend from Charlevoix, $4,500,000 worth of bonds was issued on that road and $1,500,000 in addition. If you figure that out you will find that the Government is taking over a road which cost, it is claimed, $98,000 per mile, and it is not taking it at its full value.

They are tying up the judge of the Exchequer Court hand and foot so that he cannot take the value of the road, but he must take the cost as shown by the present owners who are selling to the Government, subject to the fact that it is not to be more than $2,500,000 bonds, plus $4,465,000, less all subsidies paid; whereas you have a completed road, the finest on the continent, at a cost of $85,000 a mile, and the Government now, to help out political friends, are willing that the Canadian people should pay $98,000 a mile for a right of way only, not a tie, not a bit of telegraph wire, not a telegraph post, not a station house, not a rail, not a bridge, not anything. I heard the statement made by some hon. gentleman in the House yesterday that this was just a lumber road in the first place. Now they put it over on the country, and they propose to put it in such a shape that the judge of the Exchequer Court has to take the cost of the road as shown by the owners. The owners claim that they have put into the road the proceeds of the sale of $5,600,000 worth of bonds and $1,500,000 of Canadian money, but they have nothing to offer for all that, not even a rust streak, but some grading. Hon. gentlemen opposite come forward and load on to the people of Canada, not a completed road, but a road which, when completed, will cost $10,000,000. The Minister of Finance, in spite of all the difficulties that he has pointed out during this session in the way of financing the debt of Canada in the future, now deliberately adds $500,000 to the fixed charges of Canada. I hope, after this transaction, we will never hear another word from hon. gentlemen opposite about the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific. That cost may have been excessive, that cost may have been too heavy, but we certainly got a first-class road completed for $85,000 a mile, and here we have an expenditure of $98,000 per mile when even the grading has not been done.

Mr. LOGGIE: I would like to make a few remarks about this matter. If I understand it correctly, the Government propose to take over 136 miles of railway at a cost of about $50,000 a mile, a part of which is completed and a part not completed. What I object to strongly is the departure of principle as to the acquisition of branch railways. If you are going to adopt a principle with regard to the taking over of branch railways, you ought to apply the same principle to the taking over of branch railways along the line of the Intercolonial. I want to recall to the committee how a branch line was taken over some few years ago. They did not set about to value the railway on the basis of what it cost and then deduct from that cost the subsidies paid and depreciation, but they put valuators on the railway and they purchased 125 miles between Fredericton and Loggieville at a rate of $6,000 per mile, equipped. The railway was purchased from the Gibson Manufacturing Company at the very low price of $6,000 per mile. A railway 125 miles in length was acquired for an outlay of $750,000, including equipment, cars and everything in connection with the operation of the road. If the principle that now applies had applied to the purchase of the Canada Eastern at that time I venture to say that it would have cost twice as much as it did. If you are going to adopt a principle regarding the purchase of branch lines, then I want you to apply it to the branch lines you purchase in the future. There are branch lines along the Intercolonial that it is most urgent in the public interest the Government should take over. The districts that they traverse are not properly served, and the mercantile interests are retarded because there are not proper railway facilities. If you are starting out now on a new principle of taking over branch railways, valuating them at the cost price, less depreciation and bonuses paid, you should apply the same principle in the purchase of other branch lines. I cannot say

that I am against the taking over of this road in the public interest. I believe that there is a good deal in what the minister has said that if the company is not strong enough to complete the undertaking, then strong men must come in and rescue it in the public interest. But, the same principle ought to apply to other branch lines.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I must say a word in connection with the vote I am about to give. If I were seeking for popularity, it would be quite easy to give a vote this evening, because I would vote for the interests of Charlevoix county and the city of Quebec. But there are other considerations, and I think the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has not given the same attention to this question that he gives to other business. He seems to forget that this country is loaded with a colossal debt, and that we will have to find money for the interest charges. He forgets that the people of the country, individually and collectively, in municipalities, cities and towns, have to bleed themselves white in order to do their share towards helping the great cause we have at heart. I quite believe my hon. friend the Minister of Finance when he says that the uncompleted section of the Quebec and Saguenay should be aided. I think that the promoters of the line should be aided materially and substantially to enable them to complete it. The people have been waiting for years for connection with the city and district of Quebec, and now material assistance should be given toward the completion of the line. But, Mr. Chairman, what my hon. friend has not explained to the committee, and what he will not be able to explain, is the fact that instead of aiding the only road which requires assistance, he is a party to a scheme which involves the Government in the taking over of three railways. The members of the committee this evening are not aware that the Minister of Finance, and the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals, are not, with this amount of money, buying one continuous railway system. That ought to throw some light on this scheme. Does my hon. friend believe, in his heart of hearts, that at the present moment he is asking Parliament to devote a sum of money to the acquisition of a continuous railway system?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Lotbinière and Megantic is on the other side of the river.

[Mr. Loggie.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Lotbinière and Megantic has no connection whatever with this. It starts from Lyster in the county of Megantic and runs to St. Jean des Chaillons in the county of Lotbinière. It is a little bit of railway that looks after the lumbering needs of the district.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: How much has been paid for that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Government is paying $330,000. Now this railway is paying its own way; the people are not clamouring for the Government to acquire the road. Are there any petitions from the people of this district asking the Government to take over this road? I make bold to say there is not one such petition on the files of the Department of Railways and Canals. Why then should the Government saddle the people of this Dominion with this unnecessary obligation? The other railway starts from Quebec and runs to St. Joachim in the county of Montmorency. This is a tramway, and it is also paying its way. Nobody has ever clamoured for the Government to take over this road. The other railway which the Government intends to take over is the Quebec and Saguenay, which runs from St. Joachim to Murray Bay. And I quite agree that that section of the country should be generously aided by the Government. But why is the Government taking over three roads at a cost of $6,000,000 when only one of them needs assistance? With substantial assistance from the Government the Saguenay road could be completed and its trains run right into the city of Quebec, if running rights were secured over the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix railway. This item should be reduced by at least $2,000,000; the balance of the vote would allow the Quebec and Saguenay road to be completed and fully equipped. I ask the Minister of Finance what reason in the world is there, at this present juncture, when the people all over the country are being bled white in taxes for the war and contributions to the Red Cross, the Blue Cross, the French, and Servian and Belgian Relief Funds, why the people of this country should be saddled with this $6,000,000, when the only one of these three roads which is not completed is the Quebec and Saguenay, and when that could be completed for $2,000,000?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Under the conditions to which my hon. friend has alluded,

why did he ask us last evening to pay out, in addition to this $6,000,000, a couple of million dollars to the gentlemen who had invested in this road in the first instance?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is a different proposition entirely. My argument was this, and as the Finance Minister was not here last night I may as well repeat it. The hon. member for Charlevoix stated last night that the Quebec and Saguenay had sold its bonds partly on the French market and partly on the Canadian market, and that $1,000,000 was absorbed by a group of financiers in Montreal and Quebec, and $4,600,000 by investors in France.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: The $4,600,000 of bonds produced only $3,800,000. The Canadian money has no mortgage whatever; it comes after the French bonds.

Mr. LEMIEUX: French investors subscribed the greater proportion. Now the road has failed.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: No, it hasn't.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The French investors were lured into investing in this enterprise by prospectuses which were circulated broadcast in France, and which contained the name of an ex-colleague of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The French investors were told that the road would extend not merely as far as Murray Bay, or even St. Catherines Bay, but as far as Cape St. Charles on the Labrador coast. The road was represented as being nearly half a transcontinental railway. It was further represented that there would be a surplus of over $300,000 the first year. The prospectus stated that the present Canadian Government was granting the road a mail subsidy of $50,000 per anum—which was untrue. Afterwards, I admit, the promoters modified the prospectus and stated that the mail subsidy would not be $50,000. Later on, too, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier, who was then Postmaster General, withdrew his name from the company. But before he resigned the company had obtained the millions that have been referred to by my hon. friend the Postmaster General tonight. French investors put their good money into this road in good faith, and I say that their claims should be considered if the claims of these other people are to be considered. If, as the Acting Minister of Railways says, the bondholders of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix are to get a hundred cents on the dollar for their bonds, why should not the French bondholders be given the same treatment? Is it because they are on the other side of the ocean?

Surely the fact that they are our allies is no reason why we should treat them as enemies. I am told: But the French bondholders have sold their bonds. Yes, but, as I explained to the House yesterday, they sold their bonds because of the failure of a company to carry out the rosy scheme which was represented to the bond holders as being actual and possible.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: By whom?

Mr. LEMIEUX: And also they were told that they would lose everything if they did not sell their bonds at the price offered them. So much was this felt by them that a vigilance committee was appointed which received the offers which were made. My hon. friend from Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) asked by whom the offers were made to sell the bonds? They were made by the Canadian group. I do not give the names of that group; I do not know them, but I suspect who they are. My hon. friend from Charlevoix knows more who they are, because he belongs to the financial world in Montreal, and I do not. The French bondholders had to sell their bonds at forty cents, thirty cents, twenty-five cents, on the dollar. If you give the Canadians one hundred cents on the dollar for these bonds, the French bondholders should be given that value.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Why does the hon. member say that it is proposed to pay one hundred cents on the dollar for the bonds of the Quebec and Saguenay?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) said that yesterday.

Mr. REID: I did not say so. When the hon. gentleman is through I will explain what I did say.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, let the hon. gentleman explain.

Mr. REID: The statements made by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) in regard to this matter are not in accordance with the facts. I said that, under the arrangement made the judge will take up these several roads with a view to ascertaining what actual money has actually gone into them.

First, let us suppose, he will take up the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix

and will ascertain what has been actually and legitimately expended on that road. In the same way, he will take the Quebec and Saguenay, and also the Lotbinière and Megantic. Then the three amounts will be added together. Assume that $2,500,000, an amount equal to the bonds of the Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix, is found to have been expended on that road. Then, assume that an amount equal to $4,039,000 as a maximum is found to have been expended on the Quebec and Saguenay. In either case the amount may be less. Then, assume that it is shown that $330,000 has been expended on the Lotbinière and Megantic. Now, what is the hon. member asking us to do? He has no objection, he tells us, to a loan of $2,000,000 to the Quebec and Saguenay, in order to complete the road. He knows that there is $4,680,000 of bonds on that railway to-day; the French investors only paid $3,822,000 for those bonds. He knows also that the contractors have a claim for over $1,000,000 on the road. Besides, there is $500,000 to be paid for right of way and other claims. This makes a total of over $6,000,000. Yet the hon. gentleman comes here and tells us that, instead of getting the whole road for $4,039,000, we should loan the company $2,000,000 and come in behind this $6,000,000 which now stands against the road. If I am not representing his position correctly, I hope he will tell me. We say that instead of loaning $2,000,000, leaving to stand against the road $4,680,000, of bonds with interest, it is much better to pay a maximum amount of $4,039,000 and own the road free of incumbrance.

Mr. GRAHAM: But you are not going to get a road.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman's leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated in the House that this road is a necessity.

Mr. GRAHAM: But you are not going to get a road for this money.

Mr. REID: We will get a clear title to the road for $4,039,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Only to what is there.

Mr. REID: We will get a clear title to a road eighty-seven per cent of which has been completed.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. REID: The engineers say that the road has been completed to the extent of eighty-seven per cent.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: There are no rails, no ties.

Mr. REID: The hon. member had the papers before him yesterday. Among them was the report of Mr. Beckwith, an engineer of the Intercolonial, which, I think, stated that there were 470,000 ties. We are not only getting the road in its present condition, but we are getting an equipment with the Quebec, Charlevoix and Montmorency road. The engineer said that eighty-seven per cent of the road is completed. I discussed this matter with the contractor who had this work at the time the work stopped.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many miles of rail have been laid on the Quebec and Saguenay?

Mr. REID: There are 9 miles in operation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At the end of the line.

Mr. REID: Yes. Supposing there were no rails on it at all, the contractor who had the work told me at the time that he was willing to complete that road and put it in operation for $700,000. This contractor received nearly all of the $5,000,000 that have been expended up to date. Therefore, for any member to say that the road is not completed to the extent that it really is completed is most unfair. If we pay $4,039,000 for the Quebec and Saguenay instead of accepting the proposal of the hon. member for Rouville, we will save exactly $4,000,000. The hon. gentleman wants us to loan $2,000,000 behind the $6,000,000 that is now against the road. The hon. member claims that this road is only a tramway. I cannot for the life of me see why the member for Rouville wants to belittle that piece of road from Quebec to St. Joachim. From all the information I have that road is as well built as any part of the Transcontinental. It has 80 pound rails, is double tracked and is equipped with an electric system. There is a good equipment and there are valuable terminals in the city of Quebec. Any hon. member knows that to have the Quebec and Saguenay commence nowhere and end nowhere, not going into the city of Quebec, would be an unreasonable proposition. Furthermore, when it is extended into Quebec we shall be increasing the terminal facilities in connection with the Transcontinental railway. This proposal will be of very material benefit to the city of Quebec, and to that part of the province extending down to Murray Bay. To Murray Bay people

come from one end of the Dominion to the other—yes, from all over the United States. The only way they have been able to get there has been by crossing by ferry from the south shore, or by taking the Richelieu and Ontario steamer. I think that the hon. member is unfair to his native province when he does not help that province as I think he ought to. The hon. gentleman was one of the members of the Government who did their best to have this road proceeded with. He advocated the subsidy; he was in favour of tying the people of this Dominion up to that great enterprise. After taking that attitude, I do not think the people will justify his making a proposal which would involve the expenditure of $6,000,000 instead of $4,000,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend has stated what is true. I advocated the construction of that road; I helped to secure subsidies for it, both provincial and federal. I am still willing, in the interests of the county of Charlevoix, to vote for a substantial amount in order to complete that line. But that does not justify the Government in buying three roads when only one should be aided. That is what I object to. It would be quite easy for me to vote with the Government in favour of this item. It would certainly be welcomed by the members of the Government and probably by the people in the county of Charlevoix; but I care not. I am here to do my duty. The people of Charlevoix would rather see that road completed than be taxed as they will be taxed, in addition to the taxa-
10 p.m. tion that they are carrying now, in order to acquire two other roads which have nothing to do with this one. That is my reason, Mr. Chairman, for supporting the motion made by the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. NICKLE: On an occasion like this I hardly think that I would be warranted in voting for the resolution to strike out this amount without giving some explanation of my vote and my conduct. I think it is singularly unfortunate—I do not want to preach to the committee—that legislation of the important character that has been introduced during the past two or three weeks should be brought down in the dying hours of the session.

I do not know what position other members of the House who occupy the humble position that I do, find themselves in, but I find myself absolutely unable to get a comprehensive grasp of the questions that are brought before me for consideration and determination when they are launched on me as important questions have been during the last two or three weeks. I practically find myself in the same position that I sometimes found myself in when I was a child. If I had a nauseous dose to take, the wisest way was to take it at a gulp, or refuse to take it at all—and to-night I refuse to take the gulp. I am not going to discuss the merits or demerits of the scheme. It is complex; it is ten o'clock in the evening of the last day of the session, and there is much important business yet to be considered. But this I do want to say: in a time when the Empire is at war, when every dollar that Canada can raise is required for the legitimate purposes of the war—and as to this I have been deeply impressed by the speeches that the Minister of Finance has delivered in this House and elsewhere—I cannot bring myself to add anything to the burdens of the people of this country. If these were ordinary times I might not feel so strongly on the question, but being influenced by the judgment of the Minister of Finance—and I have great respect for his judgment—and realizing that a commission is about to be appointed to consider the whole railway problem in Canada, I cannot see my way clear to voting for the continuance of this amount in the Estimates.

Motion (Mr. E. W. Nesbitt) negatived on division: Yeas, 12; nays, 29.

Mr. OLIVER: May I be privileged to explain, on behalf of the mover of the motion (Mr. Nesbitt), that he found it necessary to leave in order to catch his train, and therefore was absent when the vote was taken. He was paired with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. W. H. Bennett).

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before the committee rises I should like to give some information in reply to a question asked by the hon. member from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) with regard to recruiting in Montreal. This information consists of a report from General Hodgins, the adjutant general, to which is attached a report from Lieut.-Colonel Potter, the acting-director general of the medical services. These reports are somewhat lengthy, and perhaps the committee will agree with the assent of the hon. member for Maisonneuve.

whom I have consulted, that they should be incorporated in Hansard without being read, in order that they may appear in Hansard for the information of the hon. gentleman. The reports are as follows:

Criticism by Mr. Verville, M. P. of the medical examination of recruits at Montreal and elsewhere, Hansard, pages 4219 et seq. 16th May, 1916.

The following reply is submitted herewith to the criticisms marginally noted:

1. Telegram from Brigadier General Wilson, officer commanding military district No. 4 received to-day. "Examination being carried out by Medical Board in accordance with instructions from headquarters. Not more than three hundred discharged in this district in the last six weeks. Certain civilian practitioners in outlying districts have recently been discovered passing men in defiance of definite instructions. Many of these men acknowledged that they had not been even stripped. The cases of rejection are not for minor defects but for hernia, potts' disease of the spine, hip joint disease, flat feet, under age and over age. Rejections for defective eye sight have been in accordance with regulations, and the test has been carried out at a distance of twenty feet only".

2. A full memorandum (attached hereto) prepared by Colonel Potter, the Acting Director General of Medical Services, setting forth the whole system with regard to physical examination of recruits.

3. Recent editoral (attached hereto) from the London Times clearly demonstrating the value and necessity of carrying out a very careful weeding-out process before submitting them to the thorough training for and the hardships of active service in the field.

This matter has received special care not only at headquarters, but in Military District No. 4 (Montreal) as well as in all other military districts, and it is confidently submitted that the criticism is not justified, and that what has been and is being done is in the best interests, both of those desirous of serving efficently and of the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

W. E. Hodgins,
Major General
Adjutant-General.

Physical Examination of Recruits.

Particular attention has been paid to the issuing of instructions regarding the physical examination of recruits. The assistant directors of Medical Service of the various military districts have, from time to time, sent out such instructions as appeared necessary to correct any particlar point which appeared not to be receiving sufficient attention.

The regulations for the Canadian Medical Service have been used as a guide. The standards of physical fitness were amended with regard to the condition of the teeth, and such are now practically disregarded, as the Dental Service immediately give any necessary attention. Standards of vision have been slightly modified and are now in accordance withe the standards in use by the British service.

Medical examiners of recruits have, from time to time, made mistakes at the original examination, with the result that, with later medical inspections, it was found that men were unfit, and had to be discharged, as they obviously were not physically fit for the hardships of overseas service.

Very recently, the whole matter of physical fitness of recruits was again given attention and instructions, with more particulars given, prepared. The examination of recruits, to be carried out successfully, requires a special training, and it can be understood how a good general practitioner might overlook points which, from a military standpoint, are considered as impairing efficiency, but which, in civil life, are not considered to be causative of physical unfitness. Men suffering from disabilities which, apparently, do not impair, in their civil occupations, often have disabilities which, when under the hardships of active service, are very likely to render them invalids, and, if such men are sent overseas, they only have to be returned to Canada and perhaps become the subjects for consideration in the matter of pension or other claims.

In the larger centres, as for example—Montreal, the Standing Medical Board carry out the inspections, as far as possible, of recruits, and thus a greater degree of efficiency is obtained. The instructions sent out in Military District No. 4, in which Montreal is situated, show that very careful attention has been given to the matter of the physical fitness of recruits. Reference is made to a second physical examination being carried out at some time subsequent to the primary physical examination when the man is recruited. This, obviously, would not be necessary, unless there were good reasons for such action being taken, and, with the large numbers of men enlisted, there is bound to be a weeding-out process at some stage before they proceed overseas. It is obviously much more economical and in the interests of the public to discharge a man found medically unfit than to carry him overseas and have him return as an invalid at considerable expense to the public.

Medical examiners of recruits are widely scattered throughout Canada, and many of them, prior to the outbreak of the war, had but little experience in this particular line of work, and it is hardly to be expected that a certain number of mistakes will not be made.

In the case of any man physically unfit for overseas, he may be utilized on home service in Canada, provided his disability does not impair his efficiency for the duty on which he is to be employed and it is certified that his disability is not likely to suffer from such employment. In each case, a decision will have to be made upon the merits of the case. Once the standard of physical fitness is lowered from that required in the cases of men sent overseas, it becomes an extremely difficult matter to lay down general rules.

I may say that this matter is receiving special consideration with a view to giving the men who are unfit for overseas service every opportunity to replace those who are physically fit for duty in Canada, in order that the men may have an opportunity to serve overseas.

Following your instructions, I rang up Lt.-Colonel Patch, the Assistant Director of Medical Services, Military District No. 4, and asked if he had anything special to report as distinguishing the Montreal situation from that in other parts of Canada. He reported that every care is being taken to avoid the sending of men, medically unfit, overseas, and that, before troops are sent to camps, or otherwise, either as whole units or as drafts, a very careful medical inspection is carried out. Recently, the number was large, and he considered that

this was probably due to the regular medical inspections of the men not being carried out as strictly as should be expected.

Inquiry was made as to the nature of the disabilities for which discharge was carried out. He informed that, in every case, the disability which rendered the man physically unfit was a serious one, and that they were not being discharged for minor disabilities. Disabilities which tend to materially impair the efficiency of a man as a soldier were given special attention.

In the cases of all men discharged in Military District No. 4, they appear before a Medical Board. It would appear that whatever action is being taken by the medical officers is with the best interests of the service in view.

J. J. POTTER, Colonel,
A.D.G.M.S.

Editorial from the London Times.

Medical Tests for Recruits.

We fear that there are still very serious defects in the method of medical examination for recruits, similar to those on which we remarked when Lord Derby's scheme was begun. The problem is two-sided. On the one hand there are men who are determined to join the Army, and do everything on their own account to "dodge" the doctor. A less praiseworthy influence is also at work, in that certain people are anxious at this moment to get on paper as many voluntary recruits as they can, irrespective of their quality. Whatever the motive, the results of admitting men who are physically unfit are certain to be lamentable. Modern warfare is all against the weak in body, however great may be their soul. The test of the trenches—with their wet or frost; their constant strain on the nerves; their demand for the unceasing and infinitely laborious labour of the spade—all this is almost sure to detect latent weakness. Then the man who has gone in under the false pretence of physical efficiency is apt to let his comrades down. This may seem a brutal way of putting it, but it is the truth. There is, too, the cost of medical attendance for men who break down in this way, not to speak of the dangers that may arise from the discovery that an unduly large percentage of unfit men is being brought into the Army by the new recruiting methods. Far less should those who are responsible for the admission of recruits allow any other motive than zeal in preventing the recruiting of unfit men to govern their supervision of the tests applied.

Progress reported.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TRANSFER OF MR. HORTON TO SENATE STAFF.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to recommend, upon the request of the Senate, the transfer, under the provisions of the Civil Service Amendment Act, of Mr. Albert Horton, editor of Debates of the House of Commons, to the staff of the Senate, where he has been appointed to a similar position; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this House doth concur in their request.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved that the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker with reference to the transfer of Mr. Albert Horton, editor of Debates of the House of Commons, to the staff of the Senate be approved; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it promotion?

Mr. SPEAKER: No, there is no promotion.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can we afford to lose him? He is a good man. Should we allow the Senate to steal one of our best officials if they are not giving him any more money?

Mr. ROGERS: How can we prevent them? They are the bosses.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure of that. They are the bosses of everything but the cash.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Really I am not very familiar with the matter. It was mentioned to me for the first time by the Clerk this evening.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does he want to go?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I understand that the Senate desires to obtain his services, and Mr. Horton is quite willing to go.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is not the first man who has been willing to go from this House to the Senate, and I suppose he will not be the last.

Motion agreed to.

PROHIBITION OR RESTRICTION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS.

On the Order for the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 66, in aid of provincial legislation, prohibiting or restricting the sale or use of intoxicating liquors.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I desire to say that it is only after a great deal of hesitation indeed that I have decided—I would rather say to submit to than to accept all of the amendments which have been made by the Senate to this Bill. The amendments consist in striking out the penalty of suspension of a license proposed to be imposed upon manufacturers violating this law for the first and second offences, leaving the penalty of forfeiture for the third offence to stand. It is not in that regard that I have my greatest hesitation in

accepting the amendments. There has been struck out of the Bill clause 5. That is a provision which enabled prosecutions for violations of this Act to be instituted as well at the place to which the liquor had been sent as at the place whence it had been sent. The striking out of this provision, I think, will very materially and in a most serious manner prejudice the effective enforcement of the Act. I feel this so strongly that, were it not that I have good reason to believe that if this House refused to concur in the amendments and sent the Bill back, we might run the risk of losing the measure entirely, I would not make the motion which I am about to make. I may say that in making the motion to concur in these amendments I do it with the hope of having an early opportunity, of which I shall be glad to avail myself, of submitting again to this House for its adoption and for transmission to the other House, the disposition which that House has seen proper to strike out of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and amendments read the second time.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolutions concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE SUPPLY BILL.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair:

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ended 31st March, 1916, the sum of $4,485,537.26 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1917, the sum of $115,077,465.72 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

THE SUPPLY BILL.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 104, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1916, and the 31st March, 1917.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I would like to call the attention of the House to Order No. 26, Public Bills and Orders, Bill No. 21, to amend the Canada Shipping Act, which was introduced by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair). This Bill at my suggestion was referred to the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries. After hearing the evidence and statements from officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department and others interested in marine matters, that committee made a report recommending the Bill to the favourable consideration of the House. I may say that the Department of Marine and Fisheries agrees with the report of that committee, and under those circumstances I beg to move that public Bills and Orders be now taken up in order that Bill No. 21 may be referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on Bill No. 21—Mr. Sinclair—to amend the Canada Shipping Act, Mr. Rhodes in the Chair.

On section 1—definition of coasting voyages extended:

Mr. HAZEN: There are some amendments.

Mr. GRAHAM: What are they?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments are verbal.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The meaning is not changed in the slightest degree. The wording was a little involved owing to the fact that the old statute was followed, and the law clerk advised that these changes should be made in order to make it clearer.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ROGERS: This practically cleans the Order Paper. When the House met at two o'clock the right hon. leader of the Opposi-

tion mentioned the question about the Public Printing. We promised that the subject would be discussed before adjournment to-night. We have yet for discussion this matter of printing, and the question of pensions; and I am sure that the hon. members of the House would not like to separate without having a few parting words from our friends from the Maritime Provinces about fish. We meet at two o'clock to-morrow, and prorogation has been arranged for four-thirty o'clock. If we can discuss the three questions between two o'clock and four-thirty we could now adjourn.

Mr. GRAHAM: If we postpone the discussion until two o'clock we will have to get through by four-thirty, so it has its bright side. If we start now we do not know when we will get through. The leader of the Opposition is interested in the printing question, and he is not here to-night. I imagine that the discussion of pensions will not take long, as there is to be no legislation.

Mr. ROGERS: We might have as the order of the discussion pensions first, then printing, and then fish.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, the House adjourned at 11.10 o'clock p.m.

Thursday, May 18, 1916.

The House met at Two o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

EXTENSION OF TERM OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I sent a telegram, through His Royal Highness the Governor General, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in regard to the position of the Bill to extend the life of this Parliament one year. The telegram was sent two days ago, but I have not yet received a reply. However, I have a memorandum from the law clerk of the House of Commons, who states that he has just received a copy of the Bill, and that it was introduced into the Imperial House of Commons by the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 3rd day of May.

AGRICULTURAL LABOUR.

SOLDIERS FOR SEEDING AND PLOUGHING.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have a memorandum from the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence showing, for each military district, the number of members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force on leave of absence for seeding and ploughing. The total number of those so reported to be on leave of absence is 18,506. The details are as follows:

Number of Members of the C.E.F. on Leave of Absence for Seeding and Ploughing.

Military District.	Number.	Date of reports.
No. 1..	1,975	13-5-16
No. 2..	3,500	12-5-16
No. 3..	396	13-5-16
No. 4..	27	13-5-16
No. 5..	3	13-5-16
No. 6..	2,285	16-5-16
No. 10	5,445	13-5-16
No. 11	375	15-5-16
No. 13	4,500	12-5-16
Total..	18,506	

CANADIAN ARMY DENTAL CORPS.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I had a memorandum handed to me at my request by the Director General of the Dental Service of the Canadian Expeditionary Force which I thought would be of some interest to the members of the House. I believe that Canada is the second nation in the world which has adopted the proposal to establish such a service. According to this report, Germany first established such an organization in connection with her army and Canada was the first to follow in that regard. The memorandum is as follows:

Report on Canadian Army Dental Corps.

Organized less than a year ago, without precedent to guide its footsteps, and with a total at that time of 57, this organization has now grown to practically one thousand all told. So great and various are its ramifications today that, in that short time the need for its existence has been amply demonstrated. Its clinics and laboratories extend all the way from Vancouver Island on the West, all over the Dominion of Canada to Bermuda across the seas to Cairo and Alexandria in Egypt, to Salonika in Greece over France and Belgium wherever Canadian troops are to be found and also in England wherever Canadian troops are stationed.

Its officers and men are found not only with the various regiments but hospitals, field ambulances, ammunition columns, C.A.S.C., and all other units, are provided for as fast as men can be despatched and accommodated for these various units.

To provide men, equipment, supplies and administrative operation for a field geographically as large as the one over which our services extend, and at the same time perform nearly one half million operations of a dental nature, is a task of which any corps might be proud.

The number of operations performed may or may not be an index to the value of services rendered, but the supreme test is efficiency; and to be able to say without fear of contradiction that the efficiency of a man or a battalion is

greater as a result of these services is what is demanded. Tried by this exacting standard, what do we find? We find that over 50,000 men now doing splendid service for their country and Empire owe their presence there to-day to the services rendered by the Canadian Army Dental Corps.

In addition to this there is the huge task of keeping fit, dentally, men who are already in the service and are constantly needing attention. Over 10 per cent of an army are unfit for active service all the time owing to dental troubles, and the economic loss thus entailed in an army of only 100,000 men is tremendous, for here you would have an army of 10,000 out of action all the time on account of these very troubles.

A service that can reduce this to the irreducible minimum and keep these men in the trenches with the least possible loss in time and expense, consistent with efficiciency is doing a very real service.

Experience is teaching us that the nearer we can place our operators to the front with the greater despatch can we carry out all ordinary operations, thus saving many days loss which is occasioned by not allowing our officers up close to the firing line. They can in many cases be accomplished with two days' loss what under the present method entails from ten days to two weeks absence of the soldier from his post. This is a very vital matter for it is most important that a highly trained man whose services are valuable, shall be kept in service with the least possible loss of time.

Nothing so soon unfits a man for service as tooth troubles and nothing is more sensitive to trench life if trouble exist, than the teeth; and as a consequence the morale of troops is barometrically high or low in proportion to the state of their teeth.

Under a new establishment the C.A.D.C. will now have the services of a purely scientific dental officer whose whole time will be devoted to scientific research work which our experience has convinced us is necessary.

That part of the service whose duty it is and will be for years to come, to care for, and make fit dentally the soldiers of the casualty branch has an important service to perform.

Here, highly skilled and efficient dental surgeons of experience are needed, and more inducement in the way of rank is needed that the service become sufficiently attractive to this type of practitioner. We are doing the best we can at present, but are not able to do the service we would like as we lack the experienced men.

The Canadian Army Dental Corps has many shortcomings and has made mistakes; but who hasn't in this war?

The Germans in this as in other matters saw the necessity and prudence of organizing and equipping every unit of energy making for efficiency and not least on their list is their army dental corps.

We are not the first in the field, but are a close second and will we hope at the close of the war demonstrate our right to the first position from an humanitarian point of view.

(Sgd.) N. B. Clayton, Major,
Director General Dental Services.

MEREDITH-DUFF AND DAVIDSON COMMISSIONS.

PRINTED COPIES OF EVIDENCE.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), during my absence the other day, referred to the desirability of having a greater number of copies of the evidence taken before the Royal Commission known as the Meredith-Duff Commission. The matter stands in this way: It was suggested that it would be more convenient, and very little more expensive, to have copies of the evidence printed rather than to have a large number typewritten. That was arranged and, I think, 100 copies have been printed daily up to the present time. I have a memorandum from the King's Printer who states that there is no order of the House for the printing of the report, but the King's Printer, on his own responsibility, gave orders to strike off a few additional copies so as to supply the leaders in both Houses. However, the matter is in type and it is being held awaiting action. I would think it proper that, without any definite order from Parliament, a sufficient number might be struck off to enable all the members of the Senate and House of Commons to be supplied with copies. If that is the desire of the hon. members, and if there is no objection to it, an arrangement will be made accordingly. I shall inquire whether or not it would be possible to supply copies of the evidence already taken. As the type is standing perhaps it might be done.

[Sir Robert Borden.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Knowing what that means, there will not be much difficulty in doing that if the type is standing. I would like to ask if the same course will be followed in connection with the evidence taken by the Davidson Commission.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: As far as I am aware, the evidence has not been printed in that case. However, I shall make inquiry, and if it is being printed so that it can be distributed, there would be no objection to that.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the evidence has not been printed heretofore, I would suggest the advisability of having it printed now, and sending it out with the copies of the other.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I will consult with my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and give my hon. friend's suggestion consideration.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APPOINTMENT OF EDITOR OF DEBATES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have directed the

Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table his report and my recommendation in the matter of the promotion of Mr. T. P. Owens to the position of Editor of Debates and chief of the reporting branch of the House, and in the matter of the confirmation of the title of Mr. W. H. Dickson as "Chief Reporter of the Committees of the House." The recommendation of the clerk of the House is as follows:

Ottawa, May 18, 1916.

The Hon.,
The Speaker of the House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Sir,

The transfer of Mr. Albert Horton to the Senate Debates Staff creates a vacancy in the position of Editor and Chief of Reporting Branch of the House of Commons.

I beg to report that Mr. T. P. Owens, Associate Editor, is the proper person to be promoted to the position of Editor of Debates and Chief of Reporting Branch of the House of Commons.

I also beg to report that Mr. W. H. Dickson, who has been acting as Chief Reporter of the Committees of the House with the approval of the Speaker since 1906, should have the said title officially confirmed.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) THOS. B. FLINT,
Clerk of the House of Commons.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons with reference to the promotion of Mr. T. P. Owens as Editor of Debates and Chief of the Reporting Branch of the House, and the official title of Mr. W. H. Dickson as Chief Reporter of the Committees of the House be confirmed.

He said: The memorandum placed in my hands informs me that the promotion referred to in this motion, and in the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, and the confirmation of Mr. Dickson's title, involves no change in grading and no expenditure or charge of any kind. The proposal is merely the confirmation of a change and of a title.

Mr. MARCIL: I have no objection to either of their appointments. I have had the pleasure of knowing these gentlemen for a great many years, and I know they are very competent for the positions. But I would just like to say that in this arrangement the Debates Committee seems to have been overlooked entirely. The organization of the branch took place on the recommendation of the Debates Committee. I do not desire to precipitate a debate or to prolong the session, for the purpose of having a meeting of the Debates Committee, but I think that when we have a Debates Committee, when appointments of this kind are to be made, its existence should not be overlooked.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I was not aware as to the origin of the proposal. As I understand my hon. friend, the proposition did originate with the Debates Committee.

Mr. MARCIL: Yes, the organization originated on the recommendation of the Debates Committee. I am merely calling attention to it, because this committee does exist for some purpose or it does not. If it exists for any purpose, it might be well hereafter that it should be asked formally to agree to these matters.

Motion agreed to.

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved:

That the Report of the Special Committee appointed on the 14th day of March last, to consider and report upon the rates of pensions authorized, the establishment of a Pension Board and other matters relating thereto, presented to the House on the 10th day of May last, be received and that the rates of pensions, and the methods of procedure and administration therein recommended be commended to the consideration of the Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a good deal of doubt myself, with all deference, as to whether the House has the power to adopt the report, because it is committing Parliament and the Government to a very large expenditure of money. I would think that the report might be received and perhaps some mild expression of opinion given to the House. The proper way, it seems to me, would be for the Government to bring the matter before the House on the recommendation of His Royal Highness the Governor General.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The provisions of the British North America Act and the rules of the House which bear on this question are, of course, very well known. I mentioned to some members of the committee when it was first organized that there might be difficulty in reporting to the House proposals to increase the scale of pensions. I have not been able to give much personal attention to the question, but it has been referred to the Law Clerk. My own idea with regard to it was that, in order to comply with the British North America Act, perhaps the best course would be merely to commend the proposals to the consideration of the Government. However,

a somewhat different form has been followed, and possibly it would not be objectionable. All difficulty would be removed, however, if we amended the motion to read, after the formal part, "that the rates of pensions and the methods of procedure and administration therein recommended be commended to the consideration of the Government."

Mr. PUGSLEY: Rates of pension?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It might be better perhaps to use the expression I had in mind in the first instance as one that would not be objectionable. It is desirable that we should do nothing in the House that would have the semblance of contravening any provision of the British North America Act. If the motion were passed in the form I have suggested, the objection of my hon friend and other possible objections of a like character would be met, and the motion would be equally effective so far as future action by the Government is concerned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I approve of my right hon. friend's suggestion. I think it is desirable that we should always observe very carefully the regulations of the British North America Act. If the change suggested by my right hon. friend is made, the same result would be attained.

Mr. HAZEN: I beg to move that the motion be altered to read: "Be commended to the consideration of the Government." Before the motion is carried, I think it is only proper that I should say a few words in regard to the report; and, as several matters of importance have to be considered within the short time remaining before prorogation, my remarks will be somewhat shorter than might otherwise have been desirable. The committee, which reported on the 10th instant, consisted of nine members representing both sides of the House, and the report which has been submitted to the House was signed by every member of that committee. The committee had the advantage of hearing the views of several gentlemen who were interested in this question—gentlemen connected with the Militia Department, representatives of some of the labour associations in the country, gentlemen who have given special attention to matters of this kind, medical men, and gentlemen interested in vocational training; and, while the information obtained from these gentlemen was of great value, and while many of them went to a great deal of trouble in getting valuable information placed before the committee, I think I may be pardoned for saying that the committee were very much indebted to a gentleman from the city of Toronto, Mr. Frank Darling, for the information he gave us and for the active and intelligent interest he took in this question.

Passing briefly over the recommendations made, I may say that the committee dealt solely with the question of pensions for soldiers who have enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces. The report does not deal in any way with the question of pensions for the ordinary active militia or the permanent force in this country, but only for those who have enlisted for active service since the breaking out of the great European war. The committee were of opinion that the administration of the pensions should be entrusted to a commission consisting of three members. The language of the report in that regard is as follows:

> That three persons, to be known as the Board of Pension Commissioners, hereinafter called the commission, be appointed to hold office, during good behaviour, for ten years unless removed for cause, and to this commission be entrusted the consideration, determination and administration of all military and naval pensions.

The object which every member of the committee had in view was the establishment of a board that would be entirely removed from all considerations of a political character, and with that object in view they have provided that there shall be no appeal from the decision of the Board of Pension Commissioners, either to the Government or to anyone else. The only appeal that will be allowed is that of a soldier who is dissatisfied with the pension that has been awarded him in due course, on the documentary and other evidence that is produced in support of his claim, and that appeal will be heard by the full Pension Board; but from the decision of that board there shall be no appeal whatever. It is desired that there shall be a finality with regard to the board's decisions, and that no impression shall be allowed to get abroad in the country that a man's claim to a pension can be influenced in the slightest degree by pull or influence of any kind. Every claim will be considered absolutely on its merits, and no one will have any influence whatever in the matter except the Board of Commissioners, who will adjudicate upon the claim. The language used in the report with regard to this Pension Board and the duration of

its term is the same as that used in regard to the appointment of the Railway Commission. They will "hold office, during good behaviour, for ten years, unless removed for cause," and to this commission will be entrusted the consideration, determination and administration of all military and naval pensions.

Mr. GRAHAM: I understood my hon. friend to say that this scale of pensions will apply only to those who have gone overseas and are at the front.

Mr. HAZEN: No. These rates will apply to all those who have enlisted in the Expeditionary Forces for active service. If a man, immediately after enlisting, goes to a camp and meets with an accident there that costs him his life, or disables him while in the discharge of his military duties, he or his family will be entitled to the pensions provided for here, just as much as if he had been injured overseas in the face of the enemy.

Mr. MORPHY: What does my hon. friend mean by the word "camp?"

Mr. HAZEN: I use the word in a general sense. These rates would apply to a man who had been injured while training, at Valcartier camp, for instance, or at any other military camp.

But perhaps I should make the matter a little clearer by saying that any man who, subsequent to enlistment, meets with an accident in the discharge of his duty is entitled to a pension just as much as if the accident he met with was caused overseas on the battlefield in the face of the enemy.

The report goes on to say:

> That the commission have full authority and responsibility to deal with and determine all matters pertaining to pensions, and from their decision there be no appeal; provision, however, should be made for any complainant so desiring to present his case, either personally or by counsel, before the full commission sitting for the purpose of hearing the complaints of those who may have been dissatisfied with awards given in the ordinary course of administration.

There is a provision authorizing the commission to engage such clerical and other assistance as may be considered by them requisite for the transaction of their duties, at such salaries as may be approved by the Governor in Council, and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to facilitate administration, such rules and regulations to be submitted for approval to the Governor in Council.

There is a rule that the pension awarded to any member of the force, or any dependent of such member, should not be capable of being assigned, charged, attached, anticipated, or commuted. We are anxious that steps should be taken to ensure that no pension awarded to any soldier shall be used for any other purpose than that for which it was intended.

We had a great deal of discussion with regard to the rates of pensions. We had before us the old scale in force at the time that the war broke out, and we gave every possible consideration to it, having regard to the rates of pensions awarded in other countries, and having regard to the conditions that exist in the Dominion of Canada. The result is that we recommend a very substantial increase in the rates of pensions to those in lower ranks. From private up to lieutenant, we recommend what is a substantial increase in the pensions. From lieutenant on, we do not recommend any increase, with the exception of the rank of captain, where the increase is ten dollars, that increase being given for the purpose of convenience in the department in the working out of the pension scale. The committee were face to face with this condition of affairs, that over 300,000 men had enlisted under a certain pension scale, and, while it was perfectly right and proper and while no complaint could be made in regard to an increase in the pension scale, yet the committee felt that it would not be proper to reduce in any case the pension that had been in force at the time that such enlistment had been made. There was a very general feeling in the committee that in the existing scale there was too great a discrepancy between the pensions granted to those in the higher ranks of the service and those of the rank and file; and, had the Pension Committee been framing the scale in the first instance, my belief is that they would not have given to those who have commissions above the rank of lieutenant as high a rate as was given in the scale that we had before us. The fact, however, that over 300,000 men, of whom a percentage were officers, had enlisted with that scale in force, led us to the conclusion that, while there was no contractual relationship, yet it would be regarded as a hardship and an unfair thing for us to reduce any of the pensions that had been in force at the time that those enlistments had taken place. Therefore we left the pensions from the rank of lieutenant up generally as they were in the old scale. In some of the newspapers the criticism is

made that we are giving too low an amount to officers in the higher ranks. The reason I am giving for that must appeal to the sense of fair play and justice of any man who is familiar with the facts.

With regard to the lower ranks, we found that the old scale of pensions was: For a private, $264 a year; for a sergeant, $336 a year; for a sergeant-major, $372 a year; for a master gunner, $430 a year; for a warrant officer, $480 a year; for a lieutenant, $480 a year; for a captain, $720 a year; for a major, $960 a year; for a lieutenant-colonel, $1,200 a year; for a colonel, $1,440 a year; and for a brigadier-general, $2,100 a year. These are all if unmarried; if married, an addition was made—and I want to compare the old scale for married men with the scale that we recommend. On the scale as it existed on the first of August, 1914, a private, if married, received $396 a year. Under the scale we submit a private receives $480. Under the old scale a sergeant received $504; under our scale he receives $510. Under the old scale, a sergeant-major received $612; under our scale he receives $620. Under the old scale a lieutenant received $702; under our scale he receives $720. We, however, draw no distinction between married and single men. We have not in any sense reduced the amount that is paid to the married soldier; we have increased the amount that is paid to the single soldier, bringing it up to the same rate as is paid to the married soldier. That subject caused a great deal of discusion in the committee; it was viewed and discussed from almost every standpoint, with the result that the committee, with the exception of one member, who had some doubts on the subject, were of the opinion that if a man was single he was entitled to just as large a pension as though he were married, for the reason that in many cases a single man when he came back from the war would marry, and there was no reason why he should not receive the same allowance as a man who was married at the time the war commenced. Further than that, there was a good deal of discussion as to the case of a man who had to be taken care of, and it was generally felt that a man who had a wife was likely to be better cared for than a man who was single, and that the single man would be put to extra expense to have himself cared for. We made the condition that in the case of total disability, that is, in the case of a man totally unable to help himself, he could be allowed, in the discretion of the Pensions Board, an extra sum of $250. That applied to both married and single men and to all ranks up to and including the rank of lieutenant. We felt that the amount of pension allowed to those above the rank of lieutenant was sufficient to enable them to get the necessary attendance without the extra amount of $250.

The committee further decided to recommend that those entitled to be awarded pensions should be divided into six classes, and that to each member of such class there should be awarded a pension in the direct proportion of his disability to total disability. The man who is totally disabled receives $480 a year, and if he is totally helpless, so far as attendance on his physical wants is concerned, the board may make, subject to annual review, a further grant not exceeding $250 a year.

Total disability is regarded at 100 per cent. Of total disability, the matter will have to be worked out by the Pensions Board; the only examples would be these: loss of both eyes; loss of both hands, or all fingers and thumbs; incurable tuberculosis; loss of both legs at or above knee joint; insanity; permanent extreme leakage of valves of heart. Class 2 would be disability of 80 per cent and less than 100 per cent, and the pension would be 80 per cent of that for total disability. The examples in class 2 are loss of one hand and one foot, loss of both feet, dislocation of leg at hip; and so on with class 3, class 4, class 5, and class 6. Class 6 is where the disability is under 20 per cent, a gratuity not exceeding $100 being given. An example of that would be where a man gets deafness in one ear or loses his index or other finger. In that case there would be a gratuity of $100, but no pension.

Then we provide for pensions for children. "A disabled member of such force, up to and including the rank of lieutenant, entitled to a pension in the 1st, 2nd or 3rd class, in addition to his personal pension, shall be entitled to draw $6 a month for each child; of the rank of captain, $7 a month for each child; of the rank of major, $8 a month for each child; of the rank of lieutenant colonel, colonel, or brigadier general, $10 a month for each child, a child to include a step-child in respect of which such member was in loco parentis"—in the place of a parent, whether his own child or not.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the provision that we make in regard to the widow. We provide that if a member

of such force has been killed or has died as the result of injuries received or disease contracted or aggravated while on active service, the widow until remarriage is entitled to the equivalent of the pension mentioned in class 2, and is also entitled to draw the allowance recommended for children. Upon her re-marriage her personal pension ceases, but she is entitled to draw a gratuity of an amount equal to one year's pension. If a man who is a widower dies on active service as the result of injuries and leaves a child or children, the orphan children are entitled to receive $12 a month each.

Then, there is this very important provision: in the even of application being made for a pension on behalf of a woman who has, without being married to a member of such force, lived with him as his wife, or on behalf of the child or children of any such man or woman, the commission is authorized to grant the customary pension for a wife or for a child or children upon being satisfied that the circumstances were such as to warrant the conclusion "that the woman had at the time of enlistment and for a reasonable time previously thereto been publicly represented as the wife of said member of such force, or if the commission is satisfied that justice would be done by the recognition of such woman, for the purpose of pension, as the wife of such member. On the marriage of the woman her personal pension ceases, but she is entitled to draw a gratuity of an amount equivalent to one year's pension."

The committee is of opinion that in the case where a man and a woman have been living together as husband and wife without any marriage ceremony having been performed, the woman ought to be placed on the same basis as in the case of actual marriage, and that the children should be provided for in the same way.

It is provided also that "no payment will be made on account of any child, if a boy over the age of sixteen, or if a girl over the age of seventeen, unless owing to mental or physical infirmity the child is incapable of earning a livelihood, in which case the pension may, if in the discretion of the commission it seems best, be continued until the child is twenty-one."

I cannot in the time that is at my disposal go fully through this report, but I wish to call attention to a provision the effect of which is that a widowed mother, step-mother, or grandmother wholly or mainly dependent upon a member of such force who is killed or dies as the result of injuries received, or disease contracted, or aggravated while on active service, if such member was without dependent children and unmarried, or a widower, be entitled to a pension of class 3, provided, however, that no such woman be entitled to more than one pension, and that on the marriage of the woman such pension do cease. There is also a provision that a father wholly or mainly dependent upon a son who is a member of such force and who is killed or dies as a result of injuries received, or disease contracted, or aggravated, while on active service will be entitled to a pension under similar circumstances.

In the case of a man who had served at the front, had been wounded, had come back and received his pension and subsequently died, no provision being made for his widow, we make provision for the widow in case of total disability or in case of total disability or in case of pension under the 80 per cent disability clause. In those cases the man would be unable, because of his wounds or infirmities, to make provision for his wife, and the opinion of the committee was that it was only fair that under such circumstances some aid should be given to the wife by the State. But that provision is to be applicable only to the case of a woman who was married to the soldier at the time that he received the wound or injury or contracted the disease which subsequently led to his receiving a pension. If a man returned from the war and married afterwards, the widow would not be entitled to a pension.

Another matter that was urged strongly on the committee, but upon which we did not take any decisive action, was with regard to the question of reservists. There were a considerable number of people in Canada who at the outbreak of war were called to the colours of the countries to which they owed allegiance. Britishers, French, Belgians, Russians, Italians, have been called to the colours of their respective countries. It was urged very strongly on the committee, especially by the member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. H. B. Ames), secretary of the Patriotic Fund, that we should place these men in the same position as men who enlisted in the Canadian overseas expeditionary force; or, rather, that we should pay to these men the difference between the amounts which they would receive from their respective Governments

by way of pension and the amounts they would have received had they enlisted in the Canadian overseas expeditionary force. That would be limited to the case of men who were married and whose families had been living in Canada at the outbreak of war and who after the war returned to Canada for the purpose of settling in the country. With the amount of information before us, however, we did not feel like making a recommendation in this respect at the present time. Some gentlemen who were interested in English pensions appeared before the committee and one of them said that he understood that the British Government was considering that question with a view of determining whether they would not give an increased pension to those who came to join the colours from countries overseas in which larger pensions were provided than are provided by the British Government. We were unable to ascertain what would be done in that regard; besides, we were unable to get accurate information in the time at our disposal as to the number of those who had actually joined the colours of the countries to whom they owed allegiance. We therefore recommended, in section 25 of the report, as follows:

That strong recommendations were made to your committee that the reservists of the Allies who were bona fide residents of Canada at the time they were called to the colours of their respective countries, and who left their dependents with the intention of returning to Canada after the war to make it their home, should be treated on the same basis as those enlisting from Canada in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and that this country should supplement the pension granted respectively by the Allies.

As your committee were unable to get definite information as to the policy of the other Governments, and sufficient information to warrant a sound conclusion being reached, your committee recommend that the commission give the matter of pensions to reservists and their dependents careful consideration and investigation, so as to permit a full report being made to the House at its next session.

The attention of the Canadian Patriotic Fund should be directed to the advisability of its aiding in the meantime the dependents in Canada of such reservists as have become disabled, and whose dependents as a result require assistance.

Your committee are, however, of the opinion that if provision be subsequently made for supplementing pensions given to reservists by their respective Governments, it should apply to men who, at the time of their being called to the colours, had dependents bona fide residing in Canada and who continued in Canada during the war.

And that such supplementary pensions be not continued beyond the time that the dependents of such Reservists actually continue to reside in Canada.

We make the recommendation that the gentlemen who are appointed to administer the pension fund should deal with all applications with the utmost despatch; that in due course legislation should be introduced confirming this report; and that, in the meantime, proceedings be taken forthwith to bring it into operation. That can be done under the provisions of the War Measure Act. The desire of the committee was that, as soon as possible, the new board should be constituted and should proceed with its duties. It will be the duty of the Government, as soon as the session is over, to consider this report and, if it commends itself to the Government, to deal with it under the provisions of the War Measures Act.

We also recommend that our recommendations with regard to the pension scale become operative as from the 4th day of August, 1914, the day on which war was declared. This makes it retroactive as to every man who has enlisted since the 4th day of August, when the war broke out—and an appeal was made for volunteers. The result will be that all members of the forces will be placed on the same footing as regards the pensions they will receive; the men who enlisted in the earlier days of the war will receive the same pensions as those who enlist now.

The changes which we recommend involve a very considerable increase in the amount that the country will have to pay for pensions. Under the scale in force at the present time, it is estimated that for a force of 100,000 men of all ranks in the field for one year the pension list of Canada will amount to $5,481,500. It is estimated that, under the pension laws which we recommend, the total pensions for a similar force in the field for a similar length of time will be $7,184,181 a year. So hon. gentlemen will see that, based on the estimate of a force of 100,000 men in the field for a period of one year, there is an extra cost under the scale we propose of $1,702,681. That statement is based on figures received from the War Office with regard to casualties that have taken place during the present war. The estimate of the War Office for a force of 100,000 men in the field for one year is as follows: Deaths, 15 per cent; total disablement, 3 per cent; partial disablement, 6 per cent; and slight disablement, 9 per cent. The militia

authorities tell us that judging from the experience of the Canadian forces for the past year, the above estimate as to the percentage of deaths, is high.

The increase is a very substantial one, and the amount that this country will have to pay for pensions in the future will be a large annual charge upon the finances of the country. Even although that is the case, the members of the committee, and I am sure the members of the House, and I think everybody in this country, are desirous that justice and fairness and liberality—generosity, in fact—should be extended to the men who, at this crisis in the history of our country, have come forward to fight our battles and are willing, with the red blood that flows in their veins, to sacrifice their lives for that liberty which we all hold so dear.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen). In my experience in this Parliament I have never served on a committee in which every gentleman, on both sides, seemed to be actuated by so sincere a desire to arrive at the best solution of a very important question as were the members of this committee. I regret that the report is necessarily being considered on the last day of the session, and that the recommendations contained in it have not formed the subject of special legislation on the part of the Government. It is true that, under the War Measures Act, power is vested in the Government to deal with this question; but, after all, the provisions of the War Measures Act vest only temporary powers in the Government of the day in order to enable them to deal with situations occasioned by the war. This problem of pensions, while it is one that arises immediately on account of the war, is yet a permanent problem and one which will remain with the Canadian people long after the war will have been successfully concluded.

I assume, however, notwithstanding the fact that we have not legislation of a special character, that in the carrying out of the recommendations of this report during the coming year, the Government will be actuated by the same spirit, in the formation of the Board and all other phases of this question, as they would have been in asking for a parliamentary ratification of this proposal; and that at the next session of Parliament it will be the duty of the Government to present to the House an Act dealing permanently with this question. The figures which the minister has just given indicate the tremendous importance of this question to the Canadian people from a financial standpoint. On the basis of the estimate prepared for us by the officials of the Militia Department, and, assuming the percentage of disabled men to be similar to that contained in the calculation, for the 300,000 men who are already under arms the annual cost to the Canadian people for pensions would be $21,552,543. For 400,000 men, the annual charge to the Canadian people would be $28,736,724. If hon. gentlemen will pause for a moment to estimate what this annual charge would amount to if capitalized, they will realize the tremendous extent of the onerous charge placed on the whole people, and the importance of this matter from a financial standpoint will be recognized.

Alongside of that great question there is, of course, the other equally important consideration, which I am sure actuates every member of this House and every loyal citizen of the Dominion, just as it impressed, in the most serious way, every hon. gentleman composing the committee—that is, the duty which falls upon us, as representatives of the people, to do everything that is possible for the men who bear the burden and go out to make the great sacrifice in this terrible war. Let me state clearly that the idea which may naturally occur, if not to the minds of some hon. members, to others outside of this House, that this country proposes to give a pension to every one who has gone across, is not the idea at the basis of these proposals. Only those who have enlisted in the Canadian overseas expeditionary force and who become disabled, whether they are disabled at home or at any period of the war, become entitled, under these proposals, to any monetary consideration from the Government. The extent to which they do become entitled to such consideration depends entirely upon their disability, and the minister has stated very clearly the different grades under which these pensions are to be paid. We have recommended that the extent of assistance to be given be determined according to the extent of the disability, and the figures which we have published in the report and in the press indicate the maximum amount which a person suffering from any disability is entitled to receive. That amount is graded according to the extent of the disability. As we pass through this war

and the years succeeding it, proposals will no doubt be made from various sources in the direction of the extension of the liability of the country in regard to the pension system. What has occurred in the United States gives an illustration of what may be expected in this country in that particular, and hence it is that I regret that legislation has not been formulated so that a definite policy might be laid down by Parliament. It may be that in the intervening year further light may be had upon this question, so that the legislation, when it is finally brought down, will be the result of perhaps riper judgment and more information than the committee has had before it.

Realizing, to the full, the importance of all these considerations, it was the unanimous judgment of those composing the committee that the members of the board, which has been recommended in this report, ought to be independent men, not mere office holders or office seekers, but men whose position, character and status in the country are such that there will be no question about their absolute independence and integrity, and whose position will be recognized by all classes in the country as being above party. It was felt by the members of the committee representing both sides of the House that the appointment of this board should only be made by the Government after a consultation with the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, in order that the members should not be merely appointees of the Government, but, to a very great extent, the representatives of the Parliament of Canada chosen by the leaders of the two great political parties. The annual expenditure of at least $25,000,000 will constitute this board, once it is organized, one of the most important bodies in the whole Dominion, in so far as the disbursement of funds are concerned. I am sure that what I have said in that respect will, upon reflection, commend itself to every hon. gentlemen in this House.

I am not going into this matter in detail, but there are a couple of considerations to which I would like to refer. One is the point emphasized by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the difference in the scale of pensions paid to the men of the rank and file and the men in the higher ranks. In the short discussion which took place upon the motion, which I had the honour to move on the subject earlier in the session, I pointed out that there was not between the men in the ranks and the men who hold commissions that difference in status, either socially or otherwise, in this country which warranted any very great line of demarcation being drawn between the two classes in the awarding of pensions. In that respect, the conditions in Canada differ from those that exist in the Mother Country and in other countries across the ocean. That view was fully entertained by every hon. member of the committee, but the conclusion at which we arrived, and which has been so well stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, expresses the difficulty which confronted us when we came to deal with the question of final adjustment. The fact that men had gone out, had suffered and died for their country, that their dependents were entitled to feel that they had a vested right in the scale of pensions originally introduced, created a situation in which we felt the great difficulty of interfering with the scale of pensions allowed to the men in the upper ranks of the overseas forces. As a consequence, we have recommended that the scale should be levelled up on the basis described by the minister. We provide not merely for the man who is disabled and who survives the conflict, but, as the minister pointed out, for his widow and his children, and, in addition to that, where a man may not leave a widow or child, we provide for the widowed mother, the step-mother, or the grandmother in the way which is set out in section 21 of the report.

Just one word more in regard to the proposition that the pension aid should be extended to the men of other nationalities who left Canada to fight or to the reservists who belong to Great Britain.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Before my hon. friend proceeds to deal with that, there are one or two questions which I would like to ask for information. I observe that in clause 8 it is provided that after an extension of one year, no pension can be reviewed. Does it not sometimes happen that a disability, which seemed very serious at first, may in the course of two or three years be completely removed, so that the man is restored to health and to his usual strength and energy? I have known instances of that character in accident cases during my own practice in the legal profession. Is it intended to debar any further inquiry in a case of that kind? A board can be held under the law as it is at pre-

sent, for the purpose of establishing the fact that the injury is greater than was supposed, or for the purpose of establishing the fact that the disability has been completely removed.

With regard to single and married men, I would like to know, merely for information, whether or not the committee had under consideration a suggestion that some difference might be made in the first instance, but that if the returned soldier should afterwards marry, he would be placed on the same footing as if he had been married in the first instance. I do not know whether that was under consideration or not.

I do not suppose that the language of these clauses is intended to be construed with the utmost exactness; but it seems to me that clause 17, taken literally, would lead to the conclusion that if a woman had been living a number of years with a member of the Expeditionary Force, though not married to him, she might, in the event of his death, be entitled to a pension, although the conditions might have very greatly changed in the meantime. I suppose that a consideration of that kind is not intended to be excluded by the committee's report.

Mr. MACDONALD: With reference to the first question suggested by the right hon. gentleman, section 8 provides for a review at the end of the first year after the grant had been made in the first instance, and each pension must be applied for, if I recollect rightly, within two years of the date of discharge. But there is no review. There may be in those cases where the disability is obviously permanent, but there can be no further review. If my right hon. friend will look at the clause which is included in what is known as class 1, he will see that where the disabilities consist of the loss of both eyes, both hands, incurable tuberculosis, the loss of both legs, insanity, or permanent extreme leakage of the valves of the heart, you have cases in which the permanent disability is settled and determined, and upon which there is not much room or necessity for further review.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes, but I suppose that these illustrations are not intended to be exhaustive. For example, I have known of cases of very severe injury to the spine in which medical men testified that there could not possibly be any relief, that the man was permanently injured, and would be incapable all his life, but, in the course of two or three years, the anticipations of the physicians were not realized, and the man recovered his strength completely. I had in mind cases of that kind which possibly might occur.

Mr. MACDONALD: All these matters were fully discussed before the committee, and I think that every hon. gentleman composing the committee will agree that I am only stating what is true when I say that the suggestion of my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who gave very careful consideration to all those questions and details, included the matters to which my right hon. friend refers.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I am not criticising at all.

Mr. MACDONALD: I quite understand. My right hon. friend is only inquiring whether these considerations were before the committee and were considered. As a matter of fact, they were. The attention of the committee was exhaustively directed to matters such as have been referred to by my right hon. friend. No doubt my hon. friend from Kingston may have a word or two to say in regard to them, and I will leave to him the task of dealing with the points suggested by my right hon. friend.

A very important question upon which the committee came to no final conclusion was the question of whether we should include in our pension list those men who enlisted in Canada for service in any of the Allied countries or who went as reservists to the British Isles. It was felt by the committee that the inclusion of this class in our pension list at this juncture would not be prudent. Some members of the committee were very strongly of the opinion that provision should be made at once for the inclusion of this class, but it was deemed wise and prudent to take at least a year for deliberation and consideration of the question. I may point out that the estimate which has been given of the extra annual charge which would be involved by the inclusion of that class is $1,000,000, and, in view of this fact, together with the other consideration that it was thought desirable before final action was taken to obtain full information from the other countries interested as to how they deal with pensions in Canada, it was felt that the recommendation made was the best way of solving this question. In conclusion, I may say that every hon. gentleman on the committee worked with the greatest unity, interest and enthusiasm upon this very important question with the view of arriving, if possible, at some scheme

which would enable this country to feel that it was doing its duty towards those who go out and suffer and die on behalf of the issues involved in this great war. We were guided by these feelings and by the desire that Canada should do what is right and proper and generous towards our soldiers.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have just one word to say. I subscribe unreservedly to what has been said by my colleague from Pictou and by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I was a member of the committee, and I am proud to say that there was never a ripple of disagreement between the members composing it. We reached those conclusions after long and friendly deliberations. I am glad that we have provided generously, as I believe, for the disabled soldiers and their families. I hope that the commission to be appointed will be on the lines suggested by all the members of the committee, that it will be a non-partisan commission. I make a special appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to the patriotism of the right hon. the Prime Minister to see that it is of a non-partisan character. I also beg to recommend the Government to take a broad view as regards the reservists, both British and French, and possibly the Belgian reservists too, who answered so nobly to the call of duty when war was declared. I refer to the reservists who had taken up their homes in Canada, and who were Canadian citizens, practically speaking. It seems to me that if the Governments of their respective countries are not as generous, for obvious reasons, as the Canadian Government is towards our own kith and kin, we should not begrudge the little difference that would have to be made up in order to put them on a footing of equality with our own boys. I agree unreservedly with the remarks which have been made by the mover and seconder of the report.

Mr. NICKLE: As a member of the committee which had under consideration the question of pensions, it may not be amiss if I say a word or two. In the first place, I can unreservedly bear testimony to the fact that the whole conduct of the committee was characterized by the fullest sympathy and accord, and that from beginning to end there was not one jarring word or difference. We were confronted at the inception by a difficulty which was found to be insurmountable. The scale of pensions, which came into effect in 1914, made a most radical distinction between pensions granted to men of the lower ranks, and those who held more exalted positions. For some time the committee considered and canvassed the wisdom of bringing in a report dealing de novo with the entire situation. Mature consideration made it clear that it would be eminently unfair, after 300,000 men had enlisted, with a certain scale of pensions in view, to reduce the pensions that were held out to the men of higher rank. The result was that the committee determined to increase the pensions where they were thought to be inadequate and to leave to the higher ranks the pensions that were promised under the scheme of 1914. I understand that there is very little time available this afternoon to consider this subject in detail, and this, I am sure, is a matter of regret. However, if I may be permitted I should like to put on Hansard section 641 and 648 of the Pension Act of 1914 and the report of the committee. They outline what the pension allowance was under the scheme of September 1, 1914."

Scale of Pensions—Pay and Allowance Regulations effective Sept. 1, 1914.

641. The following rates of pension will be granted militiamen wounded or disabled on active service, during drill or training, or on other military duty, provided the disability was not due to his own fault or negligence.

Rank held at time of injury or illness.	First Degree.	Second Degree.	Third Degree.	Fourth Degree.
	$	$	$	$
Rank and file	264	192	132	75
Sergeant	336	252	168	100
Squad, Battery or Co. Sgt.-Major	372	282	186	108
Squad, Battery or Q.M. Sergt.				
Colour Sergeant				
Staff Sergeant				
Regimental Sgt.-Major, not W.O.	432	324	216	132
Master Gunner, not W.O.				
Regimental Q. M. Sergeant				
Warrant Officer	480	360	240	144
Lieutenant	480	360	240	144
Captain	720	540	360	216
Major	960	720	480	288
Lieut.-Colonel	1,200	900	600	360
Colonel	1,440	1,080	720	456
Brig.-General	2,100	1,620	1,050	636

(a) The first degree shall be applicable to those only who are rendered totally incapable of earning a livelihood as the result of wounds or injuries received or illness contracted in action, or in the presence of the enemy.

(b) The second degree shall be applicable to those who are rendered totally incapable of earning a livelihood as a result of injuries received or illness contracted on active service, during drill or training or on other duty; or are rendered materially incapable as a result of wounds or injuries received or illness contracted, in action or in the presence of the enemy.

(c) The third degree shall be applicable to those who are rendered materially incapable of earning a livelihood, as a result of injuries received or illness contracted on active service, during drill or training, or on other duty; or rendered in a small degree incapable as a result of wounds or injuries received, or illness contracted in action or in the presence of the enemy.

(d) The fourth degree shall be applicable to those who are rendered in a small degree incapable of earning a livelihood as a result of injuries received or illness contracted on active service, during drill or training, or on other duty.

(e) Where the injury is great enough to require the constant services of an attendant, such as the loss of both legs or both arms or the loss of sight of both eyes; or where the use of both legs or both arms has been permanently lost, the rates shown in columns "1st degree" and "2nd degree" may be increased one-third.

(f) In addition to the above rates, a married officer, warrant officer, non-commissioned officer, or man, totally incapacitated may draw for his wife half the rate, provided in Article 642 for the widow and the full rate for the children of an officer, etc., of his rank, subject to the limitations respecting the age of children. After the death of the officer, warrant officer, non-commissioned officer or man, the widow may then draw the full rates provided in Article 642 for widows and children.

(g) The widowed mother of a totally disabled soldier may be granted a pension at half the rates fixed in Article 642 for a widow, provided the soldier is her sole support and unmarried. In the event of the soldier's decease, she may draw the full rate referred to.

642. Pensions may be paid to the widows and children of those who have been killed in action, or who have died from injuries received, or illness contracted on Active Service, during drill or training, or on other military duty, at the following rates; provided the soldier's death was not due to his own fault or negligence, and was clearly due to the carrying out of his military duties:

Rank held by Husband, Son or Father at time of death.

Rank and file, $22 a month for widow and $5 a month for each child.

Sergeant, $28 a month for widow and $5 a month for each child.

Squad., Battery, or Company Sergeant-Major; Squad. Battery, or Q.M. Sergeant, $30 a month for widow and $5 a month for each child.

Colour Sergeant or Staff Sergeant, $30 a month for widow $5 a month for each child.

Regimental Sergeant-Major, not W.O.; Master Gunner, not W.O.; or Regimental Quartermaster Sergeant, $30 a month for widow and $5 a month for each child.

Warrant Officer, $32 a month for widow and $5 a month for each child.

Lieutenant, $37 a month for widow and $6 a month for each child.

Captain, $45 a month for widow and $7 a month for each child.

Major, $50 a month for widow and $8 a month for each child.

Lieut.-Colonel, $60 a month for widow and $10 a month for each child.

Colonel, $75 a month for widow and $10 a month for each child.

Brig.-General, $100 a month for widow and $10 a month for each child.

(a) A widowed mother whose son was her sole support, and unmarried, shall be eligible for a pension as a widow without children, and subject to the same conditions as hereinafter set forth.

(b) In the case of orphans, the rates shown above for children may be doubled, and the pension paid to legally appointed guardians.

643. Pensions to widows and children shall take effect from the day following that on which the death of the husband, etc., occurred, and a gratuity equivalent to two months' pension shall be paid the first month, in addition to the pension.

644. The pension of a widow, a widowed mother, or child may be withheld or discontinued should such widow, etc., be or subse-

quently prove, unworthy of it, or should she be or become wealthy.

The decision of the minister as to whether a pension should be so withheld or discontinued shall be final.

645. The pension to a widow or widowed mother shall cease upon her re-marriage, but she will be eligible for a gratuity of two years' pension payable to her immediately after her marriage.

646. Neither gratuity nor pension shall be paid on account of a child (or orphan) over fifteen years of age, if a boy, or over seventeen years of age, if a girl, unless owing to mental or physical infirmity, the child (or orphan) is incapable of earning a livelihood, in which case the pension may be continued till the child (or orphan) is twenty-one years of age, but no pension will be paid to a child or orphan after marriage.

647. Individual cases for which the Regulations do not provide or sufficiently provide, may be specially considered by the Governor in Council.

648. Pensions may be paid monthly in advance.

The report of the committee reads as follows:

The special committee, appointed to consider and report upon the rates of pensions to be paid disabled soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and the establishment of a Permanent Pension Board and any other matters relating thereto or connected therewith, have carefully considered the questions submitted to them, and beg to submit the following as their third report:

(1) Your committee, appreciating the probable short duration of the present session of Parliament, and the difficulties that might be encountered and not adequately met if the entire pension system of Canada were reviewed, have limited their inquiries and recommendations to pensions and assistance for the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in the great war which began in August, 1914, and to the system of pension administration likely to secure the most equitable and satisfactory results.

(2) That all pensions, expenses for appliances—such as artificial limbs—and for vocational training, or other advantages awarded to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or their dependents, be paid by the Government of the Dominion from the national funds.

(3) That three persons, to be known as the Board of Pension Commissioners hereinafter called the Commission, be appointed to hold office, during good behaviour, for ten years unless removed for cause, and to this commission be entrusted the consideration, determination and administration of all military and naval pensions.

(4) That the Commission have full authority and responsibility to deal with and determine all matters pertaining to pensions, and from their decision there be no appeal; provision, however, should be made for any complainant so desiring to present his case, either personally or by counsel before the full commission sitting for the purpose of hearing the complaints of those who may have been dissatisfied with awards given in the ordinary course of administration.

(5) That the Commission have authority to engage such clerical and other assistance as may be considered by them requisite for the transaction of their duties, at such salaries as may be approved by the Governor in Council, and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to facilitate administration; such rules and regulations to be submitted for approval to the Governor in Council.

(6) That the pension awarded any member of such force, or any dependent of such member, should not be capable of being assigned, charged, attached, anticipated or commuted.

(7) That all pensions awarded to members of such force be determined by the disability of the applicant without reference to his occupation prior to enlistment.

(8) That each case be subject to review at the end of the year from the time the pension is first granted, except in those cases where the disability is obviously permanent, and then there be no further review.

(9) That, to encourage industry and adaptability, no deduction be made from the amount awarded to such pensioner owing to his having undertaken work or perfected himself in some form of industry. The welfare of the State demands that so far as possible those who are at all able should endeavour to augment their pension allowance. If the pension granted were subject to reduction owing to the recipient having remunerative work, your committee are of the opinion that a premium would be put on shiftlessness and indifference. That provision be made by the Commission for vocational training for those who are desirous of taking advantage of it, and for the supplying of artificial limbs and appliances, from time to time, to those who would thereby be benefited. This subject is within the province of the Military Hospital Commission, and is now receiving attention.

(10) That provision be made by the Commission for entrusting to a reputable person for administration, the allowance to any pensioner or to any dependent when the Commission is satisfied that it is being improvidently expended by the ordinary recipient, the expense of such administration, if any, to be borne by the Commission.

(11) That a member of such force, on account of disability incurred on active service or aggravated thereby, be pensionable at the following rates for total disability:

	Yearly.
Rank and file	$ 480
Squad Battery or Company Sgt.-Major Squad, Battery or Company Q.M. Sergeant Colour Sergeant Staff Sergeant Regimental Sgt.-Major not W.O. Master Gunner not W.O. Regimental Q.M. Sergeant	510 620
Warrant Officer	680
Lieutenant	720
Captain	1,000
Major	1,260
Lieutenant-Colonel	1,560
Colonel	1,890
Brigadier-General	2,700

(12) That those who are entitled to be awarded pensions be divided into six classes, and to each member of each class be awarded a pension in the direct proportion of his disability to total disability, as follows:

Class 1.—Total disability, 100 per cent.
For example—
Loss of both eyes.
Loss of both hands, or all fingers and thumbs.
Incurable tuberculosis.
Loss of both legs, at or above knee joint.
Insanity.
Permanent extreme leakage of valves of heart.

Class 2.—Disability 80 per cent and less than 100 per cent—pension 80 per cent of Class 1.
For example—
Loss of one hand and one foot.
Loss of both feet.
Disarticulation of leg at hip.

Class 3.—Disability 60 per cent and less than 80 per cent—pension 60 per cent of Class 1.
For example—
Loss of one hand.
Loss of leg, at or above knee.
Loss of tongue.
Loss of nose.

Class 4.—Disability 40 per cent and less than 60 per cent—pension 40 per cent of Class 1.
For example—
Loss of one eye.
Loss of one foot.
Total deafness.
Loss of two thumbs.

Class 5.—Disability 20 per cent and less than 40 per cent—pension 20 per cent of Class 1.
For example—
Loss of one thumb.
Anchylosis of elbow, knee, shoulder, wrist or ankle.

Class 6.—Disability under 20 per cent, a gratuity not exceeding $100.
For example—
Total deafness in one ear.
Partial deafness in both.
Loss of index or other finger.

(13) That, to those, up to and including the rank of Lieutenant, who are totally disabled and in addition are totally helpless so far as attendance to their physical wants is concerned, the Commission may make a further grant subject to annual review of not exceeding $250 a year.

(14) That a disabled member of such force, up to and including the rank of Lieutenant, entitled to a pension in the 1st, 2nd or 3rd class, in addition to his personal pension, be entitled to draw $6 a month for each child; of the rank of Captain, $7 a month for each child; of the rank of Major, $8 a month for each child; of the rank of Lieut.-Colonel, Colonel or Brigadier-General, $10 a month for each child, a child to include a step-child and a child in respect of which such member was in loco parentis.

(15) That, if a member of such force has been killed, or has died as the result of injuries received, or disease contracted or aggravated while on active service, the widow, until re-marriage, be entitled to the equivalent of the pension mentioned in Class 2, and also be entitled to draw the allowance recommended for children; on the re-marriage of the widow her personal pension cease, but that she be entitled then to draw a gratuity of an amount equivalent to one year's pension.

(16) That, if a member of such force who has been killed, or has died, as the result of injuries received, or disease contracted or aggravated while on active service, was a widower, but leaves a child or children, as defined by this report, said child or children receive $12 per month each.

(17) That, in the event of an application being made for a pension on behalf of a woman who has, without being married to a member of such force, lived with him as his wife, or on behalf of the child or children of any such man or woman, the commission be authorized to grant the customary pension for a wife or for a child or children, on being satisfied that the circumstances were such as to warrant the conclusion that the woman had at the time of enlistment and for a reasonable time, previously thereto, publicly been represented as the wife of said member of such force, of if the commission is satisfied that justice would be done by the recognition of such woman, for the purpose of pension, as the wife of such member; on the marriage of the woman her personal pension cease, but that she be entitled to draw a gratuity of an amount equivalent to one year's pension.

(18) That no payment be made on account of any child, if a boy over the age of sixteen, or if a girl over the age of seventeen, unless owing to mental or physical infirmity the child is incapable of earning a livelihood, in which case the pension may, if in the discretion of the commission it seems best, be continued until the child is twenty-one. That no pension be paid in respect of a child after the marriage of such child.

(19) That no pension be paid, when disability or death was occasioned by the negligence of the member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, to any person claiming, or on whose behalf a pension is claimed, unless the commission otherwise consent.

(20) That in all cases the claims for personal pensions must be made within two years of the date of the appearance of the disability in respect of which the claim is made.

(21) That a widowed mother, step-mother, or grandmother, wholly or mainly dependent upon a member of such force who is killed or dies as the result of injuries received, or disease contracted or aggravated while on active service, if such member was without dependent children and unmarried, or a widower, be entitled to a pension of Class 3, provided, however, that no such woman be entitled to more than one pension; on the marriage of the woman such pension cease, but that she be entitled then to draw a gratuity of an amount equivalent to one year's pension.

(22) That a father, wholly or mainly dependent upon a son who is a member of such force and who is killed or dies as a result of injuries received or disease contracted or aggravated while on active service, if such member was without dependent children and unmarried, or a widower, be entitled to a pension of Class 3.

(23) That if a member of such force to whom a pension has been granted in either Class 1 or in Class 2 dies, leaving a wife to whom he was married at the time of his incurring the disability in respect of which his pension was granted, or a woman occupying at said time the position of a wife within the purview of Clause 17 of this report, or leaving children by such wife or woman, the pension for the class next below that granted the said member be given said wife or woman, and the allowance on behalf of any child or children be continued subject to the restrictions as to age

as provided by Clause 18 of this report; on the marriage of the wife or woman her personal pension cease, but that she be entitled to draw a gratuity equivalent to one year's pension.

(24) That pensions to widows and children take effect from the day following that on which the death of the member of such Force, in respect of which said pension is granted, occurred and that a gratuity equivalent to two months' pension be paid the first month in addition to the pension.

(25) That strong recommendations were made to your committee that the reservists of the Allies who were bona fide residents of Canada at the time they were called to the colours of their respective countries, and who left their dependents with the intention of returning to Canada after the war to make it their home, should be treated on the same basis as those enlisting from Canada in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and that this country should supplement the pension granted respectively by the Allies.

As your committee were unable to get definite information as to the policy of the other Governments, and sufficient information to warrant a sound conclusion being reached, your committee recommended that the Commission give the matter of pensions to reservists and their dependents careful consideration and investigation, so as to permit a full report being made to the House at its next Session.

The attention of the Canadian Patriotic Fund should be directed to the advisability of its aiding in the meantime the dependents in Canada of such reservists as have become disabled, and whose dependents as a result require assistance.

Your committee are, however, of the opinion that if provision be subsequently made for supplementing pensions given to reservists by their respective Governments, it should apply to men who, at the time of their being called to the colours, had dependents bona fide residing in Canada and who continued in Canada during the war. And that such supplementary pensions be not continued beyond the time that the dependents of such reservists actually continue to reside in Canada.

(26) That, in the administration by the Commission, in order to obviate the annoyance and distress incidental to delay, great care be taken to insure all applications being considered and determined with the utmost despatch.

(27) That in due course legislation be introduced confirming this report, but that in the meantime, proceedings be taken to forthwith bring it into effect.

(28) That the provisions of this report relating to the granting of pensions be made effective as and from the date of the declaration of war, August 4, 1914.

Your committee also recommend that this report and the evidence and the statements submitted herewith, together with a suitable index to be prepared by the secretary of the committee, be printed forthwith for distribution, and also printed in the appendix to the Journals of 1916, and that Rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his remarks, directed attention to the fact that the scheme as outlined in the report made no distinctions as between the pensions that were suggested for married men and unmarried men. All the members of the committee, with one exception, agreed that no distinction should be made and I think I might outline the reasons that brought them to this conclusion. The Canadian Expeditionary Force is a purely voluntary army; it is an army of men who came from all over the country, without premeditation and in response to the national call. Some were married at the time of enlistment, some married subsequent to enlistment, and later on a regulation was made that to the wife of a man who married subsequent to enlistment, no separation allowance would be granted unless he obtained the consent of his commanding officer. Some men obtained the consent of their commanding officers and were married. Others abandoned the hope of securing the separation allowance and married without the consent of the commanding officer. Another group of men who had contemplated matrimony and were engaged to Canadian girls, went overseas without marrying, no doubt with the understanding that on their return they would be married. The committee felt that it would be unfair to make any distinction between these various groups and classes and they therefore laid down the rule that they would make no distinction between married and unmarried men, that they would not take from the unmarried man and give to the married man, but that they would give the same pension to the unmarried man as to the married man, so that when the war was over and the men returned, all men, no matter whether they had married before the war broke out or subsequently, or before going to the front or thereafter, would be put on exactly the same plane.

An object of the committee was to increase the pensions in these groups in which the committee were of opinion that inadequate pensions had been granted. Perhaps a comparative statement showing the rate of pensions granted a totally disabled soldier or his widow under the present scheme and under the suggested scheme may not be amiss.

Comparative rates of pensions for totally disabled soldiers; present and suggested schemes:

	Unmarried Soldier		Soldier and Wife.		Soldier Wife and 3 Children.	
	Present.	Suggested.	Present.	Suggested.	Present.	Suggested.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Rank and file	264 00	480 00	396 00	480 00	576 00	696 00
Sergeant	336 00	510 00	504 00	510 00	684 00	726 00
Warrant officer	480 00	680 00	672 00	680 00	852 00	896 00
Lieutenant	480 00	720 00	702 00	720 00	918 00	936 00
Captain	720 00	1,000 00	990 00	1,000 00	1,242 00	1,252 00
Major	960 00	1,260 00	1,260 00	1,260 00	1,548 00	1,548 00
Lieut-Colonel	1,200 00	1,560 00	1,560 00	1,560 00	1,920 00	1,920 00

Comparative rates of pensions for widows of officers and men killed on active service; present and suggested scheme:

	Widow.		Widow and 3 Children.	
	Present.	Suggested.	Present.	Suggested.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Private	264 00	384 00	444 00	600 00
Sergeant	336 00	408 00	516 00	624 00
Warrant officer	384 00	544 00	564 00	760 00
Lieutenant	444 00	576 00	660 00	792 00
Captain	540 00	800 00	792 00	1,052 00
Major	600 00	1,008 00	888 00	1,296 00
Lieut-Colonel	720 00	1,248 00	1,080 00	1,608 00

The committee were of opinion that a pension scheme on that scale made a living reasonably secure for a married man, an unmarried man, or a family man, if the man should return totally disabled. If, perchance, the breadwinner were killed at the front, the pension to the widow was not quite as great as it was to the man who returned totally disabled. Under the present scheme the widow of a private would receive $264, whereas under the suggested scheme, the widow would receive $384. If the widow has, in addition, three children whom she will have to support, under the present scheme, she would get $444 and under the suggested scheme $600. I think that a consideration of these figures would indicate that in so far as the report of the committee goes, Canada is prepared to deal generously with her soldiers. A comparative statement of the pensions that would be received by soldiers, or the widows of officers and men, under the suggested scheme, as compared with that adopted in other parts of the Empire, might also be of interest:

A.—Comparative rates of pensions for totally disabled soldiers, pursuant to report.

Rank.	—	Unmarried Soldier.	Married Soldier and Wife.	Soldier and 3 Children.	Remarks.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Rank and file (i. e. corporals and privates)	Canada	480 00	480 00	696 00	Rates may be increased by $250 if helpless.
	Australia	253 00	380 00	569 00	
	New Zealand	442 86	601 02	790 80	
	British	316 00	316 00	412 00	
Sergeant	Canada	510 00	510 00	726 00	
	Australia	340 00	496 00	701 00	
	New Zealand	442 86	613 67	803 45	
	British	366 00	366 00	462 00	
Warrant officer	Canada	680 00	680 00	896 00	
	Australia	377 00	566 00	756 00	
	New Zealand	442 86	632 66	822 44	
	British	506 00	506 00	602 00	
Lieutenant	Canada	720 00	720 00	936 00	
	Australia	443 00	664 00	854 00	
	New Zealand	474 49	695 92	885 70	
	British	700 00	700 00	700 00	In addition receives a gratuity of one year's pension the first year
Captain	Canada	1,000 00	1,000 00	1,252 00	
	Australia	492 00	737 00	927 00	
	New Zealand	506 12	759 18	948 96	
	British	1,000 00	1,000 00	1,000 00	In addition receives a gratuity of one year's pension the first year.
Major	Canada	1,260 00	1,260 00	1,548 00	
	Australia	565 00	847 00	1,037 00	
	New Zealand	594 69	892 03	1,081 81	
	British	2,000 00	2,000 00	2,000 00	In addition receives a gratuity of one year's pension the first year.
Lieut-Colonel	Canada	1,560 00	1,560 00	1,920 00	
	Australia	638 00	956 00	1,146 00	
	New Zealand	708 58	1,062 87	1,252 65	
	British	3,000 00	3,000 00	3,000 00	In addition receives a gratuity of one year's pension the first year.

B.—Comparative rates of pensions for Widows of officers and men killed pursuant to report.

Rank of Husband.	Country.	Widow without Children.	With three children.	Remarks.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	
Private	Canada	384 00	600 00	
	Australia	253 00	442 00	
	New Zealand	316 33	506 11	
	British	126 00	258 00	Increased by $30 on reaching 35 years of age and a further increase of $30 on reaching 45 years of age.
Sergeant	Canada	408 00	624 00	
	Australia	340 00	529 00	
	New Zealand	341 63	531 41	
	British	138 00	270 00	Increased on attaining 35 years and again at 45.
Warrant officer	Canada	544 00	760 00	
	Australia	377 00	566 00	
	New Zealand	379 60	569 38	
	British	175 00	307 00	Increased on attaining 35 years and again at 45.
Lieutenant	Canada	576 00	792 00	
	Australia	443 00	632 00	
	New Zealand	506 12	695 90	
	British	400 00	625 00	
Captain	Canada	800 00	1,052 00	
	Australia	492 00	681 00	
	New Zealand	569 38	759 16	
	Britsh	500 00	770 00	
Major	Canada	1,008 00	1,296 00	
	Australia	565 00	754 00	
	New Zealand	657 96	847 74	
	British	700 00	1,015 00	
Lieut-Colonel	Canada	1,248 00	1,608 00	
	Australia	638 00	827 00	
	New Zealand	768 92	958 70	
	British	900 00	1,260 00	

I direct attention to the unfortunate position that the widows of reservists in this country are going to be in after this war is over and I shall allude more fully to that matter later on. When a comparison is made between the pensions suggested by Canada and those paid in other parts of the Empire, I think the House will agree that the committee was not ungenerous in the amounts suggested as being fair and reasonable pensions to be paid.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his address alluded to certain changes and alterations with regard to pensions to be made in differentiating between the suggestions of the committee and the old pensions scheme. The pension scheme now in force makes provision for a pension being paid to a man who has received injury or contracted a disease subsequent to enlistment. It totally overlooks the fact that many men, without being aware of any physical failing, have been received into the ranks by medical officers throughout the country as being sound and fit; then, as a result of exposure, exhaustion or exertion, diseases have developed that have resulted in the men's health being permanently impaired, and, in some cases, in their death. The committee felt that this was radically unfair. If a man who had within him the germs of a disease, of which he had no knowledge, offered his services to the state in the belief that he was sound and fit, and was received by the medical officer in that condition, it was thought unfair that his wife and children should suffer because he came to a premature death owing to the development of a disease that was aggravated by his military service. As a result, the suggested scheme of pensions widens the range of those to whom a pension may be granted and it says that a pension may be granted to a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force on account of disability incurred on active service or aggravated thereby. It will permit of a pension being granted to a man who may have been suffering from some complaint of which he was not aware or which escaped the watchful eye of the medical examiner.

The committee made another change, a change that, in my judgment, is only right and fair. The original pension scheme made a distinction between the pension granted to a man when his injury or disability resulted from something that occurred when he was in action or in the presence of the enemy, or from something that occurred during ordinary drill subsequent to his enlistment. The committee were at a loss to understand why a distinction should be made between an injury suffered by a man who may have been thrown by his horse, or injured by his horse stumbling on a charge across the drill ground, and the same injuries resulting to a man in action. They took the ground that the injury that a man received subsequent to his enlistment should be the determining factor and in their report they lay it down as a principle that all men shall be treated on an equality provided their injury was received in their military work subsequent to their enlistment, or as a result of some disease contracted or aggravated by their military training or experience.

The committee made one other variation, a variation that in my judgment will meet with the enthusiastic support of the people of Canada. Under the old scheme men of the rank and file, were awarded a pension in respect of their children of $5 a month provided boys did not exceed the age of 15 and girls the age of 17. The committee thought that was radically unfair. If there is one thing more than another that a child is entitled to whose bread-winner is taken away by having voluntarily assumed military risks, it is a fair chance in life. The committee felt that to stop the pension when the boy was 15 was unfair. Accordingly they raised the age to sixteen. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the majority of boys and girls throughout this country enter our secondary schools at about fourteen. And when the pension is discontinued when a boy reaches the age of fifteen it practically means this: when he leaves the public schools the expense of education increases, and if the pension that is paid his mother is to be cut off when he enters the secondary school, and the expense of education is at the same time increased, it practically means that the boy or girl is to be deprived of the opportunity of an education. The Committee felt that the children have the right to a fair chance to secure an education, and that it was not unreasonable that a pension should be continued until the boy was not past sixteen and the girl not past seventeen, and that the pension paid on account of the child of a private should be increased from five to six dollars a month.

The committee took perhaps a radical step in another matter, but a step that

seems to me to have been fair. They said that a man in receipt of a pension should be entitled to the fruits of his labour, that if a man who had lost his eyes adapted himself to circumstances and was able to earn the means of life, if he had lost his feet or his hands and had the pluck to again face life and through the advantage of vocational training or otherwise was able to secure employment in another sphere of activity, that man was entitled to keep what he earned. The committee took the stand that if those who had suffered greatly in this war had the courage when they returned to endeavour to earn a fresh place for themselves in civil life, they should be paid their pension in respect of the physical disability they had suffered, and should also be entitled to what earnings they made, and that the earnings should not be deducted from the pension.

To adopt any other scheme than this seemed to the committee to have as an inevitable result the encouragement of shiftlessness and laziness, and the committee felt that in a country like this everything possible should be done to encourage the men to take on themselves fresh employment when they again returned to this country.

In regard to administration, under the pension regulations the court of final resort is the Minister of Militia, and no matter what Government was in power that would mean a certain amount of political intrigue, and, perhaps, a certain amount of political unpopularity. The committee, therefore, came to the conclusion that a non-partisan board should be appointed, who would hold office for a protracted period, and who would be the sole arbiters of what pension should be granted, and from the full board no appeal should lie. It seems to me that that will commend itself to the country at large.

The ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has directed attention to the peculiar position that reservists of the Allies occupy in this country. The committee canvassed this matter rather thoroughly and endeavoured to secure such information as was available, but, unfortunately, could not get complete information that would justify a conclusion. The pensions paid by the Governments of the Allies are quite inadequate to permit of anything like decent living in this country. Something must be done either by the municipalities, the country of the reservists, or by this country to supplement the

pensions that are going to be paid to these people. The committee could not reach a conclusion, and, therefore, said in their report that the matter should be carefully inquired into by the Board of Pension Commissioners during this year, and that they should report to the House at the next session. They also suggested that the Patriotic Fund should carry these people during this year, so that there would not be hardship and discontent throughout the country. I realize the danger of endeavouring to prove a general rule by a specific case, but my attention was directed only yesterday to a heart-rending case where the widow of a reservist—her husband had been killed at the front—received the munificent pension of fourteen shillings a week, less than four dollars, to maintain herself and one small child in this country! It must be abundantly clear to you, Sir, and I am sure it is clear to the House, that a pension of this amount is quite inadequate, and the inevitable result will be that if in some way means cannot be devised to supplement the pension paid to these reservists, the municipalities are going to have the burden thrown upon them, and there is going to be discontent. And, as a national asset, it seems to me it is worth while for this country to give the children of these reservists every opportunity to do well in this country. We have encouraged immigrants to come to Canada, and many have come with the idea of making this land their home, and the breadwinner has left only at the call of his country. If a scheme can be devised, or if co-operation can be secured with the governments of the Allies, I feel sure that it will relieve the strain and stress that otherwise is going to bear very heavily on a class of people in this country who deserve our sympathy.

I will not speak further this afternoon, as I understand other matters of pressing importance must be discussed, but from what I have heard, in so far as my going about the country in one direction and another has brought me in contact with the people, I believe that the people at large in this country are quite prepared to deal generously by those who have risked their all for the maintenance of the national life and the Empire at large.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER: The chairman of the committee (Mr. Hazen) has alluded to an exception in the unanimity of the committee in regard to some matters. I must confess that I occupy the position of the

historic juryman who complained that he was locked up for twenty-four hours with eleven of the most obstinate men he had ever seen. I regret being compelled to differ with a majority of the committee on what seemed to me a vital question, and, as it has already been mentioned by my hon. friend the chairman and by my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), I should like to say a word or two on the subject. I held the view that those who have wives are entitled to special consideration in the matter of pensions, over and above the amount paid to the single men. I took that view for two different reasons. The first reason has relation to the raising of the further forces that will be required. It must be admitted that in the case of a married man the strongest influence in securing his enlistment is that of his wife. Certainly, if he is the man he ought to be—and if he is not the man he ought to be, he will not make the best soldier—the views of his wife will have great weight with him in his decision. If we expect to recruit largely from amongst the married men for the future needs of the war, it appears to me that one of the first considerations is that the wives of those upon whom we must depend shall be dealt with liberally and generously, or, at any rate, justly. It is not possible to maintain two people at the same expense as one. The single man who is disabled can secure bed and board under entirely suitable circumstances at a very reasonable rate; but the married man must set up house or he does not carry on life under normal and proper conditions, and the setting up of a household absolutely and unquestionably involves a greater expenditure than does the providing of bed and board for the single man. It appears to be elementary that the requirements of two persons are greater than the requirments of one, and I maintain that when we are dealing with a minimum requirement, the requirement of a man and a woman are greater than the requirements of two single men. I speak of the minimum requirement that is necessary to establish the minimum household. For these reasons I did press my views upon the committee. I regret that I was not able to impress the majority favourably, but I take this opportunity of placing my views before the House so that there will be no misunderstanding as to what my position was.

I would be very glad, if it were possible, to consider, in the light mentioned by my hon. friend the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) the case of the reservists more definitely than is suggested in the report. That is a matter which is particularly interesting in the western country, because we have there such a very large proportion of reservists whose condition is a matter of concern to everyone. The responsibility must rest upon somebody, and we believe that as those men have rendered equal service in the same cause, we would only be doing justice to ourselves as well as to them if we gave them equal recognition.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto): Mr. Speaker, just a word in addition to what has been said so ably upon both sides of the House. As a member of the Pension Committee, I beg to approve so far as I can, the language of the hon. member for Rouville and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) in regard to the harmony that prevailed in the committee and the diligence with which they devoted themselves to their work. I do not know anything that was omitted; in fact, I think that every possible effort was made to get from all classes and sections of the public their different opinions upon this question. Every opportunity was given to all and sundry who were interested, to come to the committee, and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has very ably summarized what has been done. The best efforts that the committee could put forth has produced this report. We cannot hope that it is perfect, but we believe that if it is given a proper trial, it will be found to work out very well. In a word, the bones of the question are put together by the committee, but the filling of it out and the growth of it will have to depend upon the manner in which the commission works it out as the needs require.

One point mentioned by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was very fully considered. I would like to point out the effort that we have made to bring up to a living scale the pension to be given to the private soldier. Under the old pension scale, the married private soldier received $396 a year; under the scale we have recommended he will get $480 a year. There is a very considerable advance in the case of the single man amongst the rank and file; under the old scale he received $264 a year; under the new scale he will get $480 a year. The reasons for giving both the unmarried

man and the married man the same rate of pension were the reasons given by the hon. member for Kingston a few minutes ago, and there was the further reason that in the majority of cases where a single man returned to Canada he might wish to establish a home, and it was felt that he should be given an opportunity of doing so. It was felt that if he were left without any other means of support than the pension under the old scale, he could not marry and settle down and make his home in this country.

The committee thought that every inducement should be held out to him to lead the same life as his married neighbour, and that the pension recommended was not any more than fairly adequate to meet his requirements in that condition. The pension for the married man was increased by about $100 so that we have added considerably to his pension; we have added still more to the pension of the single man in order that he may marry if he so desires, and, as the hon. member for Kingston has pointed out, many men have married since enlistment.

I conclude by saying that the labours of this committee have been faithful. We have done our best, and, if inequalities are found in the working out of this scheme, they can be remedied either by the Pension Board or by subsequent legislation.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the committee is to be congratulated that its deliberations have been so earnest, so indefatigable, and so harmonious, and that, with the exception of the point which has been alluded to by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) there was really no difference of opinion amongst them as to what should be done. The proposals, when carried into effect, will, of course, entail a very considerable increase in the public charges, but I do not believe there is anyone in the Dominion who would not be willing cheerfully to bear his share of the increased burden.

My hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) expressed his regret that legislation was not being enacted this session for the purpose of carrying these proposals into effect. I am not inclined to agree with my hon. friend in that regard. It will be the duty of the Government in the immediate future to create a Pension Board, and I am inclined to the opinion that, after the proposals of the committee have been tested in actual practice by that board, there will be a better opportunity for this House to come to a conclusion as to legislation than there would be if we hurried it through at this stage of the session.

If I had been a member of the committee it is possible I might have entertained a different view on some points from that which has been put forward, but nevertheless the report of the committee embodying their recommendations must be considered with all respect, and I see no reason at the moment why they should not be carried into effect in their entirety.

With regard to the point raised by my hon. friend from Edmonton, I am not sure that I would have adopted either the view which he has put forward, or the view which commended itself to the majority of the committee.

There is certainly some force in the view which the hon. member for Edmonton has presented to the House. There is force also in the view with which the majority of the committee were impressed. It does seem to me that the reasons advanced by the majority of the committee would rather have pointed to this conclusion: that there should be a difference between the pension allowed to the single man and the pension allowed to the married man, but that the pension to the single man should be increased upon his marriage. In my judgment this would have been a more logical conclusion from the reasons put forward by the majority of the committee than that which in the end did commend itself to their judgment. I say that not by way of criticism, but merely by way of expressing a view which has impressed itself upon my own mind, without having had the opportunity of considering the whole matter which the members of the committee enjoyed for many weeks.

The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has alluded to the possibility of political influence or political pressure under present conditions—at least, I so understood him. I know something about the operation of the pension law as it is at present. I have known something about it during the past year or 18 months, and I desire to affirm to this House, lest there should be any impression of that kind throughout the country, that on no single occasion have I ever heard even the suggestion of political influence or political pressure from any man within this House or from any man without this House with regard to pensions. On no single occasion

have I ever heard even the breath of a suspicion that any such thing had taken place or was possible. I may tell the House, in case any hon. member or any man outside the House may be under the impression that political influence or political pressure is exerted in such cases, just how the matter is dealt with. During the past four or five weeks I myself have been dealing with this matter, and I know precisely how it is done. These matters go before the Pension Board. The Pension Board have reports prepared, make their inquiries and put everything into documentary form. They append their recommendation with these documents attached, and the recommendation comes for signature before the minister or the acting Minister of Militia and Defence. I sign as many as 40 or 50 of them in one day, and the demands upon my time are such that I do not even know the name of the man who is recommended in any one of these. I am not able in the time at my disposal even to read the papers; I pass them on as a matter of course, after they have been considered by the permanent officers of the Pension Board, to the permanent officers of the Treasury Board. How any one can reasonably suppose that political influence or political pressure comes into the matter under these conditions is entirely beyond my comprehension. I desire to affirm that during the year or eighteen months that I have had to do with these pensions, particularly during the past four or five weeks in which I have been responsible for signing these documents and sending them forward to the proper officers of the Treasury Board, there has never come to my knowledge even the breath of a suspicion that any man inside or outside of the House has exerted political pressure or political influence. If there is anything of that kind to the knowledge of hon. gentlemen in this House, I should be glad to know of it.

Mr. NICKLE: What I intended to say was that a non-partisan board would obviate the possibility of political intrigue or unpopularity.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It has been suggested, I think, on previous occasions in this House that something of this kind had taken place. I understood my hon. friend to suggest that; if he did not, I desire to withdraw any comments I made upon it. I say this merely for the purpose of indicating so far as my knowledge goes and so far as my experience is of any value, that nothing of the kind has ever taken place. We will give to the recommendations of the committee the most careful and respectful consideration and attention. As I have said already, I see no reason why they should not be carried out in their entirety. There were some matters as to which I asked for information this afternoon which may demand a little consideration when the recommendations of the committee are to be put in the form of regulations. I hope that in the immediate future everything will be put in train. I realize also that the Pension Board as constituted must be one which will command the respect and confidence of the people of Canada as a thoroughly representative and independent commission.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When this question of a commission was discussed in the committee, it was suggested that the appointment should be of a non-partisan character and that the right hon. gentleman should, perhaps, consult the leader of the Opposition as regards the appointees.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I shall, of course, be pleased to take that into consideration. We may be assured that the board as constituted will be one which, according to the view of the Government, will command the approval and confidence of the Canadian people. In conclusion, I think that the thanks of all the members of the House and of the country as a whole are due to the committee for the splendid work which they have done, and especially to the hon. member for Kingston, who, as I understand, has assumed a very large burden in connection with the work and whose presence and assistance on that committee have been invaluable throughout their deliberations.

Mr. OLIVER: I would not wish the Prime Minister to think that any such suggestion in regard to political influence was in the mind of the committee at any stage of the proceedings. It is true that we did discuss from time to time the possibility of political influence being exercised in the future with regard to pensions, having regard to the conditions in the United States. I beg to assure him that, so far as my knowledge goes, there was no suggestion that political influence had played any part in the matter of dealing with pensions at the present time.

Mr. NICKLE: What I intended to say—I am not sure whether I succeeded or not

—was that the committee recommended the appointment of a non-partisan board to avoid the possibility of political intrigue and political unpopularity. I had no reference to the present or past administration of pensions.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF ACCOUNTANT.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that a message had been received from the Senate to acquaint this House that the Senate doth concur in the nomination of Mr. A. M. W. Carter as accountant in the library of Parliament.

THE 163rd BATTALION.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With the consent of the House, I beg to say that I took some interest in the formation of the 163rd Battalion in Montreal, known as the Asselin Battalion, and I would like to have a statement from my right hon. friend the hon. Acting Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Robert Borden) of the reason why the battalion has been ordered to Bermuda. This battalion has been organized in practically three months' time, and is an excellent battalion. I suppose that the regiment has been sent to Bermuda for training purposes, and that it will ultimately go to England and France. Possibly I am giving the answer myself, but I have been asked by some people who are interested in the corps to put the question to the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If my hon. friend had given me notice that he was going to ask for this information I might have procured it for him if it were available. As a matter of fact, I cannot answer the question, because I did not know that the regiment had been ordered to Bermuda.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, I received a telegram from Major Asselin saying how proud he was to inform me that he had been ordered to go to Bermuda. I suppose it is for training purposes, as other battalions have been sent to Bermuda, and that ultimately it will go to France. It is very anxious to go to the front.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is very probable that my hon. friend's conjecture is correct. He will see how impossible it is for me to answer him; I did not even know that the regiment had been ordered to Bermuda.

[Mr. Nickle.]

PUBLIC PRINTING.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN COST.

Mr. HUGH CLARK (North Bruce) moved:

That the third report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on Printing be commended to the attentive consideration of the Government with the recommendation that the attention of each department of Government be directed thereto with a view of having the recommendations contained in the said report carried into effect so far as may be practicable and with the view to effecting all possible economy in the matter of public printing, and that a report be prepared by each department of the Government for presentation to this House at the next session in which shall be set forth the extent to which such recommendations have been carried into effect and the reasons, if any, which render it impossible or undesirable to carry into effect such recommendations in any particular department.

He said: There were three committees to report this afternoon, but the Pensions Committee has very generously and unselfishly left twenty-five minutes for the other two committees. However, I may make a few remarks, because my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) has told me that he will not go on with the third inasmuch as the first report has left so little time for the rest. The Committee on Printing have had in view all along that the Government's recommendation of production and thrift should be the slogan, particularly during war time, and they have been endeavouring to produce thrift by reducing production—reduction in the amount of printing that is done for the Government. We have had in mind the increasing cost and the increasing scarcity of paper, and we have been advised as well by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that, in view of the shortage in the supply of white paper, the public should be asked to conserve paper as much as possible. I do not know of any place where that conservation could be carried into effect more than in these Parliament and Government buildings. We have entirely too many Government publications. They are altogether too large, and the cost has gone up so tremendously that something has to be done in order to reduce it. The cost has more than quadrupled within the last fifteen or sixteen years. Something has already been done by the present King's Printer, Mr. Taché, and by his assistant, Mr. Cook. They have started out in a proper manner, and if you will look over some of the reports you will see how well the work has

been done. Take, for instance, the blue-book of "Unclaimed Balances," and the blue-book containing a list of the shareholders of banks, and you will see that by an arrangement of the forms and of the type they have put the same material in half the space, the size of the volumes has been greatly decreased and a considerable saving has been effected in that way alone. A great many publications are sent out all over the country that are not in demand at all, that are not being used, and that are simply burned up as soon as the supply becomes too large. The Department of Agriculture was sending out 110,000 copies of a certain periodical when they sent out return post cards to ascertain how many people really wanted this publication. The result was that only 25,000 people wanted it. The balance is still there and is waste paper. The committee have recommended that the post card system be used in connection with every department and that post cards be sent out annually. We found that a great many blue-books and sessional papers were being sent out, for instance, to Mechanics' Institutes that had been out of existence for a great many years, to public libraries, to members of Parliament and to others who did not require them. The lists of the Canada Gazette, until recently, had not been revised since 1892. Other lists have not been revised for twenty or twenty-five years. In this report we have recommended that copy sent to the King's Printer be typewritten. We recommend the creation of a board of editorial management, consisting of men already in the service, who will revise the copy that is sent, and blue-pencil it to some extent, so that the volume will not be so large. If ministers would tell their officers that in the preparation of copy of this sort, brevity would be considered a virtue, it might have a good effect in the meantime.

We have recommended that this editorial board should revise all the copy and say whether or not certain copy should be published. There is a great deal of waste material in many of the publications. I was looking over one of them in which there are four pages of dedications. The chief engineer dedicates the report to the superintendent, the superintendent has a page dedicating it to the deputy, the deputy has a page dedicating it to the minister, and the minister has a page dedicating it to His Royal Highness. That may not seem to be a great deal, but when you are printing ten or twenty thousand copies it involves a considerable additional expense.

Then, there is the matter of the Agricultural Gazette. The reason this is commended to the attention of the minister is that, since the report was published, representations have been made to us on behalf of the publishers of agricultural magazines and newspapers to the effect that if this Agricultural Gazette were sent free as recommended to farmers, it would practically put them out of business. It would certainly seriously interfere with such publications as the Farmers Advocate, a farm newspaper published in London, Ontario. When this publication was started by the department, I understood, and I still understand, that it was merely for the purpose of disseminating information among the different branches of the Agricultural Department, those engaged in connection with the experimental farms and the various provincial agricultural services. It was not the intention to interfere with or to compete in any way with farm publications. It is not supposed to be distributed generally. In fact, I read in it just now that it is not to be distributed generally, but that any person desiring it may procure a copy for a dollar a year. The recommendation of the Printing Committee was that it should be distributed free to all who might apply for it. The reason for the amendment is that, in view of these representations and of several other things, we prefer to have the Government consider whether or not it is advisable to adopt this suggestion. As to having the copy typewritten and having a board of editors to look over it, the cost last year on account of typographical corrections of copy was something like $48,000, and at that it was $5,000 less than the year before. A tremendous saving can be made in that way alone.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: I regret that we have not more time at our disposal for the discussion of this report. I wish to protest, on behalf of the Debates Committee, against that part of the report which refers to the Debates of the House. I am in sympathy with the economy that is suggested in connection with the printing of this House and of the departments generally. The statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), who introduced this motion the other day, that the mailing lists of these different reports were not properly revised, does not apply to the Debates of

4 p.m.

this House. The list of recipients of the Debates is revised every year. My hon. friend who introduced the motion said that sometimes these publications were being mailed to the homes of men who had been dead for 15 years. The Debates Committee look after their mailing lists very carefully. The lists are revised absolutely every year with the very closest attention.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to record my agreement with the remarks which have just been made by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). The work of the Debates Committee is, I believe, well managed, and the members are living up to what should be expected from them by their colleagues in the House of Commons in the work of publishing our little portion of the official literature. For that they are certainly not deserving the opprobrium which naturally falls on other departments of the Government. The officials who are working in co-operation with the members of the Debates Committee have taken scrupulous precautions to see that the Debates are circulated only to people who should receive them, and who do receive them. The list is scanned every year and blue-pencilled—I hope it is red-pencilled sometimes. There is no reason why this little investigation should extend to the work of the Debates Committee. I stand for the autonomy of our committee, and I agree perfectly with what has been stated by the hon. member for Souris.

Mr. BURRELL: Mr. Speaker, I have not been guilty of trespassing very much on the time of the House this session, and I do not intend to do so now. One word in answer to my hon. friend who has just spoken on behalf of the Printing Committee. I say that, in spite of whatever faults may obtain in the service or in the departments generally in regard to this matter, we owe a debt of gratitude to the Printing Committee for analysing the whole subject and putting the resolution in the way they have, that is, asking the departments to thoroughly examine into the methods adopted, with a view to simplification and economy. I do not know to what publication of our own department my hon. friend referred when he said that 25 per cent of the people who received it did not want it. We have endeavoured to increase very largely the publications of the department, believing that the educational work of the department was of great value to the country generally. In regard to the Agricultural Gazette, I may say that it was not my intention, when we founded that Gazette, nor has it been since, that it should be a journal that would be of special use to, or that would be specially desired by, the average farmer; the idea was rather that it should reflect the official work of all agricultural departments in the country, and have a special reference to the Agricultural Instruction Act, in connection with which we are expending a large amount of money. It has therefore been distributed to all agricultural educational bodies, as well as to the press. I am not at all sure that it would be advisable to extend the free circulation of that particular magazine, nor do I think that it is the business of the department to endeavour in any way to interfere with or detract from the useful work now being done by the agricultural press of the country. I appreciate the work the committee has done; and, in so far as my own department is concerned, I myself and all the officials will be only too glad to give the recommendations of the committee the fullest consideration, and if we cannot carry them out, to give reasons for not doing so.

Perhaps I may be permitted, by the courtesy of the House, to express to the members on both sides of the House my appreciation of the kind way in which they have shown their sympathy for me during my unfortunate illness occasioned by the fire in the Parliament buildings. It has been my misfortune, and not my fault, that I have not attended the House for so long a time.

Motion agreed to.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Governor General's Secretary, announcing that His Royal Highness would proceed to the Senate chamber this afternoon at 4.30, for the purpose of proroguing the present session of Parliament.

At that hour a message was delivered by Lieutenant Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Right Honourable the Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General, desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went to the Senate chamber.

In the Senate chamber His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Gover-

nor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act relating to the Superior Courts of Saskatchewan and to amend the Judges' Act.
An Act respecting Colonial Bank (Canada).
An Act respecting British Trust Company.
An Act respecting The High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.
An Act to amend The Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.
An Act to amend The Bank Act.
An Act for the relief of Christopher Sinclair.
An Act for the relief of Hope Fothergill Baily.
An Act for the relief of Robert Charles Vondrau.
An Act for the relief of Percy Lynn Woods.
An Act respecting certain patents of The Pedlar People, Limited.
An Act to incorporate The Fire Insurance Company of Canada.
An Act respecting The Governing Council of The Salvation Army in Canada and to change the name thereof to "The Governing Council of The Salvation Army, Canada East."
An Act to incorporate The Governing Council of The Salvation Army, Canada West.
An Act respecting the investments of Life Insurance Companies.
An Act to authorize certain School and Dominion Lands to be included in the Taber Irrigation District in the Province of Alberta.
An Act to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.
An Act to incorporate The Manitoba and Saskatchewan Bible Society.
An Act respecting Rentals Payable to the Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.
An Act to levy a tax on Business Profits.
An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.
An Act for the relief of David Whimster Rhodes.
An Act to provide for the payment of Bounties on Zinc produced from Zinc Ores mined in Canada.
An Act to incorporate The Eastern Canadian Union Conference Corporation of Seventh-Day Adventists.
An Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act.
An Act to aid in the construction of certain lines of railway of the Saint John and Quebec Railway Company and to confirm an agreement between the Company and the Governments of Canada and New Brunswick.
An Act to amend The Exchequer Court Act.
An Act for the relief of Martha Isabella Kenny.
An Act for the relief of William Thomas Craig.
An Act respecting The Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.
An Act to amend The Government Railways Small Claims Act.
An Act relating to the St. Peters Indian Reserve.
An Act to authorize the acquisition of lines of railway between the City of Quebec and Nairn Falls and between Lyster and St. Jean des Chaillons.
An Act in aid of Provincial Legislation prohibiting or restricting the sale or use of Intoxicating Liquors.

[Mr. Speaker.]

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.
An Act for granting to His Majesty aid for Military and Naval Defence.
An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1916, and the 31st March, 1917.

To these Bills the Royal Assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name, His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General, as follows:

May it please Your Honour:

The Commons of Canada have voted Supplies required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the Commons I present to Your Honour the following Bills:

"An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1916, and the 31st March, 1917."

"An Act for granting to His Majesty aid for Military and Naval Defence."

To which Bills I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

To these Bills the Clerk of the Senate, by command of His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General, did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General thanks His Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills.

After which His Honour the Deputy of His Royal Highness the Governor General was pleased to close the Sixth Session of the Twelfth Parliament of the Dominion with the following Speech:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In this crisis of our national life your attention has been directed to affairs of supreme importance; and it is with gratitude that I recall the care and devotion with which you have considered and approved all necessary measures for effective prosecution of the war. Our Empire, with unexampled singleness of purpose, is defending not only its own integrity and institutions, but also the rights of mankind. It is my sincere conviction that your efforts will materially aid in the achievement of that unquestioned victory for which we shall not cease to strive until it is attained.

The struggle still proceeding in many widespread theatres, has recently become more intense on the western front, where, for more than a year the Dominion troops have been engaged. The Canadian Army Corps has been entrusted with an important position, and the people of the Dominion justly cherish a calm confidence that it will fully maintain the hon-

ourable and distinguished record already established by the First Division.

Throughout our country the response to the urgency of the Empire's need has been unfailing, and unaccustomed burdens have been accepted with an unfaltering spirit. Nearly 170,000 troops have gone overseas and more than 140,000 are undergoing training in Canada. To supply the needed reinforcements, men have offered themselves in even greater numbers during the first four months of this year than in any similar period during the war.

I am convinced that the important measures which you have taken for the economic well-being of the Dominion will meet the needs of the situation and will be attended with marked advantage to the public interest.

The magnificent crops harvested during the past season have materially assisted in maintaining the stability of our national fabric. You will rejoice to learn that the vastly increased volume of Canada's exports is still maintained, and that the general prosperity of the country has not been perceptibly diminished by the war.

In dealing with national problems of railway development you have made provision by which present needs will be met. Steps will be taken by my advisers without delay to insure an effective inquiry into the conditions by which those problems are surrounded and the most efficient methods by which they can be solved.

The provision for supplementing, with such aid as is required from the federal power, the operation of provincial legislation restricting the sale or use of intoxicating liquors, is in accordance with the marked advance of public opinion to which the provincial enactments are due.

I deplore with you the partial destruction of the historic building in which the deliberations of Parliament have been held since the founding of this Dominion. It is anticipated that in its restoration the distinctive features of its architecture will be preserved while at the same time more spacious and convenient accommodatio will be provided.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you on behalf of His Majesty for the liberal provision which you have made for the public needs and for the increasing demands of the war.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is my privilege now to relieve you for the present from your arduous labours; and I do so with an ever-growing confidence that, notwithstanding any temporary reverse, victory will crown our high cause; with a fervent prayer also and an humble faith that out of this time of trial and suffering our country will assuredly advance to a greater and nobler future.

[Mr. Speaker.]

INDEX

SIXTH SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1916.

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 5.
Acknowledgment of, 1117.

Address to His Majesty the King, 636, 755.
See Parliament, extension of term of.

Adulteration of food. *See* Food.

Advertising, government,
Homestead regulations, 827.
Immigration, 2436.
Payments for, 2299, 3095.
Post Office Department, 1164, 2739.

Agriculture
Agricultural products, export of, 345.
Animals
Diseased, destruction of, 2957.
Health of, 1430, 2956, 2968.
Apples
Cost of production, 2312.
Duty on. *See* Taxation.
Bulletins, 1405.
Butter and cheese factories—taxation of, 1391, 1398.
Cold storage, 1427.
Dairying industry, 1391, 1398, 1420, 2966.
Department
Clerks, 2801.
Employees with diplomas, 2176.
Estimates, 661, 1386, 1410, 2956.
Official of—remarks on apple duty, 1426.
Staff and salaries, 661.
Development of, 1211, 1220.
Eggs, marketing of, 2961.
Exhibitions. *See that title.*
Experimental farms, 1386, 1409, 2871, 3160. 3407.
Flax. *See that title.*
Flax expert, 2348.
Fruit growing, 1407.
Grain. *See that title.*
Hay. *See* war supplies.
Hogs
American, 2923.
Cholera, 395, 1397, 2957.
Government inspection of, 1552, 1606.

Agriculture—*Con.*
Hogs—*Con.*
Slaughtering of at Amherst, 2174.
Smuggling of into Canada, 4099.
Horses
Exportation of prohibited, 1329.
Importations from United States, 2057.
Purchases by Department, 3881.
Stallion—gift of by the King, 1398.
See also war supplies.
Illustration stations, 1387, 1397, 1399.
See also experimental farms.
Insect pests, 1412.
Livestock, 716, 886, 1390, 1393, 1398.
Potatoes
Duty on, 1430.
Embargo on, 1412.
Export of, 1059.
Inspectors, 951, 1395, 1398, 1415, 1420.
Powdery scab, 1413.
Prices, retail, 873.
Shipment regulations, 1412.
Tobacco industry, 394.
Wheat. *See* grain.
Wool
Embargo on, 393.
Exportation of, 2058.

Aitkin, Sir Max, duties of, 534.
Payments to, 2692.

Airships. *See* Aviation.

Alberta
Contributions to war, 915.
Farmers, relief for, 532.
Purchases of war supplies in, 3232.
Seed grain, 886.

Alguire, Mr. Duncan Orestes (Stormont)
Soldiers, appointment of to Civil Service, 649.

Aliens
Employment of, 850.
Farm labour, for, 2649.
Government employment of, 1142.
Naturalization of, 2922.
Registration of, 542.
Supervision over, 691.

Allied Economic Conference, 2475, 2802.

Allison, Colonel J. Wesley, 271, 290, 1343, 1345. 1355, 1358, 2012, 2245, 2276, 2291, 2476. *See* also Shell contracts.

American Club, Toronto, wrecking of, 856.

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (Mont'l., St. Antoine)
Budget, 1255.
The Patriotic Fund, 1255.

Amherst, N.S.
Canada Car and Foundry Company buildings, 1078.
Military barracks, 1435, 2300, 2600.
Postal revenue, 3561.
Troops at, 3269.
War supplies purchased at, 3266.

Ammunition. *See* War supplies.

Annandale buoys, 1808.

Annuities, Government, 1437, 2735.

Anse à Beaufils breakwater, 3623.

Anticosti, Gaspé and north shore mail service, 536.

Antigonish
Fishery officer, 552.
Post office, 552.
River guardians, 552.
Station flower garden, 2057, 3593, 3603.

Apples. *See* Agriculture.

Archibald, Captain M. G., services of, 539.

Arisaig lightkeeper, 1808.

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (E. Lambton)
Budget, 1015.
The duty on apples, 1016.
The duty on oil, 1018.
Production and consumption of gasolene, 1019.
Flax industry, 1287.
Gasolene, production and consumption of, 1019.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2421, 2444, 2472.
Railways, location of, 2746.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2746.
Taxation
Apples, 1016, 1789.
Oil, 1018.

Armstrong lake bridge, 2692.

Army
Allowances
Disability, 105, 108, 110, 158, 2873, 3334.
Separation, 109, 116, 550, 1021, 1098, 1256, 2176, 2924, 3098, 3232.
Subsistence, 550. *See also* Pensions.
Amherst, barracks, 1435, 2300, 2600.
Badges, 3509. *See also* Decorations.
Cadets. *See* Militia.

Army—*Con.*
Campbellton, accommodation at, 1162.
Camps
Farnham, 1164.
Valcartier, 2174.
Canadian forces, 24, 31, 40, 60.
Reorganization of, 2015.
Canadian troops in action, 889.
Carson, Brigadier-General, Staff of, 2693.
Casualty lists, 2841, 3029, 3280, 3293.
Chaplains, 2171, 3097.
Clothing. *See* war supplies.
Commissions, granting of, 3509.
Conscription, 19, 26, 59, 65, 103, 180, 592, 829, 1272.
Decorations, military, 1969, 3294.
Dental corps, 3237, 4129.
Enlistments
Civil Servants, of, 655, 817-826, 1044.
Coloured men, of, 235, 557, 2114.
Districts, by, 1350.
Foreign labourers, of, 2145.
French-Canadians, of, 179, 1081, 3281.
Generally, 104, 107, 360, 367.
Interior Department, from, 833, 2084, 2092.
Jews, of, 1550.
Minors, of, 3049.
Paquette, Edward, of, 2241, 2648.
Post Office employees, of, 1761.
Provinces, by, 3025.
Royal Military College, from, 362.
See also Recruiting.
Equipment, military, 112.
Farnham, military camp, 1164.
First contingent, transportation of, 2693.
French-Canadiana Battalion, 1373.
Medical
Corps, 3236.
Examination, 4069, 4125.
Officers
Black, Dr. J. B., 1368.
Charlottetown, 1905.
Forbes, Dr. A. McKenzie, 3528.
Freeman, Dr. N. P., 3097.
Ottawa, 1759.
Pay of, 1349.
Selection of, 3289.
Medicine Hat Overseas Battalion, 1435.
Moosejaw military, 1651.
Officers
Canadian, in England, 949, 1377, 1551.
Commissions, granting of, 3509.
Muirhead, Major, charges against, 306, 398.
Political activities of, 3541.
Spidal, J. A., 3541. *See also* Spiddel.
Training of, 289, 3533.
Unattached, in England, 1377.

Army—*Con.*
Orangemen in Army Service, 359.
Overseas forces
Equipment of, 3504, 3513.
Forwarding of, 3513.
Framing and disposition of, 2348.
Parliament, members of, in military service, 949, 1328, 1550, 2168.
Pensions. *See that title.*
Prisoners from penitentiaries in, 2117.
Promotions, system of, 1351.
Provisions. *See* war supplies.
Rations, expenditure for, 440.
Recruiting
Alleged opposition to, 1607.
Bellechase county, in, 1325.
Coloured men, of, 235, 557, 2114.
Edmonton, in, 113, 3586.
Enrollment by districts, 1350.
French-Canadians, of, 3643.
Medical examinations, 440.
Methods of, 292.
Montreal, in, 4069, 4125.
Nova Scotia, in, 145, 1367, 3255.
Officers
Appointment of, 1350, 1373.
Fillimore, Major, 2477.
Kennedy, R. H., 4075.
Mullock, T. A., 2300.
Ottawa, 3586.
Spiddel, Rev. J. A., 3097, 3541.
Quebec, in, 479, 491, 498, 3281.
Unfit men, of, 3251.
Western provinces, in, 3550.
Rifle practice, 3517.
Soldiers
Ballots for, 673.
Barbour, Private, death of, 3417.
Chute, Lieutenant A. H., 2476.
Civil Service—appointment of to, 642, 1276.
Curry, Private D., death of, 2987, 3049.
Deceased, estates of, 4075.
Decorations, record of, 1969.
Dependents of, allowances to. *See* Allowances.
Disabled, provision for, 105, 108, 110, 158, 2873, 3334.
Discharge of, 3230.
Employment of
In England, 995, 1371.
On farms, 3589, 4129.
Equipment of, 3502-3528.
Private subscriptions for, 590.
Grenier, Private Adolphe, 3559.
Hayes, Joseph, charges against, 306, 400.
Homes for, 1657, 1662.
Illiterate, 1904.
Insane, 1659, 1664.

Army—*Con.*
Intoxicating liquor, use of by, 756, 803.
Kits. *See* war supplies.
Mail matter for, 532, 2051, 2053.
Medical examination of, 4069, 4125.
Pay of, 552, 1162.
Punishment of, 3051, 3099, 3230, 3257, 3525, 3537.
Railway fares, for
Return, 2646.
Single, 3594.
Special, 2549.
Relatives of, payments to, 3560.
Return tickets for, 2646.
Returned, provision for, 233, 237, 1638.
Riots, participation in, 756, 803, 855, 2548.
Special railway rates, for, 2549.
Stedman, Robert E., 3232.
Stewart, Corporal, death of, 2443.
Technical training for, 1618, 1626.
Voting of, 3511.
Working in England, 995, 1371.
Troops
Local, supplies to, 552, 851, 968, 1042, 1043, 1077, 1349, 2172.
Mobilization of, 288, 302.
Transportation of, 35, 58, 2693.
Woodmen's Regiment, 1117.
13th C.M.R.—commanding officer, 1329.
40th Battalion, 1043.
68th Battalion, 2695.
101st Battalion, 3548.
102nd Battalion, 1041.
104th Battlaion—medical officer, 1161.
106th Regiment—supplies, 851, 1042, 1077, 1349, 2172.
109th Battalion—separation allowances, 2348.
151st Battalion, recruiting of, 1372.
159th Battalion, 1435.
163rd Battalion, 4152.
191st Battalion, 1329.
206th Battalion, 2167.
See also War *and* Militia.

Astronomical observatory, western, 2430, 2871.

Astronomical surveys. *See* surveys.

Auditor General, salary of, 657.

Aviation, 2895, 2898, 2900.

Baddeck, wharf, 548.

Badger, W., employment of, 1439.

Baleine, steamship, 3676.

Bank Act Amendment Bills
Interest on deposits, 1r., 2599.
Loans to farmers, Res., 674. 1r., 681. 2r., 924. Ref. to Com., 937. Com., 1611. 3r., 1714. Sen. Amdts., 3147.

Banks and banking
Dominion notes, advances of, 592.
Nationalization of, 1834.
Paper currency, issue of, 1834.
Savings deposits, rate of interest on, 543.
Taxes payable by banks, 2176, 2478.

Barnard, Mr. Geo. H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Pelagic Sealing Commission, 3025.
Shipbuilding, 4057.

Bateman, Captain John, employment of, 545.

Battle of St. Julien—commemoration of anniversary, 3026.

Bay Fortune breakwater, 3635.

Bay St. Lawrence telegraph office, 1551.

Bear River, N.S.—public building site, 1164.

Beehan, J. J., employment of, 3408.

Beland, Dr. H. S., detention of in Germany, 806, 1274.
Payment of sessional indemnity to, 3873.

Bellemare, Mr. A. (Maskinongé)
Bilingual question, the, 3824.
Budget, 1034.
Canada and the war, 1034.
Our national security, 1035.
Intercolonial railway—sleepers, 549.
Rivière du Loup
Dredging, 2477.
Wharf, 2543.

Bennett, D. D., 1759.

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Bilingual question, the, 3812.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—loan to, proposed, 3945.
Grain
Congestion in the West, 3883.
Transportation of, 3077.
Interior Department expenditure, 2091.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2210.
Saskatchewan Judges' salaries, 2071.
Seed Grain indebtedness, 510.
Shell contracts, 1565.
Technical education, 2206.

Bennett, Mr. Wm. H. (East Simcoe)
Mail contracts, 2615.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2449.
Political patronage, 1363.
Shipbuilding, 3127.
War supplies—Securing of, orders for, 971.
Woman suffrage, 1195.

Berlin, Ont.
Aliens, registration of, 542.
Disturbances at, 855.

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Enlistment of Post office employees, 1761.
Genest, Mr. S. M., employment of, 885.
Mail contracts, 2613.
Railways—passenger service, 3422.
Taxation of apples, 1786.

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Aliens, naturalization of, 2922.
Capital punishment, 39, 558, 1956, 1968.

Big Island mail service, 549.

Bilingual question, the, 482-490, 1206, 1810, 1833, 3618, 3676, 3734.

Blades, Captain Charles, employment of, 545.

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Governing Council of the Salvation Army in Canada, 2907.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1891.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2906.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1888.

Blondin, Hon. P. E. (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Mines Department
Estimates, 2326.
Reports, 2336.
Peat, 2329.

Blue River M. & L. Company, 1076.

Boivin, Mr. Geo. H. (Shefford)
Bilingual question, 1206, 3808.
British Columbia Companies Act, 3561.
Farnham Experimental farm, 3407.
Fenian Raid Bounty, 3231.
Hogs, smuggling of into Canada, 4099.
Judges
Montreal, 2301.
Quebec, 2692.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2356.
Quebec referee on butter and cheese, 3942.
Victoria Memorial Museum, specimens for, 2343, 2345.

Bonaventure
Inspectors of weights and measures, 671.
Mail service, 1438, 2172.

Boots, army. *See* War Supplies.

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 22.
Decease of members, 22.
Government expenditures, 23.
Commandeering of wheat, 23.
The war situation, 23.
Canadian forces, 24, 31.
Conscription, 26.

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
War commissions, appointment of, 26.
Visit to Great Britain, 27.
Production of munitions and supplies, 28.
Transportation, 29.
Purchase of horses, 30.
Spirit of the Allies, 30.
Address to His Majesty the King, 636, 755.
Aliens, supervision of, 690.
Army
Badges, 3509.
Canadian forces, 24, 31.
Casualty lists, 3280, 3293.
Clothing, 3527.
Commissions, granting of, 3510.
Conscription, 26.
Dental corps, 3237, 4129.
Medical corps, 3236.
Military decorations, 3294.
Officers
Political activities of, 3541.
Training of, 3533.
Overseas forces, equipment of, 3504, 3515.
Recruiting, 3289, 3587, 4125.
Soldiers
Civil Service—appointment to, 650.
Deceased, estates of, 4095.
Dependents of, allowances to, 4105.
Discharge of, 3230.
Employment of on farms, 4129.
Equipment of, 3502, 3528.
Homes, for, 1662.
Pensions. *See* Pensions.
Punishment of, 3231, 3525, 3537.
Return tickets for, 2646.
Riots, participation in, 756.
Voting of, 3511.
Battle of St. Julien—commemoration of anniversary, 3026.
Beland, Dr., detention of in Germany, 806.
Bilingual question, 3619, 3690.
Brantford, city of, 2664.
Cable and wireless rates, 672.
Cadet service, 3502.
Calgary, alleged disturbances at, 756.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3945.
Canadian Red Cross Society, 1325, 1492, 2014.
Canals, patrolling of, 3591.
Censored mail matter, 3029, 3050.
Chairman of Committee, appointment of, 531.
Civil Service
Appointment of soldiers to, 650.
Enlistments from, 822, 824.

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*
Civil Service Commission, 665.
Constitutional Documents, publication of, 976.
Currie, General, 2351.
Davidson Commission, 2399, 4006.
Daylight saving, 4006.
Economic and Development Commission, 3641.
External affairs, Department of, 1207.
Fair wages boards, 1277.
Government expenditures, 974, 976.
Governor General—Correction of press statement, 2443.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3577, 3662.
Gratuities to public servants, 3535.
High Commissioner, Canadian, 664, 667, 956.
Home Guard, 3504.
Hospitals, military, 3236.
House of Commons
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 1329.
Business of the House, 1208.
Clerk assistant, appointment of, 884.
Hansard, alleged omission from, 2648.
Mace, the, 762.
Morning sittings, 2111, 2924.
Two o'clock sittings, 3294.
Immigration—widows and children, 1330.
Imperial Munitions Board, 594, 804, 923, 1509.
Intercolonial railway—return tickets for soldiers, 2646.
International Joint Commission, 980.
Law, the late Mr. B. B., M.P., death of, 590.
Meredith-Duff. Commission—printing of evidence, 4130.
Militia and Defence Department estimates, 3502, 3537, 3586.
Minister of Munitions, 532.
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 686, 956.
National Transcontinental Railway, Government operation of, 2399.
Naval Service, 1689, 1763, 2545.
Nickel, exportation of, 2166.
Ottawa buildings, height of, 2166.
Parliament
Extension of term of, 622, 4077.
See also Address to His Majesty the King.
Independence of—subscriptions to Dominion loan, 755.
Railways, jurisdiction respecting, 947.
Parliament Buildings
Destruction of, 578, 582.
Messages of sympathy, 855.
Report of Chief Commissioner of Police, 669.

Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister) —*Con.*
Parliament Buildings—*Con.*
Reconstruction of, 591, 663, 2013, 2014.
Committee of members on, 3050.
Pensions to soldiers, 1659, 1989, 4131, 4150.
Political patronage, 3288, 3544.
Post Office Department expenditure, 1887.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1441. 2351.
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2530.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4048.
Railways
Location of, 2750.
Oil for fuel on, 977.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2750.
Remounts for Canadian forces, 950.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3502.
Shell Committee. *See* Shell contracts.
Shipbuilding, 4052.
Solicitor General, 667.
Tupper, late Right Hon. Sir Charles, Bart, 39, 582.
Vessels, Canadian, requisitioning of, 1970.
Vickers-Maxim Ltd., strike at, 1764.
War
Appropriations, 3233, 3287, 3533.
Purchasing Commission, 1279.
War Supplies
Ammunition, 28, 106.
British Government, for, 957-973.
French Government, for, 973.
Horses, 30, 542, 652, 653, 758, 950, 1041.
Issues of to Canadian troops, 968.
Machine guns, contributions for, 3291, 3522.
Orders for, securing of, 957-973.
Ross rifles, 3505-3522, 4106, 4107.
Russian Government, for, 973.
Shell contracts—proposed committee of, investigation into, 1505, 2442, 2920, 2985, 3477.
Small arms ammunition, 2302, 3890.
Water powers
Control of, 556.
Ownership of, 760.
Wheat, commandeering of, 23.
Winnipeg, disturbances at, 2548.
Woman suffrage, 1203.

Boots, purchase of. *See* War supplies.

Boucher, Dr., complaints against, 1550.

Boulay, Mr. H. (Rimouski)
Agriculture, 1395.
Budget, 1079.
Reply to Mr. Lanctot, 1079.
Immigration, 1080.
Germans in the public service, 1081.

Boulay, Mr. H. (Rimouski)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
French-Canadian and enlistment, 1081.
Government expenditure, 1082.
Censors and decipherers, 2476.
Civil Service
Appointments to, 650, 666.
Examinations, 2478.
French-Canadians in, 1176.
Soldiers, appointment of, to, 650.
Enlistment of Jews, 1550.
French-Canadians in Civil Service, 1176
Gulf fisheries guardian, 548.
Haanel, Dr., employment of, 851.
Intercolonial railway
Dining car service, 2420.
Express service, 2420.
Operation of, 2595.
Passenger service, 3421.
Interior Department, expenditure, 2095.
Life-saving stations, 2916.
Military Hospital Commission, 2347.
Mining products, export of, 1161.
Ottawa Citizen—statements of, 807.
Penitentiaries, 2121.
Pilotage, 751.
Political patronage, 1377.
Post office employees, 1906.
Potato inspectors, 951.
Quebec steamship service, 2852, 2855.
Rimouski and Matane, enlistments from, 2301.
Rimouski harbour improvements, 3175.
Soldiers, appointment of to Civil Service, 650.
Wheat, free, 1060.

Boundary surveys. *See* surveys.

Bourassa, Henri, alleged disloyal utterances of, 356, 363, 379.

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Gely, Aurele, employment of, 1759.
Lévis
Drill hall, 2173.
Military property, lease of, 2922.
Quarantine station, 2011, 3352.

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Dempsey, Ernest, stone purchased from, 3098.
Macdonald, Archibald, 2694.
Maple sugar industry, 2159.
Monpetit, Eleazer, 2694.
Nickle export, 2799.
Rigaud-Pointe Fortune mail route, 541, 595.
Soulanges Canal, 1041, 1437, 1760.

Boys, Mr. W. A. (S. Simcoe)
Shell contracts, 2249.

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Political patronage, 1365.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2928.
Selkirk barracks, 1385.
Sweeney, Mr.—statement of Mr. Turriff, 1156.

Brandt, Peter, employment of, 832.

Breen's pond breakwater, 1438.

Bristol, Mr. Edward (Toronto Centre)
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2470.

British Columbia
Goods shipped to via Panama Canal, 4092.
Indian Commission, 852.
Labourers, importation of, 1329.
Lighthouse service, 3352.
102nd Battalion, mobilization of, 1041.
Public works—dredging, 1077.
Resources and production of, 3842.
Sealers, claims of, 595.

British Columbia Companies Act, 3561.

British North America Act, proposed amendment. *See* Parliament, extension of term of.

British Remount Commission, 2799.

Broad Cove Marsh wharf, 3557.

Broder, Mr. Andrew (Dundas)
Shell contracts, 2519.

Bromptonville mail service, 3562.

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Medicine Hat)
Alberta farmers, relief for, 532.
Aliens, interned, as farm labourers, 2649.
Army
13th C.M.R.—commanding officer, 1329.
191st Battalion, 1329.
British Columbia copper refineries and zinc smelter, 2799.
Budget, 915.
Alberta and the war, 915.
Taxation, 916.
Duty on apples, 916.
Political patronage, 917.
Marketing of wheat, 917.
Western farm problems, 919.
Grain elevators, 920.
Carslake hotel property, 3562.
Casualty lists, 3029.
Experimental farms, 1407.
Farm labour, 1906, 2649.
Flax industry, 1293.
Fruitgrowing, 1407.
Grain
Elevators, 532, 920, 1609.
Marketing of, 917.
Shipments on Transcontinental railway, 1276.

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Medicine Hat) —*Con.*
Grain—*Con.*
Transportation, 1308.
Wheat, commandeering of, 3222, 3226.
Grazing leases, 847.
Iimmigration—Austrian and German, 547.
Indian Lands Commission, 2057, 2867.
Irrigation, 842.
Lethbridge,
Immigration agent, 2695.
Internment camp supplies, 2011.
Post office, 2800.
Loans to farmers, 550, 679.
Medicine Hat
Customs building, 1440.
Eagle Butte mail service, 534.
Overseas regiment, 1435.
Post office, 534.
Pre-emptions, payments on, 534.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 638, 2357.
Railways, guarantees to, 887.
Roseberg post office, 2474.
Seed grain,
Distribution, 2862.
Purchase of, 886.
Taber irrigation district, 2807.
Taxation of apples, 1775.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2903, 2906.
Transcontinental railway—grain shipments on, 1276.
War supplies
Alberta purchases, 3232.
Hay, 2298.
Oats, 2298.
Purchasing agents, 3528.
Wool, exportation of, 2058.

Budget debate, 807, 889, 989, 1015, 1079, 1118, 1137, 1209, 1228. *See* Taxation.

Buffalo in parks, 845.

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Marchand, Zepherin, fuel purchased from, 3098.
Mines Department expenditure, 2341.
National Transcontinental Railway, Government operation of, 2593.
Ontario Hydro-Radial scheme and French Members, 1432.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1491.

Burleigh expedition, 853.

Burleigh falls, lease of, 2583. *See* Water-powers.

Burnham, Mr. John H. (Peterborough West)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 372.
The Opposition and the war, 372-376.
Nationalists, and political parties, 377.
Statement of Mr. Armand Lavergne, 377.
Civil Service, appointment of ex-soldiers to, 649.
Labour bureaus, national, 610.
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 377.
Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Railway Company, 2458.
Peterborough public building, 2810.
Political patronage in military affairs, 1363, 3253, 3542.
Post Office
Mail contracts, 2725.
Rural mail service, 2621.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2480.
Railways
Departmental estimates, 3063.
Nationalization of, 3364.
Recruiting, alleged opposition to, 1607.
Soldiers
Appointments to Civil Service, 649.
Illiterate, 1904.
Taxation of land, 2000.
Technical education, 1628, 2200.
Toronto Star—statements of, 555.
Trade policies, 1618.
Trent canal, 2580.

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 313.
Canadians and the war, 313.
The Davidson Commission, 315.
Purchase of submarines, 316-319.
Hay contracts, 320-335.
Printing—proposed reduction in cost, 4154.
Submarines, purchase of, 316-319.

Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3638.

Business Profits War Tax Bill, 1r., 2298. 2r., 2601. Com., 2636, 2649. 3r., 2802.

Cables. *See* Telegraphs.

Calgary, alleged disturbances at, 756, 803.

Campbellton
Alleged disturbances at, 756, 803, 855, 945.
Gaspé steamship service, 536, 3100.
Proposed bridge, 3628.
Public building, 1162.
Railway superintendent, 535.
Soldiers' accommodation at, 1162.

Canada Car and Foundry Company, payments to, 1078.

Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill, 1r., 1603. 2r., 1706. Com., 1706, 1971. 3r., 1971.

Canada Peat Society, 2329.

Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills.
Certificated motor boats, 1r., 2346. 2r., 2802. Com., 2885. 3r., 2956.
Coasting, 1r., 589. 2r., 1300-1305. Com., 1305. Ref. to Com., 2496. Com., 4128. 3r., 4128.
Pilotage, 1r., 2542. 2r., 2804. Com., 2804, 2885. 3r., 2956.

Canada Temperance Act Amendment Bill, 1r., 2878. 2r., 3298. Com., 3298. 3r., 3303.

Canadian Associated Press, 3638.

Canadian Manufacturers Association and war supplies, 159.

Canadian Northern Railway Company
Audit of revenues and expenditures, 3989.
Director of, 2648.
Loan to, proposed, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3826, 3933, 3943.
Rates on oil, 3410.
Snow blockade on, 2647.
Subsidies and guarantees to, 1042.

Canadian Pacific Railway
Freight congestion on, 2742.
Subsidies and guarantees to, 1042.

Canadiana Red Cross Society Amendment Bill. 1r., 1325. 2r., 1493. Com., 2014. 3r., 2015.

Canadian Transport Service, 2888.

Canals, 1712, 3609.
Patrolling of, 3519. *For individual canals, see their titles.*

Cap a la Roche channel, 761.

Cape Breton, dredging, 2172.

Cape Negro island lighthouse, 544.

Capital Punishment Abolition Bill. 1r., 391. 2r., 1957. Div., 1968.

Carkner, W. Lloyd, employment of, 1169.

Carleton Beach protection works, 536.

Carleton Drug Company, purchases from, 2542.

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 363.
Nationalists and the war—Bourassa and Lavergne, 363.
Loyalty of French-Canadians, 365.
The Shell Committee, 366.
Enlistments, 367.

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)—*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
Naval policy, 368.
Political patronage, 368.
Technical education, 370.
Divorce, 777.
Enlistments, 367.
Glace Bay mail service, 533.
Louisburg, censors and decoders at, 1808.
Naval Service, 1693.
Political patronage, 368.
Shell Committee, The, 366.
Shipbuilding, encouragement of, 712, 4065.
South Cape Breton, enlistments in, 2547.
Sydney Pilotage Commission, 986.

Carslake hotel property, 3562.

Carson, General John, position of, 851.

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 236.
The financial situation, 236.
Provision for returning soldiers, 237.
Naval affairs, 238.
War contracts, 238-275.
Davidson Commission, 266-274.
Political patronage and the war, 276.
Allison, Colonel J. Wesley, 1355, 1358.
See also Shell contracts.
Army
Enlistment of minors, 3049.
Officers, Canadian, in England.
102nd Battalion, 1041.
Soldiers
Pay of, 1162.
Returning, provision for, 237.
British Columbia—102nd Battalion, 1041.
Censoring of mail matter, 2880.
Cold storage, 1427.
Desks, purchases of, 1279.
Experimental farms, 1387, 1410.
Fish and fisheries—salmon, 2394.
Flax expert, 2348.
Fraudulent questions, 1492.
Hay contracts. *See* war supplies.
Indians, 2674.
Motor car—Pierce Arrow—purchase of, 1327.
Munitions inspectors, 2006.
Owen, James W., patent of, 1158.
Patent rights—extension of, 1158.
Personal explanation—shell deliveries, 2240.
Political patronage, 276, 1353, 1361.
Potatoes
Powdry scab, 1416.
Shipment regulations, 1412.
St. John and Quebec railway, 1433, 3015.

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)—*Con.*
St. John harbour improvements, 730-738.
St. John Valley Railway, 757, 1908, 1945.
Scammell, J. K., position of, 1157.
Stewart, J. H.—automobile seizure, 1438.
Surveys, 1323.
Taxation
Oil, 1804.
Profits, 1892, 1897, 1994, 1998.
Technical education, 370.
Victoria, B.C.—coal for dredges, 546.
War
Investigations, 265-276.
Submarines, 266.
Purchasing Commission, 1279, 1907.
War supplies
Bandages, 1354.
Bayonets, 1761.
Binoculars, 1353.
Clothing, 1356.
Hay, 255-265, 1422, 2543.
Horses, 267-270.
Lumber, 1354.
Motor trucks, 1358.
Munition contracts, 235.
Pistols, 270-274, 1358.
Ross rifle, 1359.
Shell contracts, 238-255, 683, 803, 1523, 1552, 1609, 3404, 3464, 3498.
Small arms ammunition, 2168, 2881, 3908.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 1278.
New Zealand purchases, 1278, 1438.

Casgrain, Hon. T. Chase (Postmaster General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 40.
Canada's war forces, 40.
Patriotic meetings in Quebec, 41.
French-Canadians in active service, 42.
Attitude of Le Devoir, 43.
Germanic aims, 44.
Heroism of France, 45.
Overseas Dominions and the war, 46.
Annuities, Government, 2735.
Bilingual question, 3620, 3709.
Canadian military forces, 40.
French-Canadians in military service, 42.
Montreal postal service, 2031, 2037.
Pilot, wreck of the, 106.
Post office
Censoring of mail matter, 2880.
Department estimates, 663, 2016, 2716, 3934.
Employees, 2029.
Letters for soldiers, 2051, 2053.
Mail service on the Transcontinental, 2051.

Casgrain, Hon. T. Chase (Postmaster General)—*Con.*
Post Office—*Con.*
Parcel post, 2736.
Railway mail service, 2023, 2051.
Revenue, 532.
Rural mail service, 2017, 2032, 2040, 2052.
Quebec
Patriotic meetings in, 41.
Postal service, 2035.
Railways, acquisition of, 4001.
Soldiers' letters, postage on, 532.
Casualty lists. *See* Army
Cattle. *See* Agriculture.
Censoring of mail matter. *See* Post office.
Censors and decoders, 640, 851, 1808, 2476.
Census—population of Canada, 1277.
Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker.
Chandler wharf, 3161.
Chaplains. *See* Army.
Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Public works employees at, 2799.
Chatham, N.B.
Local freight at, 1705.
Train service, 3394.
China, Canada's trade with, 344. *See* Trade and commerce.
Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Cape Breton—dredging, 2172.
Eastern harbour—dredging expenditure, 760, 853.
Fish and fisheries
Bait, 2387.
Dogfish, 2405.
Trawlers, beam, 760.
Halifax terminals, 885.
Indians, 2671.
Intercolonial railway—passenger service, 3428.
Inverness
Mail service, 2718.
Post offices, 1550.
Public works expenditures, 853.
Margaree harbour
Removal of wreckage, 717.
Wharf, 739.
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2854.
Port Hood wharf, 760.
Sick Mariners Fund, 752.
Temiskaming dam, 2546.
Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)
Antigonish
Fishery officer, 552.
Post offices, 552.
River guardians, 552.
Station garden, 2057, 3593, 3603.
Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)—*Con.*
Arisaig lightkeeper, 1808.
Breen's pond breakwater, 1438.
Broad Cove Marsh wharf, 3557.
Cape St. George lightkeepers, 727.
Coal mining, government control of, 719.
Cribbin's Point wharf, 1438.
Ferguson, Mr. T. R., employment of, 885.
Fish and fisheries
Dogfish, 2408.
Fishermen, medical treatment for, 2414.
Transportation, 2415.
Lobsters, 2370, 2391.
Indians, enlisted, 3407.
Intercolonial railway
Fish on, 2479, 2415.
Locomotives, 3067.
Management, 3092.
Passenger service, 3421.
Nova Scotia public works, 3149.
Pope, Sir Joseph, 2924.
Public works, expenditure on, 3319.
Spidal, J. A., 3541.
Tibbits, Archibald, employment of, 1439.
Tracadie harbour improvements, 1438, 3149.
Civil Service
Appointments to, 948, 1148, 1149, 4089.
Auditor General, salary of, 657.
Commission, 664, 665.
Deputy Ministers, salaries of, 659, 983.
Dorchester county appointments, 2921.
Employees in Government Departments, 3674.
Enlistments from, 655, 817-826, 1044, 1761.
Examinations, 2478.
French-Canadians in, 1176, 2006.
Generally, 658.
Lower grade employees, pay of, 4079.
Messengers, 2743, 2765.
Ministers, salaries of, 667.
Public Works Department clerks, 3096.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4079.
Soldiers, appointment of to, 642, 1276.
Wives of enlisted Civil Servants, allowances to, 3232.
Clark, Mr. Hugh (North Bruce)
Bilingual question, the, 3796.
Printing—proposed reduction in cost, 4152.
Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 32.
Tribute to Governor General, 32.
Western production and prices, 33.
Free wheat, 33.
Question of a general election, 34.
Delay in getting troops to the front, 35.

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)—*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
Government's war expenditures, 36.
Sir Wilfrid Laurier's patriotism, 37.
Free wheat, 33.
House of Commons—morning sittings, 2112.
Loans—Dominion, $75,000,000, 1839.
Political partyism in war time, 3275.
Taxation of apples, 1765, 2308.
Troops, transportation of, 35.
War
Appropriations, 3275.
Expenditure, 36.
Woman suffrage, 1197.

Clements, Mr. Herbert (Comox-Atlin)
Dredging, Victoria—graft charges, 2398.

Coal. *See* Mines.

Coasting trade. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills and Steamship service.

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Hudson Bay Navigation—Anderson report, 636.
Transcona railway shops, lease of, 636.

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 57.
Canada and the war, 57.
Transportation of troops, 58.
Achievments of British fleet, 58.
British forces, 58.
Conscription, 59, 65.
Canadians at the front, 60.
Great Britain's sacrifices for the war, 60.
Resources of Great Britain, 61.
Australians and the war, 61.
India and the war, 62.
Ireland and the war, 62.
Present war conditions, 63.
Supreme efforts necessary, 66.
Brantford, city of, 947, 1625.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3850.
Conscription, 59, 65.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3850.
Taxation of profits, 2002.
War
British fleet, 58.
British forces, 58.
Canadians at the front, 60.
Transportation of troops, 58.

Cold storage. *See* Agriculture.

Cole falls water-power, 842.

Cole Harbour wharf, 758, 3150.

Coloured men, enlistment of. *See* Army.

Commissions. *See individual titles*

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Conscription. *See* Army

Conservation Commission, 977.

Constitutional documents, 976.

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland, N.B.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 403.
The Government and the war, 403.
Shell contracts, 405, 409.
The Minister of Militia, 407.
Recruiting and pensions, 408.
Selection of officers, 410.
Hay contracts, 410.
Extension of term of parliament, 413.
Amherst
Military barracks, 2300, 2600.
War supplies, purchases of at, 3266.
Burleigh expedition, 853.
Experimental farms, 1402.
Ferguson, Dr., 1042.
Fillimore, Major, 2477.
Fish and fisheries
Gasolene, 2393.
Inspectors, 2392.
Lobsters, 2371.
Patrol service, 2413.
Hay compressing contracts, 537.
Hogs, slaughtering of at Amherst, 2174.
Immigration, 2106.
Indians, 2679.
Intercolonial railway
Employees, 3097, 3401.
Equipment, 3606.
Freight, handling of, 2742.
Operation, 3398.
Sackville spur line, 3611.
Train service, 3397.
Truro-Moncton section, 3352.
Militia, Minister of—trips to England, in 1914 and 1915, 2425.
Moncton—Main Street subway, 3024.
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, 3025.
Officers, military, selection of, 410.
Parliament, extension of term of, 413.
Penitentiaries, 2122, 2149.
Pensions, 408.
Political patronage, 1364, 1366, 3266.
Potatoes, inspection of, 1419.
Prince Edward Island car ferry service, 3393.
Recruiting, 408.
Rural mail service, 2730.

Copp, Mr. A. B. (Westmorland, N.B.)—*Con.*
Sackville
Public building, 2816.
Wharf accommodation, 3160.
St. John Valley Railway, 1941.
Seffington, George, 1437.
Sharpe, Colonel Samuel, M.P., 2924.
Stewart, Corporal D., death of, 2443.
Taxation of profits, 1853.
War appropriations, 3265.
War supplies
Hay, 410, 2968.
Shell contracts, 405.

Cost of Living Commission, 852, 1216.

Courts. *See* Justice

Cribbin's Point wharf, 1438.

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
Abolition of Capital Punishment. 1r., 39. 2r., 1957. Div., 1968.
Bigamy, 1r., 1040.

Crothers, Hon. Thos. W. (Minister of Labour)
Fair wages clause in munitions contracts, 3555.
Globe newspaper, statements of, 1811.
Labour
Bureaus, national, 604.
Department estimates, 3555.
Soldiers returned, provision for, 1638.
Technical education, 535, 1636, 2187.
White phosphorus matches, 989, 1493, 1615.

Cruise, Mr. Robt. (Dauphin)
Elliott, Dr. H. H., employment of, 553.
Free wheat, 1052.
Grain congestion in the West, 3882.
Manitoba school lands, 3675.
Timber protection, 839.

Currie, General, at St. Julien, 2351.

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Budget, 989.
The financial situation, 990.
Taxation proposals, 990.
Germany's commercial policy, 991.
The war and Imperial unity, 992.
Mobilization and training of Canadian forces, 993.
Soldiers—employment of in England, 995.
Experiences in the trenches, 995.
Food and clothing of the soldiers, 997.
Promotions in the army, 998.
The Battle of St. Julien, 999.
National service in France, 1002.
Organization of our industries, 1004.
Public printing—proposed reduction in cost, 3875.

Currie, Lieutenant Colonel John A. (North Simcoe)—*Con.*
Rifles, 3518.
Rifle practice, 3517.
Soldiers
Employment of in England, 995.
Punishment of, 3525.
Training of, 3517.

Customs
Agricultural implements, duty on, 4068.
Bonding privileges, 4097.
Department
Estimates, 661.
Staff and salaries, 661, 3644.
Free entry of goods, 3644.
Minister of—visit to New York, 2012.
Smuggling, 642, 4099.

Customs Tariff Act Amendment Bill. Res. 1764. 1r., 1842. 2r., 2303. Com., 2303. 3r., 2361.

Daigle, Zepherin, employment of, 2922.

Dairying. *See* Agriculture.

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
Apples, duty on, 1092.
Budget, 1088.
Party tactics, 1088.
Party policies contrasted, 1089.
The farmers and fishermen, 1091.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 1091.
The tariff on apples, 1092.
Reduction of government expenditure, 1092.
Taxation features of the Budget, 1090.
Dogfish, 2408.
Indians, 2670.
Intercolonial railway—branch lines, 2775.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2223.
Taxation of apples, 1092.

Davidson Commission
Appointment of counsel, 4006.
Printing of evidence of, 4130.
Report of, 3188. *See also* Shell contracts.

Daylight saving, 4006.

Debates. *See* House of Commons, Hansard.

Delisle, Mr. Michel (Portneuf)
Commercial agents, 1653.
Inland Revenue Department, appointments to, 2175.
Neuville lighthouse, 593.
Port Marcotte, 2171.
Valcartier camp, 2174.
Vallyfield breakwater, 2694.
Weights and measures, inspectors of, 2475.

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 529.
French-Canadian Conservative representation in the Cabinet, 529.
Hay contracts, 530.
Loyalty of French-Canadian people, 530.
Ham, Mrs. Berlington, 949.
Hay contracts, 530.
Lasoski, Max, 949.

Dempsey, Ernest, stone purchased from, 3098.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. E. N. Rhodes), rulings and statements of
Adjournment motion, 3405.
Amendments irrelevant, 1712, 1714.
Bills not to be introduced by resolution, 3617.
Committee of Supply, powers of, 3944.
Irrelevancy, 975, 1645, 1834, 3548.
Motion for Committee to rise not in order, 2453.
Unparliamentary expressions, 4035.

Derby junction railway improvements, 3393.

Descarries, Mr. Joseph A. (Jacques Cartier)
Montreal island, bridge connection with, 3629.
Petroleum, 2648.
Quebec highways, 3169.
Whistling of vessels, 3612.

Devenish, Mr., employment of, 638.

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 337.
Purchase of submarines, 337.
Canada's financial and trade conditions, 339-346.
The Shell Committee, 346-350.
Agricultural products, export of, 345.
Berlin, Ont.—registration of aliens, 542.
Bilingual question, the, 3684.
Civil Service, enlistments from, 823.
Fish, Canadian, in England, 2741.
Pay and Record Office, Canadian, 3024.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2359.
Public works—buildings, 341.
Shell Committee, The, 346-350.
Submarines, purchase of, 337.
Taxation, 339.
Trade and Commerce—China, United States, 344.
Transport, director of, 3096.
War supplies, director of, 3096.
Woman suffrage, 1203.

Digby Gap submarine bell, 1276.

Dingwall, N.S., postmaster, 1160.

D'Israeli government wharf, 3562.

Divorce cases, procedure in, 595, 762-792.

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Aliens, naturalization of, 2922.
Bilingual question, the, 1833, 3802.
Canadian Law Library in London, 987.
Canada Temperance Act Amdt., 2878, 3298.
Capital punishment, 1956, 1967.
Divorce, 781.
Exchequer Court Act, 3404.
Gratuities to public servants, 3536.
Judges' salaries, 2319, 2323.
Judicial vacancies, Quebec, 924.
Justice
Department
Estimates, 983, 2115.
Staff and salaries, 983.
Indeterminate sentences, 2845.
Penitentiaries
Kingston, 2115, 2133.
Prison reform, 2841-2846.
Prisoners from in military service, 2117.
St. Vincent de Paul, 2118.
Ticket of leave system, 2117.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1901, 2478, 2494, 2550-2569, 2696-2716, 2758-2765, 2882, 2946-2956, 4127.
Provincial legislation, reports on, 988.
Ross, W. T., release of, 2302.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2065, 2318, 2940.
Saskatchewan Judges' salaries, 2071-2078.
Shell contracts, 3487.
Small arms ammunition, 3914.
Solicitor General, office of, 985.
Thompson, Mr., 922.
Vickers-Maxim Ltd., strike at, 1764.
White phosphorous matches, 1616.
Winding-up Act, 1548, 1616.

Dominion Lands and Parks.
Administration of, 2079.
Estimates, 817-850.
Forest protection, 838, 850, 2088, 3412.
Homestead inspectors, 828, 832.
Pre-emptions, payments on, 534.
Purchase of property, 2864.
Surveys. *See that title.*
Timber areas, 836.

Douglas, Mr. James (Strathcona)
Amherst barracks, 1433.
Banks, taxes payable by, 2176.
Canada Car and Foundry Company, 1078.
Forest protection, 2087.
French-Canadian Battalion, 1373.
Killam, Alta., mail service, 1438.
Lands, western, survey of, 834.
Loans to farmers, 930.

Douglas, Mr. James (Strathcona)—*Con.*
151st Battalion—recruiting of, 1372.
Recruiting, 3592.
Officers, 1372.
Political patronage in, 1372.
Taxation of, apples, 1781.
Wetaskiwin settlers, grievances of, 2088.

Drab, Max, employment of, 1439.

Dredging. *See* Public Works.

Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 1161, 1610.

Dunvegan railway, 2081.

Dyes, shortage of, 3553.

Eastern Harbour dredging, 853.

East Gore mail service, 3353.

Economic and Development Commission, 1640, 2999, 3641.

Edmonton
Disturbances at, 8837.
Recruiting in, 3586.
Technical school, 649.

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, 2081, 3445.

Edwards, Mr. John W. (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 351.
War contracts, 352.
Enlistments by provinces, 360.
Churches and the war, 355.
Canada and Imperialism, 360.
The British Navy, 356.
Disloyal utterances in Quebec—Bourassa and Lavergne, 356.
Orangemen in army service, 359.
Army
Chaplains, 2171.
Enlistments, 360, 362, 3025.
Orangemen in, 359.
Bilingual question, the, 3747.
Hay contracts, 353.
Horses for war purposes, 353.
Immigration Department expenditure, 2109.
Kingston harbour improvements, 3182.
Lavergne, Lieut.-Col. Armand, 541.
Penitentiaries
Kingston, 2118, 2123, 2146.
Portsmouth, 541.
Prison reform, 2845.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2223. 2494.
Rifles, 3507, 3522.
Royal Military College, 362, 2172, 2831.
Rural mail service, 2043.
Trade and commerce, 3018.
Transportation, ocean, 703.

Electoral lists, printing of, 3099.

Electricity, export of, 671.

Elevators, grain. *See* grain.

Elliot, Dr. H. H., employment of, 553.

Employment. *See* Labour.

Estimates. *See titles of departments and subjects.*
Supplementary, 2646, 2798.

Esquimalt dockyards, 2889.

Ethier, Mr. Joseph A. C. (Two Mountains)
Automobiles for Militia Department, 2544.
Budget, 1269.
Taxation of profits, 1269.
Compulsory military service, 1272.
Farm help, 1272.
Political patronage in war time, 1273.
Germans in the public service, 1274.
Mr. Edwards and the French-Canadians, 1275.
Canada, population of, 1277.
Civil Service messengers, 2743, 2765.
Conscription, 1272.
Paquette, Edward, enlistment of, 2241, 2648.
Secretary of State Department, translators in, 3231.

Evans, A. A.,
Employment of, 1439.
Payments to, 1653.

Exchequer Court Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 3404. 2r., Com., 3502. 3r., 3502.

Exhibitions, 1429, 1432, 3026.

Experimental farms.. *See* agriculture.

External Affairs, Department of, 1207.

Fallis, Mr., profits of, 1259.

Farmers
Compensation for destroyed cattle, 2957.
Credits for, 1025, 1842, 2401.
Labourers, 1272, 1906.
Loans to, 463, 674, 681, 924-936, 1611, 3146. *See* Bank Act Amendment Bill.
Relief to, 432, 760, 2860, 3938. *See* Seed grain.
Rural credits. *See* credits.

Farmers Bank, depositors of, 544.

Farnham, Quebec
Experimental farm, 3407.
Military camp, 1164.

Federal Plan Commission, 1603, 3135, 3640.

Fenian Raid bounty, 593, 3231.

Ferguson, Mr. T. R., employment of, 885.

Fertilizers—Dogfish, 2404.

Field kitchens. *See* War Supplies.

Fielding, P. M., employment of, 2175.

Finance
Bonds, government, negotiability of, 660.
Coin, American, 654.
Debt of Canada—interest, 654.
Department
Estimates, 653.
Staff and salaries, 661.
Dominion notes, issue of, 1218.
Expenditure of Canada, 807, 893, 1212, 1223, 1244-48, 2622, 3137, 4116.
Loans
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3826, 3933, 3943.
Dominion
Domestic war loan, 807, 811, 815, 891, 904, 1100.
$75,000,000, 1812, 1834, 1843, 1972, 2006, 2546. *See* also Public Service Loan Bill.
Farmers, to. *See* Farmers.
Recent government—$100,000,000, 659.
War, 1023, 2546, 3233. *See* also War Appropriations Bill.
Munitions credit to Imperial Government, 1810.
Paper currency, issue of, 1834.
Revenue of Canada, 807, 893, 948, 1212, 1244. *See* also Budget and Taxation.

Fish and Fisheries
Advisory Board, 2010, 2361, 2368, 2389.
Bait, 2386.
Boats, liscensing of, 2409.
Bounties, 2546.
Canadian fish in England, 2741.
Canadian troops, for, 1652.
Canning factories, 2368.
Codfish, price of in Portugal, 3560.
Department estimates, 2404, 2901.
Dogfish, reduction works, 2404.
Exhibit at Toronto, 2376.
Fisher, Mr. Ward, 2379.
Fishermen—medical treatment for, 2412.
Fishing industry, 2363.
Guardians, 2394.
Gasolene, 2393.
Hatcheries, 2373.
Herring, 551, 2475, 3439.
Intercolonial railway, on, 2415.
Inspection, 3438.
Inspectors, 1078, 2392.
Lobsters
Close season for, 950, 2368, 2375, 2382, 2385, 2439, 4077.
Export of, 2547.
Extension of open season, 4077.
Size limit, 2369.
Marketing. *See* Transportation.

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Officers, 2379.
Overseer, appointment of, 535.
Patrol service, 2412, 2373.
Pickled fish, 1761.
Inspectors of, 2175.
Protection service, 2901.
Quebec, in province of, 638.
Robertson, Mr. A. C., 2379.
Salmon, 2394.
Shell Fisheries Commission, 2368.
Shipments to Great Britain, 2411.
Smelt-fishing regulations, 673.
Toronto exhibit, 2415.
Transportation and marketing of, 558, 582, 636, 2374, 2365.
Trawlers
Beam, bounty to, 760.
Steam, 640, 641.
Trout fry, 2421.

Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, 2411.

Fisheries Marine Biological Board of Canada, 3439.

Fisher, Mr. Ward, employment of, 1078.

Flax industry, The, 1279.

Food—maple sugar, adulteration of, 2159.

Forest protection. *See* Dominion Lands.

Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2495. 2r., 2663. Com., 2663. 3r., 2663.

Forget, Sir Rodolphe Kt. (Charlevoix and Montmorency)
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4020.

Fortier, Mr. Edmond (Lotbiniere)
Quebec public works 3176.

Foster, Mr. A. De W., 949, 2175, 4075.

Foster, Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Bilingual question, 3620, 3790.
Budget, 903.
The Balance of Trade, 903.
Domestic war loan, 904.
War expenditures, 905.
Capital expenditures, 906.
Political patronage, 907.
Government taxation proposals, 907.
Taxation of incomes, 908.
The war and economic problems, 908.
Future immigration, 910.
Outcome of the war, 910.
Lessons from the war, 913.
Canada Temperance Act, 3298.
Civil servants, enlistment of, 655.
Davidson Commission, 3189.
Domestic war loan, 904.

Foster, Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)—*Con.*
Grain
Administration of Act, 3189.
Commissioners, 1603.
Congestion, 1706, 1971.
Oats and oatmeal, embargo on, 653, 854.
Storage and shipment, 532.
Transportation of, 2080, 3069.
Wheat, commandeering of, 544, 610, 3192, 3224.
Immigration, 910.
Political patronage, 907.
Railway Department estimates, 3056.
Shipbuilding, 639, 3106-3134.
Small arms ammunition, 3943.
Speaker, election of, 1.
Steamship service, 2531-2542, 2847, 3134, 3554.
Taxation
Incomes, 908.
Profits, 907.
Tonnage, shortage of, 3100-3134.
Trade and Commerce
Commissioners and agents, 3023, 3551.
Department estimates, 664, 3022, 3120, 3551.
Statement on, 2989, 3100.
Trade Commission, 4076.
Transportation, ocean, 638, 2858, 3100-3134.
West Indies—syrup shipments from, 1970.

Fox river breakwater, 1761.

France, fighting in, 1118.

Fraserville—river store repairs, 535.

Fredericton experimental farm. *See* Experimental farms.

Free Wheat. *See* Grain.

Freight rates. *See* Transportation and Railways.

French-Canadians
Alberta and Saskatchewan Battalion, 1373.
Civil Service, in, 1176, 2006.
Enlistment of, 179, 1081, 3281.
Military service, in, 42, 51, 177.

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Cable and wireless rates, 672.

Galops canals, 6310.

Gasolene. *See* oils.

Gaspé
Anticosti and north shore mail service, 536.
Bonaventure lighthouses, 536.
Campbellton steamship service, 536, 3100.
Inspectors of weights and measures, 671.
Maritime road, repairs to, 746.

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Lareau, J. E., 950.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1486.

Gauvreau, Mr. Chas. A. (Temiscouata)
Blue River M. & L. Company, 1076.
Devenish, Mr., employment of, 638.
Dionne, vs. the King, 2743, 2924.
Fraserville—river store repairs, 535.
Intercolonial railway
Saving of life and property on, 3458.
Train despatchers, 2691.
Lighthouse keepers retiring fund, 754.
Louisville
Post office, 546, 1077.
Postmaster, 2114.
Pilot, wreck of the, 106, 154.
Post Office Department—advertising, 1164, 2739.
Rimouski customs officer, 546.
Shell boxes, duty on, 2351, 2691.
Temiscouata mail service, 2477.
Victoriaville, P. Q.—Post Office Department advertising, 1164.

Geley, Aurele, employment of, 1759.

Georgian Bay Canal, 3182.

German-Canadians
Military service, in, 683.
Public Service, in, 1142, 1274.

German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2467.
Shell boxes, 543.

Girard, Mr. Jos. (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
Agriculture, 1388.
Bilingual question, the, 3822.
Experimental farms, 1389.
Mail contracts, 2721.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4042.

Glace bay
Harbour improvements, 3154.
Mail service, 533.

Glass, Mr. S. Francis (East Middlesex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 277.
The war, 278.
War contracts, 279.
Liberal members and the war, 283.
Canada's problems and prospects, 285.
Animals, inspection of, 2960.
Flax industry, 1279.
Rural credits, 1842.
Shell contracts, 279.
Soldiers, insane, 1665.
Technical education, 1631, 2200.

Gobeil, Antoine, payments to, 1551.

Government railways
Acquisition of new lines, 1590.
Branch lines, purchase and operation of, 2789.
Divisions, 549.
Ferguson, Dr., employment of, 1042.
Halifax terminals, 1597.
Intercolonial
Accident at Val Brilliant, 2058.
Branch lines, 2767, 3432.
Campbellton superintendent, 535.
Cars, 757, 1705, 2347, 3091.
Chatham, N.B.
Local freight at, 1705.
Train service, 3394.
Coal
Alleged expropriation of, 1762.
Supply, 538, 2115, 2795, 3462.
Cold storage service, 2415.
Devenish, Mr., employment of, 638.
Dining car service, 2379, 2420, 3093.
Elevator, 3597.
Employees, 1040.
French-speaking, 2789.
From other railways, 3097.
Rates of pay, 2881, 3401.
Equipment, 2793, 3459, 3606.
Estimates, 2767-2798.
Fish on dining cars, 2415, 3093.
Freight
Congestion, 2742.
Rates
Coal, 548.
Forest products, 1652.
Lumber, 1435.
French-speaking employees, 2789.
Halifax terminals, 2573.
Locomotives, 3067.
Lumber, rates on, 1435.
Management, 3092.
North Sydney terminals, 3425.
Operation, 1590, 2595, 2792, 3398.
Paradis, Mr. T., claim of, 2781.
Passenger service, 3393, 3419.
Pay, rates of, 2881.
Pensions. *See that title.*
Pictou harbour bridge, 2785.
Pugwash spur line, 3024.
Return tickets for soldiers, 2646.
Rolling stock, 2799.
Sackville spur line, 3611.
Saving of life and property on, 3458.
Sleepers for, 549.
Train despatchers, 2691.
Truro-Moncton section, 3352.
Locomotives, lease of, 2546.
Rates on coal, 548.

Government railways—*Con.*
Small claims. *See* Government Railways Small Claims Act Amendment Bill.
Steamers, charter of, 1076.

Government Railways Small Claims Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1900, 2919. 2r., 3303. Com., 3303. Rep., 3308. Amdt., 3308. Div., 3311. 3r., 3312. Sen. Amdts., 3884, 4039.

Governor General
Speech, opening of Parliament, 4.
Correction of press statement, 2443.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. (South Renfrew)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 491.
Extension of term of Parliament, 492.
Canada Foundries and Forgings, 493.
War contracts, 494.
Recruiting, 498.
Collection and disbursement of Patriotic and other funds, 500.
Naval defence, 502.
Unity of the Empire, 504.
Allied Economic Conference, 2802.
Armstrong lake bridge, 2692.
Army
Barbour, Private, death of, 3417.
Recruiting, 498.
159th Battalion, 1435, 2349.
Separation allowances, 2176, 2349.
Bilingual question, the, 3785.
Brantford, corporation of, 1649, 1726.
Bridges, construction of, 3164.
Budget, 1099.
Public expenditure, 1100, 1102.
Dominion loans, 1100.
The balance of trade, 1101.
Purchase of war supplies, 1102.
Proposed taxation measures, 1103.
United States and the war, 1108.
Results of the war, 1109.
Canadian Associated Press, 3638.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3574, 3649, 3827, 3962.
Capital punishment, 1966.
Censoring of mail matter, 2054.
Civil Service
Appointments to, 642, 4091.
Auditor General, salary of, 567.
Commission, 664.
Deputy Ministers, salaries of, 983.
Enlistments from, 656, 822.
Ministers, salaries of, 667.
Soldiers, appointments to, 642.
Dairying industry—rennet, 2966.
Dredge Port Nelson, 2690.
Dredging, 3186.
Federal Plan Commission, 3135.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. (South Renfrew)—*Con.*
Forest protection, 2088.
Government railways—lease of locomotives, 2546.
Grain
Elevators, 3597.
Transportation of, 1309.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3574, 3649, 3827.
High Commissioner, Canadian—office of, 970.
Highways, 3164, 3168.
Horse raising, 2970.
House of Commons
Saturday sittings, 3409.
Two o'clock sittings, 3295.
Hudson Bay Navigation—Anderson report, 636.
Hudson Bay railway, 543, 3376.
Immigration
Expenditure, 2100.
Inspection, boundary, 656.
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 2767.
Elevator, 3597.
Halifax terminals, 2573.
Lindsay, J. T., 2349.
Loans, Dominion, 1100, 2006, 2546.
Lumber, rates on, 548.
Marine
Harbour improvements, 741.
Prescott depot, 724.
Wreck of the Mayflower, 727.
McNab, C. C., claim of, 4074.
Medical instruction, 978.
Mines Department expenditure, 2326.
Montreal postal service, 2037.
Morrisburg, free entry of goods at, 3644.
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, 3374.
Munitions Works Commission, 2841.
National Transcontinental Railway
Government operation, 2569, 3038.
Quebec terminals, 2569, 2584.
Rates on lumber, 548.
North Bay armoury, 2691.
Oil, freight rates on, 3411.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1648.
Paris agency, 982.
Patriotic funds, 500.
Prison reform, 2842.
Port Nelson
Dock accommodation, 2692.
Harbour improvements, 2838.
Live stock for, 2692.
Post Office Department, administration of, 2035.
Postage stamps, sale and use of, 2051.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. (South Renfrew)—*Con.*
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2356, 2699, 2946.
Public works expenditure, 2826.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 3146, 3431.
Quebec bridge, 3435.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3616, 3995, 4010.
Railway Commissioners, 3411.
Railways
Department estimates, 3054.
Fires caused by, 3412.
Location of, 2744.
Oil for fuel on, 977.
Situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3982.
Subsidies to, 3445.
Royal Military College, 2831, 3881.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4091.
Taxation
Land, 2000.
Oil, 1803, 2303.
Profits, 1103, 1854, 1978, 1991, 200, 2640.
Toronto
Harbour improvements, 3338.
Post office, 2836.
Railway terminals, 3414.
Trade and Commerce, 3021.
Transcona railway shops, lease of, 636.
Transportation, ocean—harbour facilities, 741.
Trent canal, 2575.
Naval policy, 502.
Parliament, extension of term of, 492.
War
Appropriations, 3284.
Munitions, manufacture of, 493.
Shell contracts, 494.
Supplies, orders for, 970.
United States contracts, 495.
Water-powers, ownership of, 556, 760.
Welland canal, 3455.
Yukon, the, 1309, 1318.

Grain
Administration of Act, 3189.
Amendment Bill. 1r., 1603. 2r., 1706. Com., 1706, 1971. 3r., 1971.
Calgary elevator charges, 1609.
Canada Grain Act Amendment. *See that title.*
Commissioners, 1603, 3191.
Congestion in the West, 3882. *See* also Canada Grain Act Amendment Bill.
Corn, freight rates on, 2963.
Elevators, 920, 3084, 3190, 3594, 3597, 3604.
Alberta—petitions from, 2693.
Calgary, 532, 3223.
Quebec, 3058.
St. John, 3060, 3593.

Grain—*Con.*
Freight rates on, 2795, 3058-3089, 3601-3604.
National Transcontinental railway freight rates, 2795.
Oats and oatmeal, embargo on, 803, 854, 653.
Shipments on National Transcontinental railway, 1276.
Storage and shipment, 532.
Transportation of, 1207, 1306, 2857, 3069-3089, 3601, 3456, 3981.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 20, 23, 156, 168, 445-452, 458-461, 544, 1278, 1434, 1609, 3192.
Free, 33, 793, 802, 856-884, 1046-1096.
Marketing of, 917.
New Zealand purchases, 1278, 1438.
Storage of, 428, 445-452.
Winnipeg and Minneapolis prices, 857.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.
Audit of revenues and expenditures, 3989.
Lease of by the Government, 1594.
Loan to, proposed, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3826, 3933, 3943.
Subsidies and guarantees, 1042.
Transcona terminals, 1595.

Gratuities to public servants, 3535.

Green, Mr. Robert F. (Kootenay)
Mining industry, 1873.
Pacific Northern and Omineea Railway Company, 1013.
Taxation
Apples, 1773, 2307.
Mining companies, 1373.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1889.
Zinc, bounties on, 3033.

Guest, Mr. S. M., employment of, 885.

Guthrie, Mr. Hugh (South Wellington)
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2356, 2481, 2563, 2952.
Taxation of profits, 1896.

Guysborough
Branch railway, 850.
Mail service, 2800.

Haanel, Dr., employment of, 851.

Half Moon fog alarm, 593.

Halifax
Coal shipments from, 1759.
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Exports and imports through, 3734.
Military hospital, 2114.
Ocean terminals, 885.
Postmaster, 2033.
Post office, 1651.
Railway terminals, 1597.

Ham, Mrs. Berlington, employment of, 949.

Hanover public building, 1439.

Hansard. *See* House of Commons.

Harbours. *See* Public works.

Hartt, Mr. Thomas A. (Charlotte, N.B.)
Naval Service Department—travelling expenses, 2300.

Hayes, Joseph, charges against 306, 400.

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 184.
Mobilization of Canadian troops, 184.
Ocean shipping conditions, 185-192.
Lumber export trade, 490.
The Shell Committee, 193.
Shell contracts, 194-200.
Purchase of submarines, 200-211.
Soldiers' pensions, 211-215.
Extension of term of Parliament, 215.
Shell inspection and political patronage, 217.
Agriculture
Animals, health of, 1430, 2957.
Cold storage, 1427.
Department estimates, 661, 2956-2971.
Eggs, marketing of, 2961.
Experimental farms, 1402.
Hay, 2963.
Hogs, government inspection of, 1606.
Potato inspectors, 1398, 1415.
Apple duty—government official on, 1426.
Aviation, 2898.
Canadian Law Library in London, 987.
Coal mining, government control of, 719.
Crosby, A. B.—hire of steamer, 727.
Dairying industry, 1420.
Deputy ministers, salaries of, 983.
Exhibitions, 1429.
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2389.
Boats, licensing of, 2409.
Department estimates, 2404, 2901.
Dogfish, 2404.
Gasolene, 2393.
Hatcheries, 2373.
Herring, 551, 3439.
Inspection, 3438.
Intercolonial railway, on, 2416.
Lobsters, 2376, 2389, 2441, 4077.
Officers, 2381.
Patrol service, 2373.
Protection service, 2901.
Shipments to Great Britain, 2412.
Transportation, 2374, 2416.
Flax industry, 1295.
Harbour Commission, organization of, 740, 742.

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)—*Con.*
Hay contracts, 1424.
Health, public, suggested department of, 1172.
Heidman, Gustav, 681.
Horses for war purposes, 2969.
Hospitals, marine, 3437.
Hudson Bay navigation, 2908.
Live stock inspection, 716.
Lumber, export trade, 190.
Marine
Coasting privileges, 700.
Coast service, 723-728.
Department estimates, 2361, 3436.
Government steamers, 693, 727, 751.
Harbour improvements, 729, 741.
Hospitals, 752, 3437.
Hudson Bay—Anderson report, 726.
Ice breaking, 723, 743.
Life-saving, 726, 2916.
Lighthouse keepers retiring fund, 754.
Lighthouses
Maintenance and repairs, 728.
Salaries and allowances, 725.
Supplies, 728.
Masters and Mates, examination of, 694.
Motor boats, 2346, 2802.
Navigation
Aids to, 728.
Obstructions to, 715.
Pilotage, 2542, 2804.
Pensions, 747, 750.
Schools, 695.
Ocean Transportation, 185, 740, 1681.
Prescott depot, 724.
St. John harbour improvements, 729.
St. Lawrence ship channel, 719.
Shipbuilding, 701, 2896.
Shipping conditions, 701. *See also* Transportation.
Sick Mariners Fund, 753.
Wrecks
Investigations into, 695.
Mayflower, 727.
Wrecking plants, 716.
Naval service, 1671.
Department estimates, 662, 2885, 2908, 3442.
Recruits for, 2947.
New Brunswick—lumber exports, 190.
Noreen, steamer, hire of, 727.
Owen, James W., patent of, 1157, 1159.
Parliament, extension of, term of, 111, 215.
Patent rights, extension of, 1158.
Pensions
Pilots, 747-750.
Soldiers, 211-215, 4131.

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)—*Con.*
Pictou—handling of freight and coal at, 953.
Political patronage, 217.
Prince Edward Island ferry service, 954, 1704.
Radiotelegraph service, 2908.
St. John post office, 2039.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3365.
Sealers, British Columbia, claims of, 595.
Shell Committee, The, 193.
Shell contracts, 194, 805.
Shipbuilding. *See* Marine.
Stefansson expedition, 2914.
Submarines, 200, 2897.
Surveys, hydrographic, 2901.
Transportation, ocean, 185, 1681.
Vancouver Harbour Commission, 1604, 2078.
Vessels, commandeering of, 1608.
West Indies—syrup shipments from, 1762, 1809.
Wireless telegraph stations, 2909, 2913.

Health, Public, proposed department of, 1065.

Heidman, Gustav, 681.

Hepburn, Mr. B. R., (Prince Edward, Ont.)
Shell contracts, 155.

High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 664, 667, 956.

Highways, 3164, 3168.

Hjort, Dr., employment of, 1552.

Hog cholera. *See* agriculture.

Homesteads.
Entries by volunteers, 3529.
Inspectors, 828, 832.
Purchases, collections on, 3463. *See* also Dominion Lands.

Horses. *See* Agriculture and War supplies.

Hospitals
Marine, 752, 2918, 3437.
Military, 2114, 3236.

House of Commons
Business of the House
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 1329.
Easter adjournment, 2925.
Government orders, 2303.
Morning sittings, 2111, 2925.
Notices on order paper, precedence of, 1908.
Saturday sittings, 3409.
Two o'clock sittings, 3294.
Wednesday sittings, 1208.
Chairman of Committees
Appointment of, 531.
Rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker.

House of Commons—*Con.*
Committees
Debates, 3143.
Internal Economy, 38.
Library of Parliament, 151.
Printing of Parliament, 151, 3875.
Public Accounts, 2973.
Restaurant of Parliament, 161.
Select Standing, 5, 148.
Decease of members, 22.
Deputy Speaker, appointment of, 531.
Electoral lists, printing of, 3099.
Fraudulent questions, 1492.
Hansard—alleged omissions from, 2647, 2840, 3188.
Mace, the, 762.
Members
Decease of, 22.
Military activities of, *See* Army.
New, 1.
Officials, appointment of
Assistant clerk Orders and Records, 4079.
Aubrey, Napoleon, 2300.
Chief of Committee Reporters, 4131.
Clerk, assistant, 884.
Clerk Votes and Proceedings, 755.
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 77.
Editor of Debates, 4131.
Horton, Mr. Albert, transfer of to Senate Staff, 4127.
Library Accountant, 4152.
Reading room, 1706.
Reporting Branch, changes in, 2398, 4127, 4131.
Sessional clerks, 2799.
Speaker, election of, 1.
Vacancies
Bellechase, 3618.
Lincoln, 3404, 3410.
Restigouche, 3404, 3410.
Yarmouth, 3942.
See Parliament.

Hudson Bay navigation, 636, 726, 2908.

Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 138, 543, 636, 1598, 3375.
Government operations of, 3989.
Terminals, 636, 3375.

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)
Annandale buoys, 1808.
Army
Canadian forces, reorganization of, 2015.
First contingent, transportation of, 2693.
Mullock, Major T. A., 2300.
Officers
Medical, 1905.
Unattached, in England, 1377.
Parliament, members of in, 949, 1328, 1550.

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)—*Con.*
Army—*Con.*
Troops, local, supplies for, 552.
Budget, 1118.
Public expenditures compared, 1119.
Patriotic spirit of the people, 1125.
Purchase of war supplies, 1122.
Censoring of mail matter, 2880.
Coal mining, government control of, 718.
Charlottetown—Public works employees at, 2799.
Coasting privileges, 699.
Experimental farms, 1409, 1411.
Exports to United States, 2057.
Fielding, P. M., 2175.
Fish and fisheries
Herring fishery investigation, 551.
Inspectors, 2010, 2175.
Intercolonial railway, on, 3093.
Foreman, Dr. N. O., 2174.
Government railways—small claims, 1900, 3303-05.
Horses
Exportation of prohibited, 1329.
French Government, for, 950.
See War Supplies.
House of Commons
Members of in military service, 1328.
Reading room, 1706.
Hudson Bay navigation, 2911.
Imports from United States, 2057.
Intercolonial railway
Car shortage, 3091.
Dining cars—fish on, 3093.
Labour bureaus, national, 620.
Little Sands
Breakwater, 2175.
Wharf, 3154.
Navigation schools, 696.
Necklaces—duty on, 641, 758, 1329.
Parliament, Members of in military service, 949, 1150.
Political patronage, 3261.
Potatoes
Duty on, 1430.
Export of, 1059.
Inspection of, 1418.
Powdery scab, 1418.
Shipping regulations, 1414.
Powder milk. *See* War Supplies.
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry service, 954, 1704, 3391.
Dredging, 853.
Hillsborough bridge, guard on, 1433.
Horses, purchases of in, 672.
Judicial vacancies, 924.
Public works, 3152.
Steamship service, 536, 2850.
Telegraph and telephone lines, 3187.

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island—*Con.*
War supplies purchased in, 3406.
Winter communication with, 1433.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1949, 2235, 2558, 2697, 2758, 2955.
Riverside Lumber Company, 2058.
Ships, purchase of for war purposes, 673.
Souris rifle range, 2600.
Summerside
Post office building, 2010.
Rifle range, 2010.
Taxation
Pearls and diamonds, 641, 758, 1329.
Profits, 1852.
War
Appropriations, 3261.
Supplies
Hay, 2963.
Horses, 542, 652, 653, 672, 759, 1041, 1124, 1380, 1383.
Political patronage in purchase of, 3261.
Powder milk, 850, 1043, 1053, 2175, 3262.
Prince Edward Island purchases, 3406.
Rifles, 1328, 3506.
Shells, 1123.
Shovels, 156, 1123.
Wheat, free, 1058.

Hughes, Major-General Sir Sam (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 287.
Mobilization of Canadian troops, 288, 302.
Militia officers in Canada, 288, 299.
Machine guns, 289.
Training of officers, 289.
Purchase of pistols, 290.
Col. J. Wesley Allison, 290.
Location of Canadian troops, 291.
Recruiting, 292.
The Ross rifle, 292.
Shell contractors, 293.
Militia Appointments, 294.
The Shell Committee, 295, 303.
Shell manufacture, 295-302.
The press and the war, 303.
Aitken, Sir Max, duties of, 534.
Allison, Col. J. Wesley, 1343, 1345, 1355.
See also Shell Contracts.
Allowances, separation and subsistence, 551.
Bands, regimental, 1044.
Berlin, Ont., disturbances at, 855.
Campbellton, disturbances at, 855.
Canadian troops in action, 889.
Civil Servants, enlistment of, 1045.
Currie, General, at St. Julien, 2351.

Hughes, Hon. Major-General Sam (Minister of Militia and Defence)—*Con.*
Currie, Lieut.-Colonel John, M.P., 1045.
Edmonton, alleged disturbances at, 888.
Field kitchens, 547.
France, fighting in, 1118.
Fuses, 1345, 2979. *See* Shell contracts.
German-Canadians in military service, 684.
Horses, purchase of, 542, 685, 1378.
Inspectors of munitions, 544.
Lavergne, Lieut.-Col. Armand, 541.
Lessard, Major-General, position of, 547. 670.
Machine guns, 289, 532.
Medical examiners, 1349.
Medical officers—Black, Dr. J. B., 1369.
Militia
Appointments, 293.
Estimates, 1341.
Officers in Canada, 288.
Mobilization of troops, 288, 302.
Motor trucks, 1345, 1358, 2978.
Officers
Training of, 289.
Unattached, in England, 1377.
Pistols, purchase of, 290, 1343, 1346, 2977.
Political patronage in war contracts, 1351, 1361.
Recruiting
Coloured men, of, 557.
Officers, 1350.
System, 292.
Ross rifle, 292, 1347, 1359.
Shell Committee, The, 295, 303.
Shell contracts, 295-302, 2974, 2979.
Shovel shields, 1347.
Small arms ammunition—sale of, 3902.
Soldiers
Employment of in England, 1372.
Enrolment of by districts, 1350.
Equipment, private subscriptions for, 590.
Payment of, 553.
Riots, alleged participation in, 803, 855.
Southern rifle deal, 2981.
Thompson, Mr., 922.
Troops, local, supplies for, 552.
War contracts, 1342, 1351, 1361.
Wellington Barracks School, 558.
Woodmen's Regiment, 117.

Huntingdon preventive stations, 641.

Ice-breaking. *See* Marine.

Immigration
Advertising, 2436.
Agencies, 1440, 2096, 2435.
Austrian and German, 547.
Boston agent, 593.
Chinese, 2441.

Immigration—*Con.*
Co-operation of British Government in, 1164.
Department expenditure, 1245, 2606, 2628.
Dominion and provincial government co-operation in, 1277, 1904.
Future, 910.
Inspection, boundary, 656.
Jewish, 1080, 1083.
Newfoundland, from—regulations affecting, 2441.
Stations, western, 2869.
Statistics, 540, 1436, 2093.
Widows and children, 1330.

Illustration stations. *See* Agriculture.

Imperial Munitions Board, 594, 923, 1509.

Indians
British Columbia, 2681, 2866.
British Columbia Indian Commission, 852.
Department clerks, 2800.
Education of, 2690.
Enlisted, status of, 3407.
Kitsilano reserve, 1652, 2681.
New Brunswick, 2674.
Nova Scotia, 2666.
Okanagan reserve, 3144, 3676.
Ontario, 2665.
Prince Edward Island, 2681.
Quebec, 2665.
St. Peter's reserve, 593, 2316.
See also St. Peter's Indian Reserve Bill.

Indian Land Commission, 2867, 2057.

Ingonish harbour, ice breaking in, 2421.

Inland Revenue Department
Appointments, 2175.
Clerks, 2544.
Estimates, 661, 2157.
Officials of in municipal elections, 1759.

Insurance Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1548.

Insurance Companies Extension Bill. Res., 685. 1r., 686. 2r., 937. Ref. to Com., 938. Com., 1610. 3r., 1714.
See also Life Insurance.

Intercolonial railway. *See* Government railways.

Interior Department
Enlistments from, 833, 2084, 2092.
Estimates, 655, 817-850, 938, 1309, 2079, 2428, 2665, 2860.
Expenditure, 895, 2079, 2086, 2090, 2095, 2431, 2435, 2607.
Minister of in Chicago, 756, 829.
Orders in Council approved, 3347.
Promotions, 836.
Salaries, 655, 817, 2079.
Surveys. *See that title.*

International bridge—guarding of, 1041.

International Joint Commission, 979.

International Nickel Company, 1867.

Inverness
Mail service, 2718.
Post office, 1550.
Public works expenditures, 853.

Irrigation
Staff and salaries, 843.
Works, 842.
See Taber Irrigation District Bill.

James, Mr. C. C.—question of appointment, 2477.

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Canadian Northern Railway—subsidies and guarantees, 1042.
Digby Gap submarine bell, 1276.
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 558.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—subsidies and guarantees, 1042.
Lighthouse Board, 1078.

Joliette
Government offices, 3562.
Post office, 3561.

Jewish people, The, 1242.

Jews
Enlistment of, 1550.

Judges Act Amendment Bill. Res., 2071. 1r., 2078. 2r., 2319. Com., 2319. 3r., 2326.

Justice
Canadian Law Library in London, 987.
Department
Clerks, 2801.
Estimates, 983-989, 2115, 2157.
Staff and salaries, 983.
Indeterminate sentences, 2844.
Judges
Montreal, 2301.
Nova Scotia, 685.
Quebec, 2692.
Salaries, 2071, 2319.
Judicial vacancies, 924.
Provincial legislation, reports on, 988.
Solicitor General, office of, 985, 1076.
See also Penitentiaries.

Kastella, A., employment of, 1549.

Kay, Mr. William T. (Missisquoi)
British Remount Commission, 2799.
Censored mail matter, 3029.
Farnham Military Camp, 1164.
Hay, 2694.
Horses, 542, 671, 1326, 2057.

Keay, R. H., fraudulent operations of, 836.

Kemp, Hon. A. E. (East Toronto)
Canadian fish in England, 2741.
Canadian forces, reorganization of, 2016.
Casualty lists, 2841.

Kemp, Hon. A. E. (East Toronto)—*Con.*
Enlistment of Edward Paquett, 2242.
Shell contracts—Sheet Metal Products Company, 1646.
War supplies
Clothing, 3592.
Kits, 1810, 2167.
Small arms ammunition, 2881.
Winnipeg, disturbances at, 2548.
206th Battalion, 2167.

Killam, Alberta, mail service, 1438.

Kingston
Harbour improvements, 3182.
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries.

Kitsilano Indian reserve. *See* Indians.

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 423.
Political partyism, 424.
Extension of term of Parliament, 425.
Spirit of Canadian soldiers, 426.
Storage and transportation of wheat, 428.
United States and the war, 427.
Commandeering of wheat, 429.
Seed grain indebtedness, 432.
Problem of production, 435.
Agriculture—illustration plots, 1397, 1400.
Bilingual question, the, 3618.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3933.
Fair wage clause in munition contracts, 1969.
Government railways—small claims, 3309.
Grain
Congestion, 1708.
Freight rates on, 3058, 3065.
Gratuities to public servants, 3536.
Machine guns, 2542.
Moosejaw customs office, 2171.
Parliament, extension of term of, 425.
Public works expenditure, 3315.
Saskatchewan judges' salaries, 2075.
Saskatchewan river water supply, 3189.
Seed grain indebtedness, 432, 505, 517, 1607.
Soldiers, punishment of, 3051, 3099, 3537.
Taxation
Apples, 1770.
Land, 3934, 3941.
Wheat, commandeering of, 156, 428.

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N.S.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 138.
Nova Scotia's contributions to war, 138.
Necessity for economy, 138.
Government expenditure, 139.
Hudson Bay railway, 138.

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N.S.)—*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
The Shell Committee, 140.
Appointment of shell inspectors, 143.
Political patronage in army service, 145.
Allison, Colonel J. Wesley, 2276. *See also* shell contracts.
Black, Dr. J. B., 1368.
Civil Service, enlistments, from, 823.
Crosby, A. B.—hire of steamer, 727.
Curry, Private D., death of, 2987, 3049.
Day, Colonel F. P., 2920, 3028.
Fisher, Mr. Ward, 2379, 2389.
Fishery inspector Fisher, 1078.
Fish and fisheries
Advisory Board, 2010.
Lobsters, 2379.
Officers, 2379, 2389.
Glace Bay harbour improvements, 3152.
Gobeil, Antoine, 1551.
House of Commons—Saturday sittings, 3409.
Hudson Bay railway, 138.
Indians, 2667.
Intercolonial railway—passenger service, 3426.
Loans to farmers, 934.
Morrisburg, Ont., militia office, 1078.
Noreen, steamer, hire of, 727.
Nova Scotia—its contributions to war, 138.
Political patronage in army service, 145, 1366.
Railway mail service, 2025.
Recruiting, 1367.
Robertson, Mr. A. C., 2379.
Rural mail service, 2020.
Schooner Two Brothers, 533.
Shelburne
Customs duties, 1762.
Imports, 1276.
Shell Committee, The, 140.
Spiddel, Rev. J. A., 3097.
Technical education, 2206.
War
Expenditure, 138.
Recruiting of officers, 145.
Shells, inspectors of, 143.
War supplies
Fuses, 2274.
Machine guns, 2275.
Pistols, 2276.
Rifles, 2286.
Shell contracts, 2259, 2264, 3296.
Wheat, commandeering of, 544.
Woman suffrage, 1189.

L'Assomption
Mail service, 3881.
Wharf, 2174.

Labour
Aliens, interned, farm labourers, as, 2469.
Department
Estimates, 3555.
Expenditure, 1226.
Employment bureaus, national, 597.
Fair wage boards, 1277.
Fair wage clause in munition contracts, 1969, 3555, 3662.
Labourers
Farmers, for, 1906, 2469.
Foreign, enlistment of, 3145.
Importation of into British Columbia, 1329.
Munitions factories, in, 2549.
Unemployment, 535, 595.
Vickers-Maxim, Ltd., strike at, 1079, 1763.

Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
Boucher, Dr., 1550.
Daigle, Zepherin, 2922.
Montreal Immigration agent, 1440.
Quebec Harbour Commission, 2347.

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Penitentiaries, 2156.

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Taxation of profits, 1852.

Lamarche, Mr. Paul E. (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 467.
Canada in the war, 468.
Attitude of Messrs. Bourassa and Lavergne, 468.
Principles of the Nationalists, 471.
The naval policy, 471.
Le Devoir newspaper, 474.
Aspirations of French-Canadian people, 475.
Extension of term of Parliament, 475.
Bilingual question, the, 3758.
Ogilvie, Major G., R.C.A., 1162.
Renfrew wool contracts, 1436.

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Budget, 1035.
War expenditure, 1035, 1036, 1038.
Canada's contributions to war, 1035.
French-Canadians and the war, 1036.
Mr. Patenaude's speech, 1037.
Expenditure and taxation, 1038.
Purchases of hay, 1039.
Chaplains, Roman Catholic, 3097.
Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, 949.
Hay, purchase of, 1039, 2964.
Laprairie protection wall, 3164.
Lopassey, Major de, employment of, 1163.
Quebec highways, 3164.
Recruiting, 3530.
Solicitor General's office fittings, 1076.

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)—*Con.*
Taxation of profits, 1038.
War appropriations, 3530.

Lands. *See* Dominion.

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 377.
The war, 378.
Bourassa and Lavergne, 379.
Utterances of Cabinet Ministers, 381.
War contracts, 384.
Agriculture, 1394.
Agriculture Department—employees with diplomas, 2176.
Bilingual question, 1810, 3618, 3676, 3678.
Nationalism—Bourassa and Lavergne, 379.
Ottawa Separate School Commission, 2456.
Riviere Ouelle wharf, 1164.
War contracts, 384.

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Savings deposits, rate of interest on, 543.

Laprairie protection works, 3164.
Lareau, J. E., employment of, 950.
Lasoski, Max, government employment of, 949.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (East Quebec)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 16.
Progress of the war, 16.
Attitude of Canadian people, 17.
The nationalist party, 17.
Canada's interest in the war, 18.
Conscription, 19.
Rigid economy necessary, 20.
Commandeering of wheat, 20.
Battle of St. Julien—commemoration of, 3028.
Bilingual question, 2974, 3619, 3697.
Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3639.
Censoring of mail matter, 2691.
Chairman of Committee
Appointment of, 532.
Ruling of, 2453.
Conscription, 19.
Davidson Commission, 4006.
Dyes, shortage of, 3553.
Economic and Development Commission, 3642.
Federal Plan Commission, 3641.
Fuses, 1502.
Governor General—correction of press statement, 2496.
Gratuities to public servants, 3535.
High Commissioner, Canadian, 962.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (East Quebec) —*Con.*
House of Commons
Business of the House, 1208.
Hansard, alleged omission from, 2647, 2840.
Morning sittings, 2112, 2925.
Two o'clock sittings, 3294.
Immigration
Co-operation of British Government in 1164.
Dominion and provincial co-operation in, 1277, 1904.
Imperial Munitions Board, 804.
Insurance companies, life, investments of, 2399.
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 688.
National Battlefields Commission, 3148.
Nickel, exportation of, 2166.
Parliament, extension of term of, 629, 3943.
Parliament Buildings
Destruction of, 581.
Reconstruction of, 591, 2013, 3050.
Pilotage, 2805.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4004, 4036, 4040.
Quebec sewerage system, 3557.
Rainbow, alleged capture by, 3943.
St. Amour, A. C., 3408.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2070.
Saskatchewan judges' salaries, 2073.
Sealers of British Columbia, claims of, 595.
Shell Committee, The, 923.
Shell contracts, proposed investigation, 1495, 2351, 2519, 2984.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4084.
Small arms ammunition, 3898, 3943.
Soldiers' equipment, private subscriptions for, 590.
Soulanges Canal employees—charges of partisanship, 3231.
Speaker, election of, 2.
Taxation of profits, 1847.
Trade and commerce, 3006.
Tupper, the late Right Hon. Sir Charles, Bart, 584.
Valcartier expropriations, 1300.
Vancouver Harbour Commissioners, 2078.
West Indies—syrup shipments from, 1762, 1970.
Wheat, commandeering of, 20, 1434, 1609, 3197.
Winnipeg, disturbances at, 2548.
Winnipeg Telegram—statements in, 2973.

Lavallée, Mr. J. O. (Bellechasse)
Talbot, Lieut.-Col. Onesiphore, 1325.

Lavergne, Lieut.-Col. Armand, statements of, 356, 363, 377, 379, 541.

Law, Mr. Bowman B. (Yarmouth)
Bateman, Captain John, employment of, 545.
Blades, Captain Charles, employment of, 545.
Cape Negro Island lighthouse, 544.
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 571.
Half Moon fog alarm, 593.
Immigration officer at Boston, 593.
Intercolonial railway—coal supply, 539.
Nova Scotia, western, fishery inspector, 546.
Ross, Captain William, employment of, 545.
Shelburne
Bell buoy, application for, 543.
Fishery guardian, 545.
Mail service, 594.
Port physician, 543.
Steamer Starling, 544.
Yarmouth
Dredging, 550.
Public works, 550.

Law, The late B. B., M.P., Death of, 590.

Legion of Frontiersmen, 3507.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 47.
The Liberal Party and the war, 47.
Opposition's right to criticise, 48.
Our soldiers at the front, 48.
Common defence of the Empire, 49.
Britain's true glory, 49.
War against militarism, 50.
Unity of French and English in Canada, 50.
Traditional policy of Roman Catholic Church, 57.
Recruiting in Quebec, 51.
Government expenditures, 52.
Economy and retrenchment, 53.
Problems after the war, 54.
Technical education, 55.
Canada in Imperial affairs, 55.
Advertising, government, 2299.
Aliens, supervision of, 691.
Anse à Beaufils breakwater, 3623.
Bands, regimental, 1044.
Beland, Dr., payment of sessional indemnity to, 3873.
Bilingual question, the, 3715.
Budget, 1143.
Canada's part in the war, 1144.
United States and the war, 1145.
Achievements of the British Navy, 1145.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
British aristocracy and French democracy in the war, 1146.
Partyism in war time, 1147.
Public expenditures compared, 1147.
Civil service appointments, 1148, 1149.
Departmental appointments and expenditures, 1148.
Tariff policies—reciprocity, 1157.
The government's taxation proposals, 1153.
Britain and France and the war, 1154.
Cadet service, 3503.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3586, 3655.
Carkner, W. Lloyd, employment of, 1163.
Censoring of mail matter, 2840.
Censors in Rimouski, 851.
Chandler wharf, 3162.
Civil Service
Appointments, 1148, 1149.
Enlistments, 819.
Soldiers in, 1276.
Cost of Living Commission, 852.
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Divorce, 771.
Dredging, 3186.
Electoral lists, printing of, 3099.
Farmers Bank, depositors of, 544.
Federal Plan Commission, 3136.
Forest protection, 850.
Fox river breakwater, 1761.
French-Canadians, enlistment of, 3281.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3586, 3655.
House of Commons
Officials, 2475.
Vacancies, 3618.
Indians, 2665.
Intercolonial railway
Car shortage, 1705, 2347.
Freight service, 2543.
Paradis, Mr. T., claim of, 2781.
Inland Revenue Department officers, 2158.
Judges' salaries, 2319.
Labour bureaus, national, 597.
La Patrie, payments to, 2299.
L'Evenement, payments to, 2298.
Loans—Dominion, $75,000,000, 1817.
Magdalen islands steamship service, 3352.
Mines, former Minister of—travelling expenses, 2336.
Montreal Island, bridge connection with, 3163, 3628.
Monument of His late Majesty King Edward VII, 3324.
163rd Battalion, 4152.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)—*Con.*
Ottawa
Buildings, height of, 2165.
Departmental buildings, 2875.
Parliament Buildings, destruction of—alleged warning, 674.
Peat experiments, 2327.
Penitentiaries, 2144.
Pensions to soldiers, 4140.
Post office
Censoring of mail matter, 2840.
Employees, 1651, 2010.
Parcel post, 2737.
Revenues, 1651.
Salaries, 1651.
Printing—proposed reduction in cost, 4154.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2491.
Pulp industry—shortage of vessels, 638.
Quebec
Judicial vacancies, 924.
Post office, 547, 672.
Recruiting in, 51, 3281.
Sewerage system, 3557.
Steamship service, 2852.
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2475, 2530, 3431.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4024, 4046, 4122.
Rainbow, alleged capture by, 3297.
Recruiting in Quebec, 51, 3281.
Roman Catholic church—traditional policy of, 57.
Royal Society of Canada, 2875.
St. Bernard-St. Maxime mail service, 3560.
Soldiers
Civil Service, in, 1276.
Disabled, provision for, 2873.
Steamship service, 3554.
Taxation of profits, 1336.
Technical education, 55, 535, 2177, 2209.
Trade Commission, 4076.
War
Appropriations, 3281.
Supplies
Kits, 1809.
Ross rifle, 4108.

Lesperance, Mr. David O. (Montmagny)
Bilingual question, the, 3811.
Pilotage, 2805.

Lessard, Major-General, position of, 547, 670.

Lethbridge
Immigration agent, 2695.
Internment camp supplies, 2011.
Post office, 2800.

Lévis
Drill hall, 2173.
Military property, lease of, 2922.
Quarantine station, 2011, 3352.

Life Insurance Companies Investment Bill. 1r., 885. 2r., 1611. Ref. to Com., 1615. Com., 2399. 3r., 2802.

Life saving. *See* Marine.

Little Sands
Breakwater, 2175.
Wharf, 3154.

Live stock. *See* Agriculture.

Loans. *See* Finance.

Loggie, Mr. Wm. S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Budget, 1126.
Parliament Buildings fire, 1126.
Political patronage, 1127.
Taxation of profits, 1127.
The Minister of Trade and Commerce and political partyism, 1129.
Canada Temperance Act, 3300.
Chatham, N.B.
Local freight at, 1705.
Train service, 3394.
Commissions, granting of, 3519.
Derby Junction railway improvements, 3393.
Dyes, shortage of, 3553.
Fish and fisheries
Canning factories, 2368.
Codfish, price of in Portugal, 3560.
Transportation and marketing of, 576.
Lobsters, 2368, 2383, 2391, 2547, 3441.
Government railways, purchase and operation of, 2789.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4121.
St. John Daily Telegraph—statement of, 213.
Shipbuilding, 3130.
Taxation
Apples, 1780.
Profits, 1127, 1338, 1849, 1859, 1891-1898, 1972, 1980, 1983, 1988, 2001.

Lopassey, Major De, employment of, 1163.

Lotbiniere and Megantic railway. *See* Quebec Railways Acquisition Bill.

Louisburg
Censors and decoders at, 1808.
Post office, 546, 1077.
Postmaster, 2114.

Lumber
Export trade, 190.
Freight rates, 1435.
Shipments, 1681, 1682.

Lunenburg county mail service, 3942.

Lyons, John, employment of, 3881.

Macdonald, Archibald, payments to, 2694.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 218.
Canada and the war, 218.
Political patronage in war expenditures, 220.
Shell contracts, 221-225.
Cabinet ministers and the war, 226.
Naval policy, 228-232.
Transportation, 232.
Provision for returning soldiers, 233.
Problems after the war, 233.
Aliens, supervision of, 689.
Army
40th Battalion—supplies, 1043.
106th Regiment—supplies, 851, 1042, 1077, 1349, 2172.
Officers in England, 1077, 1551, 2172.
Recruiting, 2987, 3255.
Soldiers
Disabled, provision for, 233, 2874.
Homes, 1657.
Pensions, 1654, 1666, 4137.
Punishment of, 3257, 3525.
Special railway rates for, 2549.
Technical training for, 1620, 1626.
Voting of, 3512.
Bear River public building site, 1164.
Beland, Dr., detention of in Germany, 806.
Big island mail service, 549.
Bilingual question, the, 3819.
British Columbia, subsidizing of ships in, 1551.
Budget, 1243.
Record of the Government, 1243.
Increases in the Civil Service, 1243.
Revenue and expenditure, 1244-1248.
Immigration, 1245.
Public debt, 1246.
The taxation proposals, 1248.
Political patronage, 1254.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3346, 3568, 3580.
Carson, Brigadier-General, staff of, 2693.
Davidson Commission, 2399. *See* Shell contracts.
Daylight saving, 4006.
East Gore mail service, 3353.
Eureka, railway accommodation at, 1043.
Fielding, P. M., 1551.
Freeman, Dr. N. P., 3097.
Government railways
Divisions, 549.
Freight rates on coal, 548.
Small claims, 3311. *See* Intercolonial railway.
Government steamers, 548, 950, 1076.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3346, 3568, 3580.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)—*Con.*
High Commissioner's office, organization in, 957-965.
House of Commons—morning sittings, 2112.
Immigration
Expenditure, 2100.
Statistics, 1436.
Indians, 1652, 2668.
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1161.
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 2773, 2785.
Car purchases, 757.
Coal supply, 538, 2795.
Employees, 1040.
Equipment, 3460.
Operation, 2792.
Pictou harbour bridge, 2784.
Pugwash spur line, 3024.
Rates
Coal, 548.
Forest products, 1435, 1652.
Kastella, A., 1549.
Law, the late Mr. B. B., M.P., death of, 590.
Loans
Dominion, $75,000,000, 1824, 1830.
Farmers, to, 931.
War, 3253.
Lobsters, 950, 2387, 2439, 4017.
Mines Department, expenditure, 2328, 2331, 2344.
Mining industry, 1862, 1874, 1878.
Munitions. *See* War.
Naval Brigade, 1671.
Naval service, 228-232, 1667, 1697, 2987.
New Glasgow, shell inspectors at, 674.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2454.
Nova Scotia
Coal situation, 1609.
Judges, appointment of, 685.
Steamship service, 2853.
Patent rights, extension of, 1160.
Political patronage, 220.
Pensions. *See* Army.
Pictou (county)
Mail service, 549, 955.
Recruiting officers, 1165.
Telephone service, 549.
Pictou (town)
Freight and coal, handling of, 952, 955.
Local troops, supplies to, 857, 1042, 1077, 1349, 2172.
Pictou Island life-saving station, 549.
Political patronage, 1254, 1326, 1875, 3256.
Port Howe, mail service, 1076.
Post Office
Department expenditure, 1875, 1885.
Rural mail service, 2045, 2049, 2052, 2616.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)—*Con.*
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2359, 2478, 2554, 2760.
Public works, expenditure on, 2827.
Railway mail service, 2047.
River John customs officer, 549.
Rural mail service. *See* Post Office.
Saskatchewan Judges' salaries, 2073.
Shell Committee, the, 221-225.
Sherbrooke postmaster, 2033.
Shipbuilding, encouragement of, 703, 2115, 4052.
Steamship service, 2538.
Stellarton
Public building site, 1164.
Shell inspectors at, 673.
Taxation of profits, 1248, 1865, 1874, 1985, 1999, 2004, 2616, 2640, 2658.
Technical education, 1620, 1626.
Thompson, Mr. K. C., 921.
Transportation, 232.
Vale railway, 3024.
Vickers, Limited—sale of ammunition to, 2695.
Victoria Memorial Museum, specimens for, 2331, 2344.
War
Appropriations, 3253.
Cabinet Ministers and, 226.
Munitions
Factories—labour in, 2549.
Imperial Government, credit for, 1810.
Inspectors of, 544, 673.
Pay and record office, Canadian, 3023.
Supplies
Clothing, 4078.
Fuses, 2514.
Groceries—British Columbia, 3097, 3733.
Machine guns, 3258.
Orders for—securing of, 957, 965.
Ordnance, construction of, 2799.
Pistols, 2510.
Rifles, 3510.
Shells, 673, 2509, 3491.
Small arms ammunition, 1551, 2302, 2543, 2546, 2695, 3297, 3923.
War Purchasing Commission, 2695, 2801.
Wentworth mail service, 3353.
West Gore-Clarksville mail service, 2695.
Wilson, Fred S., 3353.
Woman suffrage, 1201.

Macdonald, Rev. D. R., claim of, 3675.

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (Toronto South)
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 2663.
Bilingual question, the, 3780.
Prison reform, 2842.

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (Toronto South)—*Con.*
Pensions to soldiers, 4149.
Toronto harbour improvements, 3344.

Machine guns. *See* War Supplies.

MacInnes, C. S., position of, 2923.

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Black, R. Robson, 3144.
Budget, 889.
Balance of trade, 890.
Domestic war loan, 891.
Revenue and expenditure, 892.
Customs taxation, 892.
Financial policy, 893.
Economy in public expenditure, 894.
Political patronage, 895.
Expenditures by departments, 895.
Government taxation proposals, 899.
Tariff on apples and oils, 899.
Taxation of profits, 899.
Taxation of incomes, 902.
Domestic war loan, 891.
Dominion notes advanced to banks, 592.
Dominion Telegraph steamer Tyrian, 1437.
Exports to United Kingdom, 592.
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 572.
Halifax
Coal shipments from, 1759.
Postmaster, 2033.
Wellington Barracks School, 558.
House of Commons—morning sittings, 2112.
Immigration, 540.
Indians, 2669.
Insurance companies, life, investments of, 1612.
Interior Department expenditure, 2607.
Kennedy, R. H., employment of, 4075.
Labour bureaus, national, 618.
Lunenburg county mail service, 3942.
Mahone bay-Martin's brook mail service, 545.
Martin's river mail service, 3881.
Militia Department—political patronage in, 3248.
Navigation schools, 698.
Nova Scotia—coal shortage, 1608.
Political patronage, 895, 3248.
Population of Canada, 636.
Post Office
Department expenditure, 2609.
Mail contracts, 2610, 2720.
Public Works Department expenditure, 2605.
Shipbuilding, 701, 703.
Shipping, lack of, 700, 1608.
Soldiers' ballots, 673.
Steamer Starling, 540.

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)—*Con.*
Steamship service, 2537, 2538.
Taxation
Apples, 899.
Income, 902.
Oil, 899, 1799.
Profits, 899, 1849, 1971, 2601, 2651.
Special revenue from, 948.
Voters' lists, 1915, printing of, 593.
War
Appropriations, 3247.
Expenditures by departments, 1161.
Supplies—Windsor purchases, 3407.

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York, O.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 461.
The wheat question, 461.
South York and the war, 461.
Effect of the war, 462.
Loans to farmers, 463.
Development of natural resources, 465.
The nickel industry, 465.
Canada's part in the war, 466.
Airships, building of, 2895, 2900.
Banks, nationalization of, 1834.
Budget, 1262.
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Companies—proposed loan to, 3826, 3871.
Insurance companies, life, investments of, 2401.
Loans
Dominion, $75,000,000, 1814, 1834.
Farmers to, 464.
Railways to, 3826, 3871.
Nickel industry, 465, 1262.
Ores, refining of, 1265.
Railways
Location of, 2746.
Public ownership of, 3826, 3871.
Railway Commission, powers to, 2746, 3629.
Saskatchewan Judges' salaries, 2077.
Shipbuilding, 2895, 3116.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2907.
Transportation, 3114.
Wheat, free, 1067.

MacNutt, Mr. Thos. (Saltcoats)
Cable service, 759.
Duty on farm implements, 4068.
Steamship service, 3352.
Trench warfare, 2696.
Wheat, free, 856.

Mahone bay-Martin's brook mail service, 544.

Maloney, Thomas, injuries to, 3390.

Manitoba School lands, 3675.

Manitoba and Saskatchewan Bible Society, 3144.

Maple sugar, 2159.

Marchand, Zepherin, fuel purchased from, 3098.

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 476.
Canada and the war, 476.
Loyalty of French-Canadian people, 478.
Recruiting in Quebec, 479, 491.
The Nationalist movement, 479.
The Bilingual question, 482-490.
Allies, Conference of at Paris, 2475.
Bilingual question, the, 482-490, 3297, 3734.
Bonaventure
Enlistments from, 4078.
Inspectors of weights and measures, 671.
Mail service, 1438, 2172.
Civil Service Commision, 665.
Campbellton
Alleged disturbances at, 945.
Gaspé steamship service, 536.
Proposed bridge at, 3628.
Railway superintendent, 535.
Carleton beach protection works, 536.
Divorce, 778.
Dredging, 3627.
Fisheries overseer, 535.
Gaspé
Enlistments from, 4078.
Inspector of weights and measures, 671.
Wrecking station, 718.
Gaspé-Anticosti mail service, 536.
Gaspé and Bonaventure lighthouses, 536.
Government railways—small claims, 3307.
Grenier, Private Adolphe, 3559.
House of Commons—Clerk Assistant, appointment of, 884.
Immigration, 2102.
Imperial Munitions Board, 594.
Inland Revenue Department—officials of in municipal elections, 1759.
Intercolonial railway
Accident at Val Brillant, 2058.
Coal, 2115.
Interior Department, promotions in, 836.
Intoxicating liquor in prohibition territory, 2169.
Judges' salaries, 2324.
Letters for soldiers, 2051, 2053.
Life-saving, 726.
Lobsters, 2386.
Maria beach protection works, 536.
Maritime road, repairs to, 746.
Montreal Island, bridge connection with, 3629.
Montreal railway terminals, 3415, 3423.

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)—*Con.*
Murchies channel piers, 1654.
National Transcontinental Railway, government operation of, 3429.
New Carlisle wharf, 535.
New Richmond
Mail service, 2174.
Post office, 1118, 1653.
Overseas forces, 2348.
Paspebiac wharf, 536.
Postmasters and municipal elections, 1653.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1451, 2169, 2220, 2231, 2351, 2475.
Quebec
Fisheries, 638.
Recruiting, 479, 491.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 3429.
Recruiting, 479, 490, 3590, 3643, 5354.
Rural mail service, 2018, 2021, 2040.
Rimouski
Harbour improvements, 3174.
Inspector of weights and measures, 671.
Saguenay river improvements, 3674.
St. Alphonse de Caplan mail service, 1654.
Soldiers' decorations, record of, 1969.
Steamers, whistling of, 3375.
Steamship service, 3100.
Temiscouata county public works, 4077.

Maria beach protection works, 536.

Marine
Baleine, lease of, 3676.
Coasting privileges. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bill.
Crosby, A. B.—hire of steamer, 727.
Department
Clerks, 2801.
Estimates, 662, 692, 716, 739, 2361, 2530, 2542, 3436.
Law clerk, 2176.
Staff and salaries, 662.
Harbour commissions, 740, 742.
Harbour facilities, 740.
Hochelaga, Steamer, 950.
Hospitals. *See that title.*
Hydrographic surveys, 2901.
Ice-breaker contract, 1440.
Icebreaking, 723, 744.
Life-saving, 726, 2916.
Lighthouse and coast service
Maintenance and repairs, 728, 739.
Retiring fund, 754.
Salaries, 725.
Supplies, 728.
Lighthouse Board, 1078.
Maritime road, repairs to, 746.
Mayflower, wreck of the, 727.
Minister of—visit to New York, 2012.
Minto, sale of the, 723.

Marine—*Con.*
Montmagny, repairs to, 751.
Navigation
Aids, 728.
Anderson report, 636.
Coasting regulations, 699.
Masters and Mates, examination of, 694.
Motor boats, certificated officers. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills.
Obstructions, removal of, 715, 745.
Pilotage. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bills.
Pilots' pensions. *See* Pensions.
St. Lawrence, 719, 1906, 3437.
Schools, 695.
Noreen, rental of, 727.
Pilot, wreck of, 106, 154.
Sick Mariners Fund, 752.
Shipbuilding, encouragement of, 639, 701, 1616, 1643, 2115, 2892, 3001, 3106, 3336, 3608, 4052.
Shipping
Shortage of, 638, 706.
Total Canadian, 2175.
See also Transportation.
Steamers
Foreign trade licenses for, 2694.
Government, 693, 723, 727, 751, 950, 1076, 1437, 3437.
Whistling of, 3375, 3612. *See also* vessels.
Steamship service. *See that title.*
Transportation. *See that title.*
Tidal stations, 2913.
Vessels
Canadian, net tonnage of, 1163.
Commandeering of, 116, 1608.
Requisitioning of, 1969.
Wrecks, investigations into, 695.
Wrecking plants, subsidies for, 716.

Martin, Mr. Mederic (Montreal, St. Mary's)
Unemployment, the poor and, 595.

Martin, Mr. William M. (Regina)
Advertising, 827.
Badger, W., employment of, 1439.
Bennett, D. D., 1759.
Brandt, Peter, employment of, 832.
Criminal Code Amendment—bigamy; foreign divorces, 1040.
Drab, Max, employment of, 1439.
Evans, N. A., employment of, 1439, 1653.
Homestead inspectors, 828.
Indians, 2688.
Keay, R. H., fraudulent operations of, 836.
Labour bureaus, national, 612.
Militia Department, political patronage in, 1374, 3252.
Moosejaw examining warehouse, 1550.

Martin, Mr. William M. (Regina)—*Con.*
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 691, 1439.
Political patronage, 1374, 3252.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2226.
Recruiting, 3251.
Regina
Army Service Corps—accommodation for, 1652.
Assistant Receiver General, 553.
Inland Revenue premises, 1439.
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 1439.
Riding Mountain timber reserve, 640.
Ross, W. T., release of, 2301.
Saskatchewan public buildings, 3329.
Saskatchewan river, direction of, 841.
Seed Grain indebtedness, 512.
Stedman, Robert E., 3232.
68th Battalion—payment of wages, 2695.
Swift Current post office site, 1041.
Taxation of apples, 2308.
War appropriations, 3251.
Wheat, commandeering of, 3219.

Martin's river mail service, 3881.

McCoig, Mr. Archibald B. (West Kent, O.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 389.
Kent county and the war, 390.
Hay contracts, 392.
Embargo on wool, 393.
The tobacco industry, 394.
Hog cholera, 395.
Horses for the war, 396.
Taxation of farmers, 398.
Agriculture, 1401.
Corn, freight rates on, 2963.
Hay contracts, 392.
Hogs, government inspection of, 1552.
Hog cholera, 395, 1397, 2957.
Horses, purchases of, 396, 671.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2357.
Tobacco industry, the, 394.
Wool, embargo on, 393.

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)
Budget, 1259.
Peel provincial election and Mr. Fallis, 1259.
The Minister of Public Works and the West, 1260.
Farmers and taxation, 1261.
Conscription, 592, 829.
Horses—Mr. Fallis, 674, 1259.
Immigration, 2442.
Interior, Minister of, in Chicago, 829.
Loans to farmers, 678, 928.
Prince George, B.C., railway station, 637.

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)—*Con.*
Railways
Location of, 2755.
Stations, naming of, 2738.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2755.
Reforestation, 2089.
Rural credits, 2401.
Saskatchewan—military district No. 12, 1903, 1971.
Seed grain, indebtedness, 761.
Taxation of apples, 1787, 1791, 2315.
Woman suffrage, 1195.

McCrea, Mr. Fancis N. (Sherbrooke)
Cap à la Roche channel, 761.
Rural mail service, 2042.
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1906.
Sherbrooke
Drill hall, 3098.
Postmaster, 1906, 2032.
Steamship service, 2534.
Tan bark, embargo on, 3022.
Taxation of profits, 1852, 1858, 1981, 1986, 2005, 2639.

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Shelburne and Queens)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 398.
Charges against army officers, 398.
Politics in Nova Scotia, 402.
Correction of statement in Ottawa Citizen, 2548.
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 567.
Intercolonial railway—rates of pay, 2881.

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 303.
Public expenditures, 304, 312.
Political patronage and the war, 306-312.
The Minister of Militia, 307.
Purchase of war supplies, 309.
Conservative administration, 311.
Baddeck wharf, 548.
Baleine, steamship, 3676.
Bay St. Lawrence telegraph office, 1551.
Budget, 1109.
The war, 1109.
Financial conditions, 1110.
Revenue and expenditure, 1111.
Taxation proposals, 1111, 1114.
Cost of living, 1112.
The country's finances, 1113.
The Minister of Trade and Commerce and political partyism, 1115.
Constitutional documents, 977.
Dingwall, postmaster, 1160.
Divorce, 789.
Fish and fisheries
Development of industry, 2383.

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)—*Con.*
Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Fishermen, medical treatment for,
Transportation and marketing of, 574.
Ingonish harbour—ice-breaking, 2421.
Immigration expenditure, 2606.
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 3432.
North Sydney terminals, 3425.
Passenger service, 3424.
Jamesville breakwater, 3615.
Loans to farmers, 934.
Magdalen islands cable, 759.
Mahoney, Thomas, 3390.
Meat Cove breakwater, 758.
Militia Department, 307.
Mines Department expenditure, 2333.
Newfoundland—regulations affecting immigration from, 2441.
Political patronage, 306-312, 1370, 3543.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4044, 4050.
Railway situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3988.
Rural mail service, 2054.
Shipbuilding, 4063.
Small arms ammunition, 3884.
Soldiers, employment of in England, 1371.
Technical education, 1635.
Telegraph lines, government, 3328, 3634.
Victoria county, N.S.—Government telegraphs, 548, 758.
Wellington harbour improvements, 2169.
Westover county telegraph office, 2600.

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queens, P.E.I.)
Divorce, 779.
Government railways—small claims, 3304.
Horses, 1383.
Lobsters, 2382.
Political patronage, 3276.
Prince Edward Island public works, 3155.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1953, 2560.
Shipbuilding, 713.
Soldiers, voting of, 3510.

McMillan, Mr. John A. (Glengarry)
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2357.
War supplies—transport trucks, 3676.

McNab, C. C., claim of, 4074.

Meat Cove breakwater, 758.

Medical instruction, government, 978.

Medicine Hat
Customs building, 1440.
Mail service, 534.
Overseas regiment, 1435.
Post office, 534.

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Solicitor General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 115.
Allowances to soldiers, 116.
Ocean transportation, 116-118.
Commandeering of vessels, 116.
The Shell Committee, 118, 126, 128.
Shell contracts, 120-128.
Expenditure of war funds, 125.
The Davidson commission, 129, 137.
Purchase of submarines, 132.
Budget, 1222.
Canada's trade and prosperity, 1222.
Our financial condition, 1222, 1241.
British and Canadian expenditures compared, 1223.
The late Government and taxation, 1225.
Duty on oils, 1227.
Duty on apples, 1227.
The farmers and taxation, 1229, 1242.
Exportation of nickel, 1233.
Economy in the public service, 1240.
The Jewish people, 1242.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3659.
Davidson Commission, the, 129-137.
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, 3373.
Nickel, exportation of, 1233.
Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company, 1014.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3996, 4012, 4032, 4039.
Railways, location of, 2752.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2752.
Retractation of expression, 107.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2061, 2069, 2317, 2934.
Shell Committee, 118, 126, 128.
Shell contracts, 1737, 3494.
Soldiers, allowances to, 116.
Submarines, purchases of, 132.
See Davidson Commission.
Taxation
Apples, 1227.
Generally, 1255-1299.
Oils, 1277.
Transportation, ocean, 116-118.
Vessels, commandeering of, 116.
War expenditures, 125.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 3207.
Free, 1068.

Mercantile marine. *See* Transportation.

Meredith-Duff Commission—printing of evidence, 4130. *See also* War Supplies, Small Arms Ammunition.

Michaud, Mr. E. Pius (Victoria, N.B.)
Bridges, interprovincial, 3633.
Budget, 1097.
Problems arising from the war, 1098.
Provision for returned soldiers, 1098.
Future immigration, 1098.
National economy, 1099.
Campbellton
Accommodation for soldiers at, 1162.
Public building, 1162.
International bridge, guarding of, 1041.
Minister of Militia, travelling expenses of, 2171.
Mitchell, Moses, 3408.
Penitentiaries, 2123.
Richards, I. M., services of, 1653.
Sabourin, Lieut.-Col., 949.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3371.
St. John Valley Railway, 1940.
St. Leonard, soldiers at, 640.
Soldiers, allowances to, 1098.

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Civil Service—appointment of soldiers to, 642.
Immigration, 2105.
Owen, James W., patent of, 1226.
Parliament Buildings, reconstruction of, 2013.
Political patronage, 1377.
Shipbuilding, 708.
Transportation, freight rates, 708.

Milford Haven Bridge postmaster, 2173.

Militia and Defence
Appointments, 293.
Bands, regimental, 1044.
Cadet
Services, 3502.
Inspectors, 3144.
Censors and decoders. *See* Censors.
Chief Transport Officer, 1903, 1969.
Conscription. *See* Army.
Department
Automobiles for, 2544.
Clerks, 2839.
Estimates, 1341, 3502, 3537, 3586.
Expenditures, 897.
Organization, 3233.
Political patronage in, 3248, 3252.
Dominion Arsenal, 3537, 3586.
Edmonton militiamen in active service, 114.
Fair wage clause in munitions contracts, *See* War.
Home Guard, rifles for, 3504.
Hospital Commission, 2347.
Military district No. 12, Saskatchewan, 1903, 1971.
Militia officers in Canada, 288.

Militia and Defence—*Con.*
Military training, 3501.
Minister of
Travelling expenses of, 2171.
Trips to England, recent, 1117, 1915, 2012, 2646; in 1915, 2545.
Royal Military College, 362, 2172, 2831, 3528, 3881.
Wellington Barracks School, 558.
See also Army *and* War.

Military forces. *See* Army .

Mines and Minerals.
Coal
Mining, government control of, 718.
Nova Scotia shortage of, 1608.
Shipments from Halifax, 1759.
Department
Clerks, 2921.
Estimates, 2326.
Publications, 3883.
Reports, 2335.
Staff and salaries, 2337.
Geological survey, 2341.
Nickel, exportation of, 465, 1012, 1233, 1262, 1140, 1143, 2166, 2239, 2799.
Ores, refining of, 1265, 3021.
Peat
Canadian Peat Society, 2329.
Experiments, 2327.
Tar sands experiments, 2340.
Zinc
Bounties on, *See* Zinc Bounties Bill.
Duty on, 2839.

Mitchell, Moses, position of, 3408.

Moncton—Main Street subway, 3024.

Montpetit, Elzear, payment to, 2694.

Montreal
Barracks, 2821.
Customs
Building, 2175, 2476.
Officers and revenue, 2169.
Harbour, 740.
Immigration agent, 1440.
Inland Revenue building, 2822.
Postal station G, 2821.
Postal station A, 2821.
Postal station M, 2820.
Post office
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036, 2820.
Revenues, 1651.
Salaries, 1651.
Service, 2031.
Railway terminals, 3415, 3423.
Recruiting in, 4069, 4125.
Soldiers, medical examination of, 4069, 4125.

Montreal Island, bridge connection with, 3163, 3628.

Monument of His late Majesty King Edward VII, 3324.

Moosejaw
Customs officers, 2171.
Examining warehouse, 1550.
Military, 1651.

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Bilingual question, the, 3769.
Cadet service, 3504.
Horses, 2968.
Immigration expenditure, 2108.
Intercolonial railway—operation, 3403.
Justice—indeterminate sentences, 2844.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2459.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2762.
Public works, expenditure on, 2829.
Railways
Location of, 2754.
Passenger service, 3418, 3422.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2754.
Ross rifle, 4112.
Seventh Day Adventists Conferences, 2167.
Soldiers, employment of on farms, 3589.

Morris, Mr. James (Chateauguay)
Agriculture Department—horses purchased by, 3881.
Montreal island, bridge connection with, 3631.
Telephone Companies, 3327.

Morrisburg, Ont.—Militia office, 1078.

Morrison, Mr. Alex. (Macdonald)
Free wheat, 1057.

Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 686, 956, 1439.

Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company Bill. 1r., 3230. 2r., 3372. Com., 3373. 3r., 3375.

Muirhead, Major, charges against, 306, 398.

Munitions. *See* War Supplies.

Murchies channel piers, 1654.

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 156.
Visit of Prime Minister to England, 157.
Canada's status in the Empire, 157.
Provision for disabled soldiers, 158.
Canadian Manufacturers' Association and war supplies, 159.
War contracts, 161-167.
Taxation of war profits, 168.
Commandeering of wheat, 168.
The Shell Committee, 171.
Aitken, Sir Max, duties of, 534, 2692.

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)—*Con.*
Canadian Manufacturers' Association and war supplies, 159.
Electricity, export of, 671.
Horses for war purposes, 1385.
Immigration of widows and children, 1330.
Munitions, supply of from Canada, 106.
Ottawa Customs building, 1549.
Parliament Buildings, reconstruction of, 806.
Shell Committee, the, 171.
Soldiers
Payment of, 552.
Provision for, 158.
Submarines, equipment of, 534.
Taxation of profits, 168.
Wallace Shipyards, Limited—payments to, 1077.
War contracts, 161-167.
Wheat, commandeering of, 168.

National Battlefields Commission, 3141, 3148, 3637.

Nationalist party, 471.

National Transcontinental railway
Coal for, 3468.
Equipment, 2799.
Freight rates, 1276, 2795, 3036-3089.
Government operation of, 2569, 2584, 2399, 3036,-3089, 3429, 3605, 3980, 3985.
Grain shipments on, 1276.
Locomotives, 1596.
Operating expenses, 1596.
Police commissioner, 2696.
Quebec terminals, 2569, 2584.

Naval Service
Department
Estimates, 662, 2885, 2908, 3442.
Expenditure, 2889.
Staff and salaries, 662.
Travelling expenses, 2300.
Esquimalt dockyards, 2889.
Explanation by Prime Minister, 1763.
Naval brigade, 1671.
Niobe and Rainbow, 229, 238, 1684, 1701, 1667, 2890.
Patrol service, 1680.
Rainbow, alleged capture by, 3943.
Recruits for, 2987.
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, 228.
Schooner Two Brothers, 533.
Stadacona, 548.
Steamer Starling, 540, 544.
Submarines
Equipment of, 534.
Purchase of, 75, 132, 200-211, 266, 316, 337, 387, 2890, 2897.

Naval Service—*Con.*
Submarines—*Con.*
Transport service, 1681.
Vessels in service, 1667.

Navigation. *See* Marine.

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Animals, diseased, destruction of, 2957.
Brantford, city of, 2664.
Budget, 1006.
Government expenditures, 1007, 1012.
Taxation proposals, 1008.
Immigration policy, 1011.
Political patronage, 1012.
Control of nickel industry, 1012.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan, 3662, 3979.
Civil Service—enlistments from, 825.
Flax industry, 1286.
Government expenditure, 4116.
Hay purchases, 2967.
Hudson Bay railway, 3376.
Mines Department publications, 3883.
Nickel industry, control of, 1012.
Peat, 2328.
Pensions to soldiers, 1663.
Political patronage, 1012.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2360.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4019, 4116.
Railways
Location of, 2745.
Situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3979.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2746.
Soldiers
Pensions, 1663.
Technical training for, 1618.
Steamship service, 2532.
Taxation
Apples, 1008.
Oil, 1009.
Profits, 1009, 1793, 1990, 2631, 2641, 2651.
Technical education, 2208.
Water carts, 537.
Woman suffrage, 1201.
Zinc, bounties on, 3034.

Neuville lighthouse, 593.

New Brunswick
Lumber export trade, 190.
Public works, 3159.

New Carlisle wharf, 535.

Newfoundland
Immigration, regulations affecting, 2441.
Steamship service. *See that title.*

New Glasgow
40th Battalion, supplies for, 1043.
Postal revenue, 3561.

New Richmond post office, 1653.

Nickel. *See* Mines and Minerals.

Nickle, Mr. William F. (Kingston)
Bilingual question, the, 3723.
Pensions to soldiers, 4140.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4125.
Railways, location of, 2755.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2755.
Shipbuilding, 714.
Taxation of profits, 1860.

Niobe and Rainbow. *See* Naval Service.

Noreen, steamer, 727.

North Bay armoury, 2691.

Northrup, Mr. William B. (East Hastings)
Divorce, 595, 762, 791.

Nova Scotia
Coal shortage, 1608.
Fenian Raid Bounties, 593.
Fishery inspector, 546.
Horses, purchase of in, 685.
Public works. *See that title.*
Recruiting in, 1367, 3255.
Soldiers voting in, 3510.
Steamship service. *See that title.*

Oats and oatmeal. *See* Grain.

O'Brien, Mr. A. H., superannuation of, 2131.

Oil
Duty on. *See* Taxation.
Freight rates on, 3410.
Gasolene, production and price of, 885, 1019, 2393.
Petroleum, embargo on, 2648.
Railways, for fuel on, 977, 1550.

Okanagan Indian reserve. *See* Indians.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 99.
Ocean transportation, 100.
Extension of term of Parliament, 102.
War expenditures, 102.
Conscription, 103.
Enlistment, 104.
Provision for disabled soldiers, 105, 108, 110.
Provision for soldiers and their dependents, 109.
Patriotic Fund, 109.
Military equipment, 111, 112.
Our system of recruiting, 113.
Military forces in Canada, 114.
Alberta, enlistments in, 108.
Army
Casualty lists, 3280.
Conscription, 103.
Enlistments, 104, 108, 3279, 4076.
Military training, 3503, 3507.
101st Battalion, 3548.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—*Con.*
Overseas forces, equipment of, 3513.
Recruiting, 113, 3550, 3587.
Soldiers
Allowances to, 550, 4102.
Civil Service, appointments of to, 648.
Dependents of, allowances to, 4102.
Disabled, provision for, 105, 108, 110, 3334.
Equipment of, 112, 3502-3528.
Insane, 1659.
Medical examination of, 4073.
Pensions to, 1658, 4148.
Punishment of, 3539.
Technical training for, 1619.
Astronomical observatories, 2430, 2434.
Bilingual question, the, 3773.
Budget, 1209.
The Government and national conditions, 1209.
Agricultural development, 1211, 1220.
Revenue and expenditure, 1212.
Increasing taxation, 1213.
The cost of living, 1216.
Duty on apples, 1217.
Issue of Dominion notes, 1218.
Business corporations, government control of, 719.
Cadet service, 3503.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan, 3658, 3863, 3976.
Civil Service—appointments of soldiers to, 648.
Cold storage, 1428.
Cost of living, 1216.
Edmonton
Disturbances at, 887.
Militia, 114.
Technical School, 648.
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, 2081, 3448.
Experimental farms—bee-keeping on, 1410.
Grain
Congestion, 1706.
Elevators, St. John, 3594.
Freight rates on, 3074.
Oats and oatmeal, embargo on, 653, 803.
Transportation of, 3074, 3085, 3456, 3981.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 3201.
Free, 874-880.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—proposed loan, 3658, 3863.
Homestead entries by volunteers, 3529.
Hudson Bay railway, 3379, 3989.
Immigration
Expenditure, 2110, 2440.
Policy, 831.
Stations, western, 2869.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—*Con.*
Indian Commission—British Columbia, 852.
Indians
Okanagan reserve, 3144, 3676.
Saint Peter's reserve, 593, 2060, 2067, 2316.
Intercolonial railway equipment, 3601.
Interior
Department expenditure, 2079, 2090.
Minister of—speech in Chicago, 831.
Orders in Council approved, 3347.
Lac St. Anne improvements, 3313.
Lands, western, survey of, 835.
Legion of Frontiersmen, 3507.
Loans to farmers, 681.
Mining industry, 1880.
National Transcontinental railway
Freight rates, 3074.
Government operation of, 3980.
Northern Alberta, enlistments in, 4076.
Oats and oatmeal. *See* Grain.
Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company, 1013.
Parliament, extension of term of, 102.
Patriotic Fund, 109.
Penitentiaries, 2154.
Prisoners from in military service, 2117.
Pensions. *See* Army.
Political patronage in military affairs, 3547.
Potatoes, duty on, 1431.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2947.
Public works, expenditure on, 3313.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4002, 4016.
Railways
Oil for fuel on, 977, 1550.
Western, 2081.
Railway mail service, 2045, 2050.
Rogers, Colonel Maynard, services of, 848.
Rural mail service, 2044.
Seed grain indebtedness, 509.
Seventh Day Adventists Conferences, 2167.
Spirit river—proposed forest reserve, 3529, 3883.
Surveys, 1324, 2342, 2429.
Tar sands, 2340.
Taxation
Apples, 1217, 1792, 2306, 2310, 2315.
Profits, 1880.
Telegraph lines, government, 3326, 3634.
Transportation
Ocean, 3131.
Railway, 3980.
War
Appropriations, 3277.
Expenditures, 102.
Supplies
Canvas shoes, 595, 673.
Field kitchens, 547.
Machine guns, 111, 595, 3522.
Orders for, securing of, 964.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—*Con.*
War, Supplies—*Con.*
Overshoes, 673, 886.
Rifles, 595, 3520, 4105, 4107.
Socks, 593, 887.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1888.
Western development, 2080.
Wheat. *See* Grain.
Woman suffrage, 1608.

Ontario Public works, 3179.

Orangemen in army service, 359.

Ottawa
Buildings
Customs, 1549.
Departmental, 667, 2830, 2874, 3135, 3612.
Height of, 2165.
New drill hall, 2832.
Recruiting offices, 3587.
Victoria Memorial Museum, 2331, 2343.
Military camp doctors, 1760.

Ottawa Separate School Commission, 2546.

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)
Budget, 1095.
Canada and the war, 1095.
Government expenditure, 1095.
Quebec and the war, 1096.
Civil Service—appointments from Dorchester, 2921.

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Railway Act, consolidation of, 1276.
Soulanges canal, dredging, 1761.

Paquet, Mr. Eugene (L'Islet)
Agriculture, 1392.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 11.
Review of the war, 12.
Canada's part in the war, 13.
Extension of term of Parliament, 15.
Canada's economic conditions, 15.
Exhibitions, 3026.
Government employees, 3674.
Intercolonial railway—French speaking employees, 2788.
Mail service on the Transcontinental, 2050.
Quebec (city), Transcontinental railway employees at, 1436.
Dairy inspection, 852.
Live stock, 886.
Quebec (prov.)

Panama Canal, goods shipped to Canada via., 4092.

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 453.
Canada and the war, 453.

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)—*Con.*
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech—*Con.*
Problems after the war, 454.
War contracts, 455.
Titles, 457.
Bilingual question, the, 3794.
Civil Servants—separation allowances to wives of, 3232.
Dredging—launch Waldrondo, 3942.
Flax industry, 1292.
Frontier protection, 744.
Horses for war purposes, 1381.
Mail contracts, 2723.
National Transcontinental railway police commissioner, 2696.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1890.
Postage stamps, sale and use of, 2050.
Prince Rupert Militia quarters, 3352.
Separation allowances, 3232.
Shell Committee, the, advances by, 3528.
Shell contracts, 757, 2243.
Taxation of profits, 1847, 2652.
War contracts, 456, 2243.

Paris
Agency, 982.
Allied Economy Conference at, 2475, 2802.

Parks, Canadian National, 844, 846.
See also Dominion Lands and Parks; Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amendment Bill.

Parliament
Committees of. *See* House of Commons.
Extension of term of, 6, 15, 68, 97, 102, 181, 215, 413, 425, 437, 475, 492, 622, 636, 755, 1133, 3943, 4007, 4129. *See* Address to His Majesty the King.
Independence of—subscriptions to Dominion loan, 455.
Library of, 668, 755.
Members of in military service. *See* Army.
Railways, jurisdiction respecting, 947.

Parliament Buildings
Desks, purchase of, 1278.
Destruction of by fire, 578.
Alleged warning, 674.
Architect's report on, 888.
Commission of Inquiry into—appointment of, 582. Report of, 4006.
Messages of sympathy, 579, 587, 652, 669, 855, 885, 1276.
Report of Chief Commissioner of Police, 669.
Improvements to, 2833.
Light on, 739.

Parliament Buildings—*Con.*
Plans of, 1969, 4077.
Reconstruction of, 591, 663, 806, 2012, 3049.
Committee of Members on, 3049, 3613.
Fair wage clause in contract for, 3622, 3464.
Plans for, 1969, 4077.
See also Ottawa.

Parliamentary procedure
Amendments, 1712, 1714, 2238.
Answer to question, discussion of, out of order, 652.
Bills not to be introduced by resolution, 3617.
Committee of Supply, powers of, 3944.
Consent of the Crown, 2116.
Irrelevancy, 975, 1834.
Motion for Committee to rise not in order, 2453.
Point of order, discussion on, 3621.
Reading of unsigned letter not in order, 2743.
Subjects debatable by House, 3621, 3676.
See Deputy Speaker *and* Speaker.

Paspebiac wharf, 536.

Patenaude, Hon. Esioff L. (Hochelaga)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 521.
Quebec and the war, 521.
Attitude of the Liberal Party, 523, 525.
Views of the late Mr. Monk, 527.
Canada's part in the war, 527.
Haanel, Dr., 852.
Inland Revenue Department estimates, 661, 2157-2165.
Maple sugar adulteration, 2164.

Patents
Records, printing of, 1386.
Rights, extension of, 1157.

Patriotic Fund, Canadian, 109, 500, 1255.

Patronage. *See* Political.

Peat. *See* Mines.

Pelagic sealing investigation, 2918.

Penitentiaries
Industrial farms, 2841.
Insane patients, 2119.
Juveniles in, 2121.
Kingston, 2115.
Portsmouth, 541.
Prisons and reformatories, 2841.
See also Prisons and Reformatories Act Amendment Bill.
Prisoners from in military service, 2117.
Ross, Walter T., release of, 2301, 2302.
St. Vincent de Paul, 2118.
Ticket-of-leave system, 2117.

Pensions
European War, 3643.
Fenian Raid, 3642.
Intercolonial railway, 757.
Militiamen, 3642.
Pilots, 747-750.
Soldiers, 211, 236, 440, 1087, 1255, 1654, 1665, 1704, 1989.
Report of Special Committee on, 4131.
See Army, allowances.

Perley, Sir George. *See* High Commissioner.

Peterborough public building, 2810.

Pictou (county)
Mail service, 549, 955.
Recruiting officers, 1165.
Telephone service, 549.

Pictou (island) lifeboat station, 549.

Pictou (town)
Freight and coal, handling of, 952.
Troops at—supplies, 851, 1041, 1077.

Pilotage. *See* Marine.

Political patronage, 145, 217, 276, 294, 299, 303-312, 368, 416, 895, 907, 917, 1012, 1032, 1127, 1254, 1273, 1326, 1351, 1353, 1361, 1363, 1366, 1370-1374, 1875, 3248, 3252, 3256, 3261, 3266, 3275, 3288, 3542.

Pope, Sir Joseph, payments to, 2922.

Port Hood wharf, expenditure on, 560.

Port Howe mail service, 1076.

Pont Marcotte, 2171.

Port Nelson
Dock accommodation, 2692.
Harbour improvements, 1599, 2838.
Live stock for, 2692.
Navigation, 592.

Post Office
Advertising, 1164, 2739.
Censoring of mail matter, 2054, 2691, 2840, 2880, 3029, 3050.
Estimates, 663, 2016, 2716, 3534.
Expenditure, 1244, 1875, 1885, 2056, 2609.
Finances, 895.
Mail contracts, 2610, 2720.
Motor cars, purchase of, 1327, 1328.
Parcel post, 2736.
Postmasters and municipal elections, 1653.
Railway mail service, 2023, 2045, 2047, 2050,
Revenue, 2173.
Rural mail service, 2017, 2032, 2040, 2044, 2050, 2052, 2054, 2616, 2621, 2716.
Savings deposits, 543.
Soldiers' letters, 532, 2051, 2053.
Staff and salaries. *See* estimates.
Stamps, sale and use of, 532, 546, 2051, 2718.

Powder milk. *See* War Supplies.

Prince Albert—hydro-electric development, 842.

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 1597, 1704, 3391.
Dredging, 853.
Fishery inspectors, 2010.
Hillsborough bridge, guard on, 1433.
Horses, purchase of, 672.
Public works, 3152, 3635.
Steamship service, 2851.
Telegraph lines, 3187.
War supplies, purchases of, 3406.
Winter communication with, 1433.

Prince Edward Island railway, 1594, 3035, 3051, 3074.

Prince George, B.C., railway station, 637.

Prince Rupert militia quarters, 3352.

Printing, government, 668, 3095, 3099, 3785, 4152. *See also* advertising.

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2690. 2r., 2841-2845. Com., 2846. Rep., 2847. 3r., 2847.

Prison reform. *See* penitentiaries.

Private bills discussed.
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 2663.
Brantford, City of, 947, 1625, 1648, 1726, 2663.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 1013.
Eastern Canadian Union Conference of Seventh Day Adventists, 2167.
Governing Council of the Salvation Army in Canada, 2907.
Manitoba and Saskatchewan Bible Society, 3144.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2421, 2444.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1647, 1727, 1890.
Owen, James W., patent of, 1154, 1228.
Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company, 1013.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2765, 2903.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1649, 1887.

Privilege, questions of
Boivin, Mr.—bilingual question, 1206.
Bureau, Mr.—Ontario hydro-radial scheme, 1432.
Burnham, Mr.—statement in Toronto Star, 555.
Carvell, Mr.—fraudulent questions, 1492; shell deliveries, 2240.
Clements, Mr.—graft charges, 2398.
Crothers, Hon. T. W.—Globe newspaper, 1811.

Privilege, questions of—*Con.*
Hepburn, Mr.—shell contracts, 154.
Hughes, Sir Sam—Lieut.-Colonel John Currie, M.P., 1045.
Kemp, Hon. A. E.—Sheet Metal Products Company, 1646.
Kyte, Mr.—shell contracts, 3296.
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid—statement in Winnipeg Telegram, 2973.
Loggie, Mr.—St. John Daily Telegraph, 2113.
McCurdy, Mr.—statements of Ottawa Citizen, 2548.
Pugsley, Mr.—remarks of Solicitor General, 151; statement of Ottawa Journal, 806; correction of statement in Hansard, 2399.
Rogers, Hon. Robert—charges in Saskatchewan legislature, 1045.
Seguin, Mr.—statement of Ottawa Citizen, 2239.
Turriff, Mr.—statement of Peterborough Review, 414.

Prohibition of intoxicating liquors during the war. Res., 1441, 1918, 1949, 2210, 2351. Div., 2361. *See* also, 638, 2475, and Canada Temperance Act Amendment Bill.

Prohibition or Restriction of Intoxicating Liquors Bill. 1r., 1901. 2r., 2478. Com., 2479-2494, 2549-2569, 2696-2716, 2758-2765, 2882. Rep., 2885. 3r., 2946, 2956.
Amendments proposed: Mr. Guthrie, 2953. Div., 2954. Mr. Sinclair, 2955. Mr. Hughes, 2956. Sen. Amdts., 4127.

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Allison, Col. J. Wesley, 2012, 2476.
Bilingual question, the, 3798.
Cabinet Ministers, visit to New York of, 2012.
Carleton Drug Company, 2542.
Carson, General John, position of, 851.
Chute, Lieutenant A. H., 2476.
Civil Service—pay of lower grade employees, 4079.
Forbes, Dr. A. Mackenzie, 3528.
Foster, A. De W., 2175.
Lessard, Major General, position of, 547.
Marine and Fisheries law clerk, 2176.
Motor car, Packard—purchase of, 1328
O'Brien, Mr. A. H., superannuation of, 2131.
Peat, 2328.
Penitentiaries
Kingston, 2116.
Sentencing of children to, 2122.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2358, 2882.
Proof spirit purchase, 2176.

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)—*Con.*
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4087.
Shouldis, Mrs., employment of, 1328.
64th Battalion—medical officer, 1077.
Sussex, N.B., Battalion—medical officer, 1161.
Tibbits, Archibald, 2176.
Tremain, Lieut.-Col., M.P., 1652.
Trenches, improvement of, 2922.
Wilson, Mr. Beckles, 1327.
Woman suffrage, 1196.

Public Accounts Committee. *See* House of Commons.

Public health, proposed department of, 1065.

Public printing. *See* Printing.

Public Service Loan ($75,000,000) Bill. Res., 1812, 1834. Rep., 1843. 1r., 1843. 2r., 1972. Com., 1972. 3r., 1972.

Public works
Applications for, 1807.
Buildings
Alberta, 2868.
Generally, 341.
Manitoba, 2818.
Nova Scotia, 2814.
Ontario, 2824. *See* Ottawa.
Quebec, 2818.
Saskatchewan, 3329.
Department
Architectural Branch, 3319.
Clerks, 3096.
Engineering Branch, 3319.
Estimates, 663, 2808-2838, 2868, 2148-3188, 3312-3344, 3556, 3612, 3621.
Staff and salaries, 663.
Dredging
British Columbia, 1078, 3942.
Dredge Port Nelson, 2692.
Maritime Provinces, 853.
Ontario and Quebec, 3186, 3627.
St. Lawrence ship channel, 722.
Victoria, B.C., 546.
Expenditures, 896, 2605, 2808, 2826, 3156, 3322, 3338.
Harbours and rivers
British Columbia, 3626.
Generally, 3152.
Manitoba, 3184.
Ontario, 3625.
New Brunswick, 3335, 3621.
Nova Scotia, 3149, 3615.
Ontario, 3179, 3338.
Prince Edward Island, 3635.
Quebec, 719, 3161, 3556, 3623.
St. Lawrence, 719.
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3313.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 67.
Extension of term of Parliament, 68.
Transportation requirements, 69.
Manufacture of munitions, 71-90.
Shell Committee, 71-92.
Shell contracts, 72-90.
Submarine investigation, 75.
Taxation of war profits, 85.
Contributions for machine guns, 92.
Advertising, Government, 2436.
Burleigh falls, lease of, 2582.
Canadian Northern Railway Company
Director, 2648.
Proposed loan to, 3581, 3940, 3944.
Canada Temperance Act, 3298.
Carnegie, Colonel, correspondence with, 1731.
Civil Service—enlistments, 818, 1844.
Coloured men, recruiting of, 235, 557, 2114.
Davidson Commission, report of, 3189.
Dominion Lands and Parks, 2865.
Economic and Development Commission, 1640, 2999.
Experimental farms, 2871.
Fish and fisheries
Transportation, 2418.
Trout fry, 2421.
German-Canadians in military service, 683.
Government expenditures, 973, 986, 1321, 3137.
Government railways—small claims, 3304.
Grain
Congestion, 1713.
Elevators, 3059, 3082.
Transportation, 2857.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3581, 3940.
Hansard—correction of statement, 2399.
High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 963.
House of Commons—morning sittings, 2112.
Hudson Bay navigation, 2912.
Immigration
Advertising, 2436.
Expenditure, 2093, 2099, 2436.
Indians
Kitsilano reserve, 2681.
St. Peter's reserve, 2063, 2937.
Insurance companies, life, investments of, 1612, 2401.
Intercolonial railway—branch lines, 3434.
Interior Department expenditure, 2090, 2431, 2435.
International Joint Commission, 979.
Kingston harbour improvements, 3182.
Labour bureaus, national, 615.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—*Con.*
Loans to farmers, 677.
Marine Department estimates, reduction of, 2362.
Motor boats, 2803.
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, 3374.
National Transcontinental Railway, Government operation of, 2399, 2588, 3036-3089, 3605.
Naval service, 1683, 2888.
Niobe and Rainbow, 2890.
Ottawa Journal—correction of statement in, 806.
Parliament, extension of term of, 68.
Parliament Buildings, reconstruction of, 2013, 4077.
Pensions to soldiers, 4131.
Prison reform, 2846.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2486, 2551, 2561, 2697.
Public works expenditure, 2769, 2808, 3341.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3616, 3998, 4008, 4011, 4051.
Railways, location of, 2747.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2747.
Recruiting—coloured men, 235, 557, 2114.
Royal Academy of Arts, 3142.
Rural mail service, 2729.
St. John
Harbour improvements, 735-737, 3335.
Post office, 2817.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3356, 3500.
St. John Valley Railway, 1932.
Shell Committee, the, 71, 92.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4088.
Shipbuilding, 639, 701, 1616, 1643, 2892, 3001, 3110, 3336, 4056.
Soldiers relatives, payments to, 3560.
Solicitor General, remarks of, 151.
Steamship service, 2530.
Submarines, investigation into purchase of, 75, 152, 2890.
Supplementary estimates, 3137.
Surf Inlet harbour improvements, 3185.
Surveys, 2428, 2902.
Taxation of apples, 2305; profits, 85.
Technical education, 1642.
Trade and Commerce, 2996.
Transportation, ocean, 2857, 3110. *See* Shipbuilding.
Vancouver Harbour, 1604.
Vessels, Canadian, requisitioning of, 1969.
War
Expenditures, 39.
Supplies
Ammunition, 71-90.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—*Con.*
War, Supplies—*Con.*
Binoculars, 1717.
Boots, 1716.
Fuses, 1735.
Horses, 1719.
Machine guns, 92.
Orders for, securing of, 963.
Ross rifle, 155.
Shells, 74, 79, 86, 154, 1714, 1725, 1727, 1731, 3842.
White Phosphorous matches, 1493.
Woman suffrage, 1044, 1185, 1204.
Yukon, the, 1312, 1316, 1320.

Quebec (City)
Bridge, 1596, 3434.
Customs officer and revenue, 2169.
Harbour, 743.
Post office, 672, 1651, 2823.
Employees, 1906, 2010, 2034, 2036.
Parcel post superintendent, 547.
Sewerage system, 3557.
Transcontinental railway employees at, 1436.

Quebec (province)
Agriculture, 1389.
Dairy inspection, 852.
Fisheries, 547, 638.
Highways, 3165.
Judges, 2692.
Live stock, 886.
Public works, 3161.
Recruiting in, 479, 491, 498, 3281.
Referee on butter and cheese, 2942.
Steamship service, 2852.

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2530, 3146, 3429. *See* Quebec Railways Acquisition Bill.

Quebec Harbour Commission, 2347.

Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix Railway. *See* Quebec Railways Acquisition Bill.

Quebec Railways Acquisition Bill. (Quebec, Montmorency and Charlevoix; Quebec and Saguenay; Lotbiniere and Megantic). 1r., 3616. 2r., 3990. Com., 4007. 3r., 4052. *See also* 4116.

Railways
Bond guarantees, 887.
Fires caused by, 3412.
Jurisdiction affecting, 947.
Oil for fuel on, 977, 1550.
Passenger service, 3418.
Port Nelson harbour improvements, 1599.
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 1597.
Public ownership of, 3826, 3871.
Quebec bridge, 1596.

Railways—*Con.*
Situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3979.
Stations, naming of, 2738.
Train service in the West, 518, 576.
Transportation. *See that title.*
For individual railways, see their titles.

Railway Act, consolidation of, 1276.

Railway Act Amendment Bills
Powers of Railway Commission. 1r., 2690. 2r., 2743. Com., 2743. 3r., 2802. *See also* 3410, 3629.
Transportation of Grain. 1r., 1207. 2r., 1306. Com., 1306. 3r., 1309.

Railways and Canals
Department estimates, 662, 1590, 2569-2599, 2769, 3035, 3051, 3074, 3375, 3410, 3445, 3593, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3933, 3943.
Staff and salaries, 662.

Rainbow, alleged capture by, 3297, 3943. *See* Niobe.

Regina
Army Service Corps—accommodation for, 1652.
Assistant Receiver General, 553.
Inland Revenue premises, 1439.
Military camp, 1808.

Reid, Jack, imprisonment of for seditiion, 2007.

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Antigonish station garden, 3593, 3603.
Brantford, City of, 1626, 1648.
Burleigh falls, 2583.
Canadian Pacific Railway—freight congestion, 2742.
Canals
Galops, 3609.
St. Peter's, 1601.
Trent, 1601, 3581.
Welland, 1600, 3454.
Customs
Agricultural implements, duty on, 4068.
Bonding privileges, 4097.
Department—staff and salaries, 3644.
Huntingdon preventive stations, 542.
Morrisburg—free entry of goods at, 3645.
Smuggling, 642, 4100.
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, 3446.
Government railways—small claims, 2919, 3303, 3884.
Grain
Elevators, 3061, 3085, 3594, 3600, 3604.
Freight rates on, 3063, 3072-3089.
Transportation of, 1207, 1306, 3602, 3456.
Hudson Bay railway, 1598, 3990.
Intercolonial railway
Accident at Val Brillant, 2058.

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)—*Con.*
Intercolonial railway—*Con.*
Branch lines, 2767.
Car shortage, 1705, 3091.
Coal
Alleged expropriation of, 1762.
Supply, 538, 2115, 2795.
Equipment, 2793, 3607, 3459.
Freight congestion, 2742.
North Sydney terminals, 3427.
Operation, 1591.
Paradis, Mr. T., claim of, 3783.
Passenger service, 3419.
Rates of pay, 2881.
Train service, 3395.
Montreal railway terminals, 3416.
Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, 3230, 3372.
National Transcontinental railway
Equipment, 2793.
Freight rates, 2795, 3058, 3066-3089.
Government operation of, 2584, 2593, 3036-3089, 3605, 3984.
Quebec terminals, 2584.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2466.
Ontario Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1647.
Panama Canal, shipment of goods to Canada via., 4097.
Port Nelson harbour improvements, 1599.
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 1597, 3391.
Quebec bridge, 1596, 3434.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3990, 4007, 4122.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 3430.
Railways
Bridges, guards on, 1433.
Fires caused by, 3412.
Situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3983.
Train service in the West, 518, 556.
Railways and Canals Department
Estimates, 2767-2798, 3035, 3051, 3074, 3375-3404, 3410, 3445, 3593.
Expenditure, 2769.
Railway Commision, powers of, 2745-2758.
Railway Commissioners, 3411.
St. John and Quebec railway, 3052, 3352, 3501.
St. John elevator, 3594.
Shipbuilding, 3608.
Soldiers
Barbour, Private, death of, 3418.
Railway fares, single, for, 3594.
Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company, 2904.
Toronto railway terminals, 3414.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1650.

Reindeer, experiments with, 839.

Rhodes, Mr. Edgar N. (Cumberland)
Amherst
Accommodation for troops, 3269.
Purchase of war supplies, 3267.
Deputy Speaker, appointment as, 531.
Political patronage, 3268.

Richards, T. M., services of, 1653.

Riding Mountain timber reserve, 640.

Rigaud mail service, 541, 595.

Rimouski
Customs officer, 546.
Harbour improvements, 3174.
Inspectors of weights and measures, 671.

River John customs officer, 549.

Riverside Lumber Company, 2058.

Riviere du Loup
Dredging, 2477.
Wharf, 2543.

Riviere Ouelle wharf, 1164.

Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Animals, compensation for destruction of, 2961.
Bilingual question, the, 3771.
Civil Service, enlistment from, 824.
Dundee mail service, 2722.
Grain
Elevators, 3601.
Transportation, 2795, 3601.
Hay purchases, 2967.
Horses for war purposes, 1382, 2970.
Hudson Bay railway, 3387.
Huntingdon preventive stations, 641.
National Transcontinental railway—freight rates on grain, 2795.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4002.
Rural mail service, 2731.
Seed grain indebtedness, 516.
Shipbuilding, 3608.

Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior)
Advertising, 827.
Aliens, employment of, 850.
Alberta farmers, relief for, 532.
Astronomical observatory, western, 2430.
Buffalo, 845.
Civil service, enlistments from, 817, 820, 823.
Conscription, 592, 830.
Dominion Lands and Parks, 2865.
Farmers, western, relief for, 2860.
Forests
Protection, 836, 837.
Reforestation, 2089.
Reserves and Parks, 2496, 2663.
See Dominion Lands.
Grazing leases, 847.

Roche, Hon. W. J. (Minister of the Interior) —*Con.*
Homestead
Inspectors, 828.
Regulations, 827.
Immigration
Agencies, 2096, 2435.
Chinese, 2441.
Inspection, boundary, 657.
Newfoundland, regulations affecting, 2441.
Statistics, 540.
Indian Land Commission, 2867.
Indians, 2059, 2665, 2866. *See that title.*
Interior Department
Enlistments, 2084.
Estimates, 655, 817-850, 2428, 2860.
Minister of in Chicago, 756, 830, 832.
Orders in Council approved, 3347.
Staff and salaries, 655, 817.
Irrigation, 842.
Keay, R. H., fraudulent operations of, 837.
Labourers, foreign, enlistment of, 2145.
Parks, Canadian National, 844.
Pre-emptions, payments on, 534.
Railways, western, 2084.
Reindeer herd, 839.
Rogers, Colonel Maynard, services of, 849.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2316.
Seed grain
Distribution, 2863.
Indebtedness, 507, 518, 760, 1607.
Spirit River Forest Reserve, 3883.
Surveys, 834, 836, 1320, 2428.
Taber irrigation district, 2806.
Taxation of land, 756, 2936.
Timber. *See* Forests.
Water-powers, development of, 840, 842.
Wetaskiwin settlers, grievances of, 2089.
Yukon, the, 1310, 1317.

Rogers, Colonel Maynard, 848.

Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)
Civil Service
Appointments, 4082.
Messengers, 2767.
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, 3452.
Experimental farms, 2871.
House of Commons—Saturday sittings, 3409.
Judges' salaries, 2325.
Labour bureaus, national, 615.
Montreal island, bridge connection with, 3632.
Monument of His late Majesty King Edward VII, 3324.
Ottawa departmental buildings, 2874.

Rogers, Hon. Robert (Minister of Public Works)—*Con.*
Parliament Buildings
Plans of, 4077.
Reconstruction of, 2012, 2833, 3049, 3613, 3622.
Public works
Department estimates, 2808-2838, 2868, 3148-3188, 3556, 3612, 3621.
Expenditure, 2811.
Dredging, 3186, 3627.
Harbours and rivers, 3152, 3156, 3313, 3556, 3615, 3621, 3623.
Roads and bridges, 3163.
Telegraph lines, 3187, 3312, 3318, 3326, 3634.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 3431.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 3616.
Ross rifle, 4108.
Royal Society of Canada, 2875.
Saskatchewan, charges in Legislature of, 1045.
St. John Valley Railway, 1922.
Shell contracts, 3405.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4082.
Soldiers
Disabled, provision for, 2873, 3334.
Medical examination of, 4072.
Technical education, 2208.
Wheat, free, 880, 1046-1052.
Woman suffrage, 1202.

Roseberg post office, 2474.

Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Allowances to soldiers, 1021.
Beehan, J. J., 3408.
Budget, 1020.
Provision for soldiers, 1021.
The duty on apples, 1022.
Government war loans, 1023.
Taxation of profits, 1023.
Income taxation, 1025.
Rural credits, 1026.
Canadian ideals, 1028.
Middlesex county and the war, 1029.
Government administration and political partyism, 1037-1033.
The spirit of France, 1033.
Eggs, marketing of, 2961.
Farmers' credits, 1025.
Political patronage, 1032.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2480.
Rural credits, 1025.
Soldiers' allowances, 1021.
Taxation
Apples, 1022.
Income, 1025.
Profits, 1023.
War loans, 1023.

Ross, Captain William, employment of, 545.

Royal Academy of Arts, 3142,

Royal Assent, 1495, 2073, 2807.

Royal Military College—clothing contract, 3881.

Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, 2889, 2900.

Royal Naval College, 2889.

Royal Society of Canada, 2875.

Rural credits. *See* Farmers.

Rural mail service. *See* Post Office.

Sabourin, Lieut.-Col., rank of, 949.

Sackville
Public building, 2816.
Wharf accommodation, 3160.

Saguenay river improvements, 3674.

St. Alphonse de Caplan, mail service, 1654.

St. Amour, A. C., payments to, 3408.

St. John
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Freight exports, 3529.
Harbour improvements, 729, 3335.
Post office, 2817.
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036, 2039.
Revenues and salaries, 1651.
Terminals, 3593.

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill. Res., 3353. 1r., 3372. 2r., 3500. Com., 3500. 3r., 3502. *See also* 1433, 3051.

St. John Valley Railway, 757.

St. Leonard, N.B., soldiers at, 640.

St. Paul L'Ermite wharf, 2174.

St. Peter's canal, 1601.

St. Peter's Indian reserve. *See* Indians.

St. Peter's Indian Reserve Bill. Res., 2059. 1r., 2071. 2r., 2316. Com., 2316. 3r., 2925-2946.

St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries.

Saskatchewan
Charges in Legislature of, 1045.
Immigration—government co-operation in, 1277.
Judges' salaries, 2071.

Saskatchewan river water supply, 3189.

Scammell, J. K., position of, 1157.

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Grain
Congestion, 1712.
Freight rates, 3067.
Transportation, 2857.
Hudson Bay railway, 3384.
Mail contracts, 2615.

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)—*Con.*
Printing—proposed reduction in cost, 4153.
Rural mail service, 2055.
Sunnybrae mail service, 1549.
Taxation of apples, 2309.
Transportation, ocean, 2857.

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 171.
Imperial relationships, 172.
War contracts, 172, 175.
The tariff and trade, 173.
Public finances, 174.
Shell contracts, 175.
French-Canadians and the war, 177.
Shell Committee, the, 175.
Sealers, British Columbia, claims of, 595.
Secretary of State, department of—translators, 3231.
War contracts, 172, 175.

Seed grain
Advances for, 510, 532, 761.
Amounts required for, 2861.
Distribution of, 2862.
Impurity of, 432.
Indebtedness, 438, 761, 1607.
Liens for, 760.
Purchase of, 886.

Senate
Members of—military duties, 1328.

Seguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
Joliette
Government offices, 3562.
Post office, 3561.
L'Assomption
Mail service, 3881.
Wharf, 2174.
Ottawa Citizen—report of, 2239.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 228, 2239.
Rural mail service, 2726.
St. Paul L'Ermite mail service, 2174.

Select Standing Committee. *See* House of Commons.

Seventh Day Adventists. *See* Private Bills.

Sevigny, Hon. Albert (Dorchester). *See* Speaker.

Sharpe, Colonel Samuel, M.P., pay of, 2924.

Shelburne
Bell buoy, application for, 543.
Customs duties, 1762.
Fishery guardian, 545, 546.
Mail service, 594.
Port physician, 543.

Shell Committee, The, 71, 92, 95, 118, 126, 128, 140, 163, 171, 175, 194, 221-225, 238, 255, 295, 303, 366, 346-350, 420, 923, 1496, 1715, 1740, 2259, 2294.
Advances by, 3528.
Formal charges, 1715.
Formation of, 1500.
See Shell contracts.

Shell Fisheries Commision, 2368.

Shepherd, Mr. F. H. (Nanaimo)
Astronomical observatory, western, 2433.
Taxation of oil, 1800.

Sherbrooke
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Drill hall, 3089.
Mail service, 2173.
Postmaster, 1906, 2033.
Post office
Employees, 1906, 2010, 2036.
Revenues and salaries, 1651.

Shipbuilding. *See* Marine.

Shipping. *See* Marine *and* Transportation.

Shouldis, Mrs., employment of, 1328.

Shovel shields. *See* War Supplies.

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 414.
The war, 414.
Political patronage, 416.
Purchase of horses, 418.
The Shell Committee, 420.
Advertising, government, 3095.
Amherst, Sydney and New Glasgow postal revenue, 3561.
Archibald, M. G., services of, 539.
Bonds, Government, negotiability of, 660.
British Columbia lighthouse service, 3352.
Canada Temperance Act Amendment, 3301.
Censors and decoders, employment of, 640, 851.
Civil Service appointments, 948, 4089.
Coin, American, 654.
Cole harbour wharf, 758, 3150.
Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 1161, 1610.
Fenian Raid bounty, 593.
Fish and fisheries
Bounties, 2546.
Canadian troops, for, 1652.
Dogfish, 2406, 2409.
Fishing industry, 2369.
Herring industry, 2475.
Lobsters, 2388.
Marketing of, 2367.
Pickled fish, 1761.
Shipments to Great Britain, 2411.
Smelt fishing regulations, 673.

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)—*Con.*
Fish and fisheries—*Con.*
Transportation and marketing of, 567, 636, 2364, 2420.
Government annuities, 1437.
Guysborough mail service, 2800.
Halifax
Exports and imports through, 3734.
Military hospital, 2114.
Hjort, Dr., 1552.
Horses for war purposes, 418, 1162, 1379.
Hospitals
Marine. 2918.
Military, 2114.
Hudson Bay navigation, 2911.
Hudson Bay railway, 636, 3384.
Intercolonial railway
Branch lines, 850, 2468, 2774.
Pensions, 757.
Law, the late Mr. B. B., M.P., death of, 591.
Machine guns, private contributions for, 532.
Marine
Coasting privilege, 589, 1300.
Department estimates, reduction of, 2363.
Pilotage, 2805.
Sick Mariners Fund, 753.
Vessels, Canadian, net tonnage of, 1163.
Milford Haven Bridge postmaster, 2173.
Mines Department expenditure, 2335.
Minister of Munitions, 532.
Motor boats, 2804.
Naval service, 2545.
Navigation schools, 696.
Nova Scotia steamship service, 2849.
Oil, freight rates on, 3410.
Parliament buildings, reconstruction of, 2834.
Pensions, Intercolonial railway, 757.
Political patronage, 416.
Port Nelson navigation, 592.
Post office
Expenditure, 2056.
Parcel post, 2735.
Revenue, 532, 2173.
Rural mail service, 2019, 2041, 2048, 2732.
Printing, government, 3095.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2357, 2479, 2490, 2560, 2702, 2759, 2882, 2955.
Public works expenditure, 2815, 3155, 3322, 3338.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4040, 4049.
St. John freight exports, 3529.
Shell Committee, The, 420.
Sherbrooke mail service, 2173.
Shipbuilding, 709, 3122, 4058.
Shipping, total Canadian, 2175.
Soldiers
Letters, postage on, 532.
Punishment of, 3099.

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)—*Con.*
Steamers, foreign trade licenses for, 2694.
Steamship service, 2537, 2540.
Taxation of profits, 2636, 2651.
Transportation, ocean, 3122.
Trawlers, steam, foreign, 640, 641.
Victoria, B.C., rifle range, 1549.
West Rochdale postmaster, 1551.
Whitehead, cold storage, 757.

Smith, Mr. Wm. (South Ontario)
Horses, 672.
Loans to farmers, 933.
War stamps, commission on sale of, 546.

Soldiers. *See* Army.

Soulanges canal
Dredge, 1761.
Employees—charges of partisanship, 3231.
Stone for, 1041, 1437, 1760.
Superintendent, 3408.

Souris rifle range, 2600.

Speaker (Hon. Albert Sevigny), rulings and statements of.
Amendments, 2238.
Consent of the Crown, 2316.
Election of officers, 3.
Explanations limited to a statement of the words actually used, 2241.
Expressions, withdrawal of, 77.
Point of order, discussion on, 3621.
Privilege, questions of, 556.
Reading of unsigned letter not in order, 2743.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4087.
Subjects debatable by House, 3621, 3676.

Spirit river proposed forest reserve, 3529, 3883.

Stamps. *See* Post Office.

Steamboats. *See* Marine.

Steamship service
Canada
British Columbia, 2541.
New Brunswick, 2538, 2540.
Nova Scotia, 2537, 2540, 2847, 3554.
Prince Edward Island, 536, 2851.
Quebec, 2852, 3100, 3134.
China and Japan, 2540.
Cuba, 2534.
Great Britain, 2530, 2537, 2538, 2540.
Newfoundland, 536, 2535, 2537.
South Africa, 2536.
United States, 2541.
West Indies and South America, 2535.
See also Transportation.

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Health, Public, suggested department of, 1065.

Stefansson, Expedition, 2914.

Stellarton, N.S., public building site, 1164.

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
British Columbia, resources of, 3842.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3839.
Capital punishment, 1965.
Enlistment of foreign labourers, 2145.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3839.
House of Commons—Saturday sittings, 3409.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 2683.
Mining industry, 1885.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1442, 2230, 2486.
Railways, public ownership of, 3826.
Trade and commerce, 3002.
Post Office Department expenditure, 1882.
Taxation
Apples, 1777.
Income, 1884.
Profits, 1882.
Vancouver Harbour, 1605.
Western Canada Telephone Company, 1889.

Stewart, Mr. Dugald (Lunenburg)
Fish, transportation and marketing of, 570.
Yarmouth public works, 1905.

Stewart, J. H.—automobile seizure, 1438.

Stewart, Mr. Thos. J. (West Hamilton)
Ontario, Niagara Connecting Bridge Company, 1891.

Sheffington, George, employment of, 1431.

Submarines. *See* Naval service.

Summerside
Post office building, 2010.
Rifle range, 2010.

Sunnybrae, N.S., mail service, 1549.

Supply Bill (for 1917, $99,458,597.41). Res., 2664. 1r., 2r., Com., 3r., 2665.

Supply, Committee of, 653-669, 686-716, 716-739, 739-754, 817-850, 938-943, 956-989, 1309-1325, 1341-1385, 1386-1409, 1410-1432, 1590-1602, 1616-1646, 2016-2057, 2079-2111, 2115-2165, 2326-2346, 2361-2398, 2404-2421, 2428-2442, 2530-2542, 2569-2599, 2665-2690, 2716-2741, 2767-2798, 2808-2838, 2847-2878, 2885-2903, 2908-2919, 2956-2971, 3022-3023, 3035-3049, 3051-3074, 3074-3095, 3120-3143, 3147-3188, 3190-3214, 3214-3230, 3312-3344, 3375-3404, 3410-3463, 3502-3528,

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*

3534-3559, 3586-3616, 3021-3674, 3826-3863, 3863-3875, 3933-3942, 3943-3990, 4067-4074, 4079.

Surveys, 1320, 2428, 2901.

Sussex, N.B.—104th Battalion Military officer, 1161.

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Experimental farms, 1405.
Flax industry, 1291.
Hogs, American, 2923.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway, 2445.
Taxation of apples, 1772.
War supplies—Irish stew, 2014.

Swift Current post office site, 1041.

Sydney, C.B.
Pilotage Commission, 986.
Postal revenue, 3561.

Taber Irrigation District Bill. 1r., 2599. 2r., 2806. Com., 2806. 3r., 2841.

Talbot, Lieut.-Col. Onesiphore, duties of, 1325.

Tan bark, embargo on, 3022.

Tariff. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amendment Bill and Taxation.

Tar sand. *See* Mines.

Taxation, War.
Customs
Apples, 811, 899, 1008, 1016, 1022, 1092, 1130, 1217, 1227, 1764, 2305.
Farm implements, 4068.
Oil, 812, 899, 1009, 1018, 1227, 1796, 2303.
Pearls and diamonds, 641, 758.
Generally, 339, 1225, 1229.
Special
Income, 902, 908, 1025, 1086, 1884, 1982.
Land, 829, 200, 2934.
Profits, 168, 813, 899, 1009, 1023, 1038, 1103, 1127, 1136, 1248, 1330, 1843, 1862, 1891, 1972, 1990, 2601.
See Business Profits War Tax Bill *and* Customs Tariff Act Amendment Bill.

Taylor, Mr. James D. (New Westminster)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 384.
Canadian expeditionary force, 384.
Canada's share in the war, 385.
Conditions of military service, 385.
Naval affairs, 386.
Purchase of submarines, 387.
British Columbia affairs, 389.
Labour bureaus, national, 621.
Naval service, 386.
Submarines, purchase of, 387.
Taxation—war profits, 85.

Technical education, 55, 370, 535, 648, 1618, 1626, 1642, 2177.

Telegraphs
Bay St. Lawrence office, 1551.
British Columbia, 3318.
Cable and wireless rates, 672.
Government lines, 548.
Magdalen islands cable service, 759.
Moosejaw, 3633.
Prince Edward Island, 3187.
Quebec, 3313.
Radiotelegraph service, 2888, 2908.
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 3326, 3637.
Steamer Tyrian, 1437.
Vancouver, 3634.
Wireless stations, 2909, 2913.

Telephones. *See* Telegraphs.

Temiscouata mail service, 2477.

Temiskaming dam, 2546.

Terminal elevators. *See* Grain.

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Divorce, 779.
Shipbuilding, 4064.

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 5.
Extension of term of Parliament, 6.
Canada's productiveness in war time, 7.
Financial and trade conditions, 7.
Fortunes of the war, 9.
Principles at stake, 10.
Mining industry, 1878.
Ottawa military camp doctors, 1760.
Soldiers, insane, 1664.
Taxation of profits, 1878.
Trade and Commerce, 3023.
Yukon, the, 938-943, 1310.

Thompson, Mr. John K.C., 78, 316, 921. *See* Davidson Commission.

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 458.
Commandeering of wheat, 458-461.
Foster, A. De Wit, 4075.
Grain congestion, 1711.
Loans to farmers, 680.
Moosejaw military, 1651.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1479, 2557, 2883.
Regina military camp, 1808.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 458-461.
Free, 1062.

Thornton, Mr. Chas. J. (Durham)
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1482.

Three Rivers
Customs officers, 2169.
Post office
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036.
Revenue and salaries, 1651.

Tibbits, Archibald, employment of, 1439, 2176.

Timber. *See* Dominion Lands.

Titles of honour, 457.

Tobacco. *See* Agriculture.

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond-Wolfe)
Bromptonville mail service, 3562.
D'Israeli government wharf, 3562.

Tonnage. *See* Transportation.

Toronto
American Club, wrecking of, 856.
Customs revenue and officers, 2169.
Military buildings, 2837.
Postal station A, 2836.
Post office
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010.
Revenue and salaries, 1651.
Railway terminals, 3414.

Tracadie
Harbour improvements, 1438, 3149, 3160.
Lazaretto, 2800.

Trade and Commerce.
Agricultural products, export of, 345.
Balance of trade, 890, 903.
Central America, 1653.
China, 344.
Commissioners and agents, 1653, 3022, 3551.
Department
Estimates, 664, 2847, 3023, 3120, 3551.
Expenditure, 906.
Exports to United Kingdom, 592.
Publications, 2992.
Staff and salaries, 664, 3135.
South America, 1653.
Statements of Minister, 2989, 3100.
United States, 344, 2057.
West Indies, 1762, 1809, 1970.

Trade Commission, 4076.

Train service in the West. *See* Railways.

Transcona railway shops, 636.

Transportation
Ocean, 96, 232.
Admiralty transports, 1681.
Freight rates, 100, 116, 118, 1435, 2888.
Harbour facilities, 741, 3100-3134.
Ships, 181, 638, 700.
See also Marine.
Panama Canal route, 4092.
See Marine and Steamship service.
Railway, 1306, 3980. *See* Railways.
Troops, of. *See* Army.

Trawling. *See* Fish and Fisheries.

Tremain, Lieut.-Col., M.P., position of, 1652.

Trent canal, 1601, 2575.

Trousers, purchase of. *See* War Supplies.

Truax, Mr. R. E. (South Bruce)
Hanover public building, 1439.

Tupper, the late Sir Charles, Bart.—resolution of condolence on death of, 39, 582.

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 178.
French-Canadians and the war, 179.
Patriotism of British Dominions, 180.
Conscription, 180.
Provision for wounded soldiers, 181.
Extension of term of Parliament, 181.
Bathurst harbour improvements, 3158.
Breakwaters, necessity for, 3623.
Conscription, 180.
Fish and fisheries
Dogfish, 2404.
Lobsters, 2369, 2378.
French-Canadians and the war, 179.
Hudson Bay railway, 3383.
Intercolonial railway
Paradis, Mr. T., claim of, 2783.
Passenger service, 3419.
Rolling stock, 2799.
Navigation schools, 696.
Parliament, extension of term of, 181.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2358.
St. John Valley Railway, 1944.
Soldiers provision for, 181.
Tracadie lazaretto—firewood for, 2800.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 436.
The Government and the war, 436.
Extension of term of Parliament, 437.
Seed grain indebtedness, 438.
Canada's war loans, 438.
Expenditure for soldiers rations, 440.
Medical examination of recruits, 440.
Pensions to soldiers, 440.
Shell contracts, 441.
Expenditure on public works, 444.
Commandeering and transportation of wheat, 445-452.
Agriculture Department clerks, 2801.
Agricultural implements, duty on, 4069.
Apple duty—Government official on, 1426.
Army
Allowances, separation, 2924, 3098.
Officers, training of, 3533.
Overseas forces, forwarding of, 3512.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)—*Con.*
Army—*Con.*
Recruiting
Medical examination, 440.
Unfit men, 3253.
Soldiers
Pensions to, 440.
Rations for, 440.
Voting of, 3511.
Assistant Clerk of Routine and Records, 1161, 4079.
Banks, taxes payable by, 2478.
British Columbia, resources and progress of, 3847.
Budget, 1130.
The duty on apples, 1130.
The farmers and taxation, 1032.
Extension of term of Parliament, 1133.
Government taxation proposals, 1132, 1136.
Postal revenue, 1133.
Economy in public expenditure, 1134.
Naval policy, 1135.
The Opposition's attitude, 1136.
Taxation of profits, 1136.
The nickle industry, 1140, 1143.
Germans in government service, 1142.
Buffalo, 845.
Cadet service, 3502.
Canadian Northern Railway Company—proposed loan to, 3579, 3657, 3847, 3941.
Snow blocade, 2647.
Canals, patrolling of, 3591.
Chief transport officer, 1903, 1969.
Civil Service
Appointments, 4079.
Deputy Ministers, salary of, 659.
Enlistments from, 821, 824, 888.
Customs—free entry of goods, 3646.
Dairy Commissioner, report of, 1421.
Flax industry, 1293.
Grain
Congestion, 1712.
Freight rates on, 3063, 3072.
Transportation of, 2857.
Wheat
Commandeering of, 445-452, 3214.
Free, 793-802.
High Commissioner, Canadian, office of, 961.
Home Guard, 3504.
Homestead inspectors, 829.
House of Commons
Sessional clerks, 2799.
Sherwood, H. C., appointment of, 4079.
Hudson Bay railway, 3376.
Immigration expenditure, 2109.
Indian Department clerks, 2800.
Inland Revenue Department clerks, 2544.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)—*Con.*
Interior
Department expenditure, 2086.
Minister of, in Chicago, 756.
Justice Department clerks, 2801.
Lands, western, survey of, 835.
Loans to farmers, 929.
Macdonald, Rev. D. R., 3675.
Marine Department clerks, 2801.
Militia Department clerks, 2839.
Mines Department clerks, 2921.
National Transcontinental railway—Government operation of, 3985.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 2463.
Nickel, exportation of, 1140, 1143, 1871.
Ores, refining of, 3031.
Panama canal, goods shipped to Canada via., 4092.
Parks, Canadian National, 845.
Parliament, extension of term of, 437, 1133.
Peterborough Review, statement of, 414.
Political patronage in military affairs, 3542.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 2234, 2559, 2568, 2706.
Public Works
Applications for, 1807.
Department employees, 3155.
Expenditure, 2812.
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4028, 4120.
Railways
Department
Clerks, 2839, 3096.
Estimates, 3056.
Locating of, 2747.
Mail service, 2023.
Situation in Canada, 3988.
Train service in the West, 518.
Railway Commission, powers of, 2747.
Ross, Walter T., release of, 2302.
St. Peter's Indian reserve, 2944.
Seed grain
Distribution, 2862.
Indebtedness, 438, 511.
Liens, 760.
Shipbuilding, 706, 708, 2894, 3017.
Taxation
Agricultural implements, 4069.
Apples, 1130, 1782, 2314.
Land, 756.
Profits, 550, 1136, 1870, 1976, 1984, 2649.
Timber protection, 838.
Trade and Commerce, 3015.
Transportation, 706, 708, 2857, 3118.
Vancouver munitions workers in England, 2743.
Victoria Transfer Company, 3144.

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)—*Con.*
War
Loans, 438.
Supplies
Clothing, 3592.
Orders for, securing of, 961.
Rifles, 3505, 3506.
Shells, 441.
Western farmers, assistance to, 3938.
Wheat. *See* Grain.
Woman suffrage, 1200.
Women voters in Manitoba, 2301.

Unemployment. *See* Labour.

Valcartier
Expropriations, 1300.
Removal of refuse from, 2174.

Vale railway, 3024.

Valleyfield breakwater, 2694.

Valley railway. *See* St. John.

Vancouver
Customs officers and revenue, 1651, 2169.
Post office employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036.

Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act Amendment Bill. Res., 1604. 1r., 1606. 2r., 2078. Com., 2078. 3r., 2079.

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Aubrey, Napoleon, appointment of, 2300.
Budget, 1083.
Jewish people, 1083.
The cost of living, 1084.
Taxation systems, 1086.
Soldiers' pensions, 1087.
Fair-wage boards, 1277, 1438.
Fair-wage clause in government contracts, 3622.
Feller, Camille, 2348.
Ice-breaker contract, 1440.
Labour bureaus, national, 608.
Labourers imported into British Columbia, 1329.
Lyons, John, employment of, 3881.
Mines Department reports, 2339.
Montreal customs building, 2175, 2476.
Pensions to soldiers, 1087.
Reid Jack, imprisonment of for sedition, 2007.
Soldiers
Medical examination of, 4069.
Pensions to, 1087.
Taxation systems, 1086.
Technical education, 2198.
Vickers-Maxim, Ltd.—strike at, 1079, 1763.

Vickers, Limited
Sale of ammunition to. *See* War Supplies, small arms ammunition.

Vickers-Maxim, Ltd. Strike of carpenters at, 1079, 1764.

Victoria, B.C.
Coal for dredges, 547.
Customs, 2169.
Dredging, 546.
Rifle range, 1549.
Post office employees, 1906, 2010, 2036.

Victoria (county) N.S., Government telegraph lines, 548, 758.

Victoria Memorial Museum. *See* Ottawa.

Victoria Transfer Company, 3144.

Voters' lists, printing of, 593, 668.

Wallace, Mr. Thomas G. (Centre York)
James, Mr. C. C.—question of appointment, 2477.
MacInnes, Mr. C. S., position of, 2923.

Wallace Shipyards, Limited, payments to, 1077.

War
British forces, 58.
British Navy, 58.
Canadian forces. *See* Army.
Censors and decoders. *See that title.*
Conscription. *See* Army.
Contracts
Letting of, 161-167.
Political patronage in. *See that title.*
See also Shells.
Expenditure, 35, 36, 39, 58, 102, 138, 807, 1167. *See* War Appropriation Bill, War Supplies *and* Budget.
Fair-wage clause in munitions contracts, 1277, 1969, 3555.
France, fighting in, 1118.
French Government, horses for, 761, 950, 1041.
Frontier protection, 744.
Hospitals. *See that title.*
Imperial Munitions Board, 594, 804.
Investigatins. *See* Shells *and* Small arms ammunition.
Inspectors of shells, appointment of, 143.
Loans. *See* Finance.
Patriotic Funds. *See that title.*
Patrolling of canals, 3591.
Pay and Record Office, Canadian, 3023.
Recruiting. *See* Army *and* Naval Service.
Remount depots, 30.
Shell Committee, the. *See that title.*
Transport, director of, 3096.
Trenches, methods for improving, 2922.
Trench warfare, 2696.
Vancouver munitions workers in England, 2743.
Vessels, commandeering of, 116.
See also Transportation.
See also Army *and* Militia.

War Appropriation ($250,000,000) Bill. Res., 3233. 1r., 3294. 2r., 3530. Com., 3533. 3r., 3534.

War Purchasing Commission, 1441, 1907, 2695, 2801.

War Supplies
Alberta purchases, 3232.
Amherst Barracks, for, 2600.
Ammunition, 28, 71, 90, 106. *See* Small arms.
Bandages, 1354.
Bayonets, 1761.
Binoculars, 1353, 1716.
Blankets, 1436.
Boots, 172, 175, 1716.
British Government for, 957, 968.
Canvas shoes, 166, 595, 673.
Clothing, 1356, 3527, 3592.
Director of, 3096.
40th Battalion for, 1043.
Field kitchens, 547.
Fish, 1652.
Free entry of into Canada, 3645.
French Government, for, 973.
Fuses, 252, 1345, 1502, 1546, 1552, 1735, 1741, 1749, 2274, 2514, 2979, 3097. *See* Shells.
Groceries—British Columbia, 3097, 3733.
Hay, 255-265, 320-335, 353, 392, 410, 530, 537, 1039, 1422, 2298, 2543, 2694, 2963.
Horses, 30, 267, 270, 353, 396, 418, 542, 652, 672, 685, 761, 950, 1041, 1124, 1162, 1326, 1379, 1717, 2968.
Irish stew, 2014.
Issues of to Canadian troops, 968.
Kits, 2167.
Lumber, 1354.
Machine guns, 92, 111, 289, 2275, 3522.
Private contributions for, 532, 2542, 3258, 3291.
Milk powder. *See* powder milk.
Motor trucks, 1345, 1358, 2978, 3676.
Munitions.
Contracts, 235, 1277, 1969, 3555.
Credit to Imperial Government, 1810.
Factories—labour in, 2549.
Imperial Munition Board. *See that title.*
Inspectors of, 544, 2006.
Minister of, 532.
United States, 495.
Works Commission, 2841.
See Shells.
Oats, 2298.
Ordnance, 2799.
Overshoes, 673, 886.
Petroleum, 2648.
Picric acid. *See* Shell contracts.
Pistols, 270-274, 290, 1343, 1346, 1358, 2276, 2290, 2510, 2977.

War Supplies—*Con.*
Powder milk, 850, 1043, 2175, 3262.
Prince Edward Island purchases, 3406.
Proof spirits, 2176.
Purchasing agents, 3528.
Remounts. *See* Horses.
Renfrew wool contracts, 1436.
Rifles
Lee-Enfield, 3562.
Magazines, purchase of, 1328.
Ross, 1347, 1359, 3505-3522, 4105, 4109.
Southern rifle deal, 2286, 2981.
Russian Government, for, 973.
Shells, 74, 79, 86, 90, 143, 152, 154, 161, 175, 194, 221, 238, 279, 295, 405, 409, 420, 441, 494, 751, 803, 805, 1123, 1505, 1556, 1572.
Advances for, 2979, 3097.
Boxes, 543, 2351, 2691.
Commission of inquiry
Appointment of, 2920.
Resolution for, 1714, 1727, 2242, 2264, 2349, 2442, 2496, 2515, 2529, 3296, 3404.
Scope of, 3404, 3464.
Statement by Minister of Militia, 2974.
Shovel shields, 156, 1123, 1347.
Small arms ammunition, 2168, 2302, 2543, 2546, 2881, 3297, 3884, 3943.
Socks, 593, 887.
Southern rifle deal, 2286, 2981.
Trousers, 165.
Water carts, 537.
Wheat. *See* Grain.
Windsor, N.S., purchases at, 3407.

Water-powers
Burleigh falls, 2583.
Control of, 556.
Investigation, 839.
Ownership of, 760.
Trent canal waterway, 2575.

Ways and Means, Committee of, 1275, 1230, 1764, 1843, 1862, 1891, 1990.
See Budget *and* Taxation.

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Political patronage, 1363.

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1470.

Weights and Measures, inspectors of, 2475.

Welland canal, 1600, 3454.

Wellington harbour improvements, 2169.

Wentworth, N.S., mail service, 3353.

West Gore-Clarksville mail service, 2695.

Western farmers. *See* Farmers.

West Indies—syrup shipment from, 1762, 1809, 1970.

Westover county telegraph offices, 2600.

West Rochdale postmaster, 1551.

Wetaskiwin settlers, grievances of, 2088.

Wheat. *See* Grain.

White, Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)
Auditor General, salary of, 658.
Budget, 807.
Revenue and expenditure, 807.
War expenditure, 807.
Loan issues, 808.
Outcome of 1915-1916, 809.
Economic conditions, 809.
Fiscal year, 1916-17, 810.
Taxation and loans, 811.
Tariff proposals, 811.
Taxation of profits, 813.
Future borowings, 815.
Dominion debenture stock issue, 816.
Insurance companies—investments in Dominion securities, 815.
Bank loans to farmers. *See* Loans.
Bonds, Government, negotiability of, 660.
Business Profits War Tax Act, administration of, 3638.
Canadian Associated Press, 3638.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3830, 3964.
Civil Service—salaries, 4079.
Coin, American, 654.
Debt of Canada—interest, 654.
Dominion notes
Advances to banks, 592.
Issue of, 1218.
Federal Plan Commission, 1603, 3136, 3641.
Finance Department salaries, 661.
Government expenditures, 39, 807, 2622, 3138, 4117.
Grain, transportation of, 3981.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, proposed loan to, 3345, 3563, 3648, 3830.
Immigration
Department expenditure, 2628.
Inspection, boundary, 657.
Insurance companies
Extension of charters, 685, 937, 1610.
Investments of, 1611, 2400.
Live stock, advances on, 550.
Loans
Dominion, 659, 807, 811, 815, 1812, 1834, 2006.
See Budget *and* Finance.
Farmers, to, 674-681, 924-936, 1611, 3146.
Munitions credit for Imperial Government, 1810.
National Battlefields Commission, 3141, 3148.
Nickel industry, 1867.
Paper currency, issue of, 1837.
Pistols, 2290.

White, Sir Thomas (Minister of Finance)—*Con.*
Quebec railways, acquisition of, 4117.
Railway situation in Canada—inquiry into, 3986.
Rural credits, 2401.
Seed grain indebtedness, 513.
Shell contracts, 2496.
Sherwood, H. Crossley, appointment of, 4085.
Shipbuilding, 4061.
Taxation, war
Apples, 1764, 1791, 2312.
Income, 1982.
Land, 2001.
Oils, 812, 1796, 1806.
Profits, 813, 1330-1341, 1843-1862, 1864-1887, 1891-1900, 1972-1989, 1990-2006, 2469, 2646.
See Budget.
Transportation, railway, 3981.
Wheat, free, 861-874.
Zinc or spelter, bounty on, 2839, 3029.

White Phosphorus Matches Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 989. 2r., 1493. Com., 2r., 3r., 1616.

White slave traffic, 981.

Whitehead cold storage, 757.

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver J. (North Essex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 93.
Extension of term of Parliament, 97.
Policy of Liberal party, 94.
Shell Committee, 95.
Transportation of crops, 96.
Gasolene, 885.
Naval Service, 1697.
Parliament, extension of term of, 97.
Shell Committee, the, 95.
Transportation of crops, 96.

Willson, Mr. Beckles, position of, 1326.

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Surveys, 1321.

Wilson, Mr. Fred. S., services of, 3353.

Winding-up Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1548. 2r., 1616. Com., 1616. 3r., 1616.

Windsor, N.S.—purchase of war supplies, 3407.

Winnipeg
Customs officers and revenue, 2169.
Disturbances at, 2548.
Post office
Employees, 1651, 1906, 2010, 2036.
Revenue and salaries, 1651.

Wireless stations. *See* Telegraphs.

Woman suffrage, 1044, 1185, 1608, 2301.

Wool. *See* Agriculture.

Wrecks. *See* Marine.

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Dredging, 550.
Flax industry, 1294.
Prohibition of intoxicating liquors, 1489.
Public works, 550, 1905.
Soldiers, medical examination of, 4073.
Wheat, commandeering of, 3206.

Yukon territory, 938, 1309, 1312.

Zinc Bounties Bill. Res., 3029. 1r., 3035. 2r., 3147. Com., 3147. 3r., 3353.